Roughskin newt

Taricha granulosa

Class: Amphibia
Order: Caudata

Review Status: Peer-reviewed **Version Date:** 23 April 2018

Conservation Status

NatureServe:	*Agency:*		
G Rank: G5	ADF&G: Species of Greatest Conservation Need	IUCN: Least Concern	Audubon AK:
S Rank: S4	USFWS:	BLM:	

Final Rank

Conservation category: **VI. Yellow**

low status and high biological vulnerability and action need

Category	Range	Score
Status	-20 to 20	-11
Biological	-50 to 50	-14
Action	-40 to 40	24

Higher numerical scores denote greater concern

Status - variables measure the trend in a taxon's population status or distribution. Higher status scores denote taxa with known declining trends. Status scores range from -20 (increasing) to 20 (decreasing). **Score**

Population Trend in Alaska (-10 to 10) -6

Unknown, but suspected stable (J. T. Ream, pers. comm.). Among Alaska's salamanders, this species has the broadest distribution and is the one for which we have the most information. Compared to the Ambystomatids, it is more highly visible and more easily encountered, and the Alaska Herpetological Society receives a lot of public reports on this species (J. T. Ream, pers. comm.).

Distribution Trend in Alaska (-10 to 10) -5

Unknown, but suspected stable (J. T. Ream, pers. comm.). Among Alaska's salamanders, this species has the broadest distribution and is the one for which we have the most information. Compared to the Ambystomatids, it is more highly visible and more easily encountered, and the Alaska Herpetological Society receives a lot of public reports on this species (J. T. Ream, pers. comm.).

Status Total: -11

Biological - variables measure aspects of a taxon's distribution, abundance and life history. Higher biological scores suggest greater vulnerability to extirpation. Biological scores range from -50 (least vulnerable) to 50 (most vulnerable). **Score**

Population Size in Alaska (-10 to 10) -2

Unknown, but suspected large. Data from amphibian surveys suggest that this species is amongst the most common and abundant amphibians in Alaska (Waters 1992; Carstensen et al. 2003; Gotthardt et al. 2015; Ream 2016; Ream et al. 2019). Several hundred individuals have been detected at individual sites along the Stikine River (J. T. Ream, pers. comm.).

Range Size in Alaska (-10 to 10) -2

Found in Southeast Alaska from Juneau south to British Columbia (MacDonald 2010; ACCS 2017a). Has been documented on many islands including the Alexander Archipelago including Mitkof, Wrangell, and Prince of Wales Islands (MacDonald 2010; Gotthardt et al. 2015; Ream 2016). Some populations are the result of human introductions (MacDonald 2010). Estimated range size is ~62,988 sq. km, based on range map from ACCS (2017a).

Population Concentration in Alaska (-10 to 10) -10

Does not concentrate. Widely distributed across Southeast Alaska. More than 300 occurrence records are documented (ARCTOS 2016; ACCS 2017b).

Reproductive Potential in Alaska

Age of First Reproduction (-5 to 5) 1

Thought to attain sexual maturity at 4-5 years (Efford and Mathias 1969; MacDonald 2010).

Number of Young (-5 to 5) -3

Females lay several clutches over the course of the breeding season, which in Alaska probably extends from April (or May) to June (Oliver and McCurdy 1974; Waters 1992; MacDonald 2010). Hanifin et al. (2003) reported a mean clutch size of 542 eggs (SD = 110, n = 4); this estimate is based on the number of ova found in gravid females taken from a population in southern Oregon.

Ecological Specialization in Alaska

Dietary (-5 to 5) 1

Feeds on small,aquatic and terrestrial invertebrates including dipterans, cladocerans, and bivalves; diet varies by life stage and appears to vary spatially and temporally, likely in response to changes in prey availability (Neish 1970; Taylor 1984). Because invertebrates are ephemeral and potentially unpredictable food sources, we rank this question as B- Moderately adaptable.

Habitat (-5 to 5) 1

Requires freshwater to complete its lifecycle. Often breeds in small, vegetated, lakes and ponds; breeding has also been observed in muskegs (Waters 1992; MacDonald 2010). Adults are mostly terrestrial; during the summer, they forage in moist habitats with woody debris, rocks, and other features that provide shade and cover (Waters 1992; MacDonald 2010). In Alaska, this species has been reported from several habitat types including muskegs, coastal forests, roadside ponds, and mountain lakes (Waters 1992; Carstensen et al. 2003; Gotthardt et al. 2015; Ream 2016).

Biological Total: -14

Action - variables measure current state of knowledge or extent of conservation efforts directed toward a given taxon. Higher action scores denote greater information needs due of lack of knowledge or conservation action. Action scores range from -40 (lower needs) to 40 (greater needs). **Score**

Management Plans and Regulations in Alaska (-10 to 10) 10

Not managed or protected in the state of Alaska. A permit is required to collect specimens for scientific or educational purposes (ADF&G 2004).

Knowledge of Distribution and Habitat in Alaska (-10 to 10) 2

Distribution and habitat associations are somewhat known (see Habitat section and references therein). This species is commonly detected during amphibian surveys and there are >300 occurrence records in Alaska (ARCTOS 2016; ACCS 2017b).

Knowledge of Population Trends in Alaska (-10 to 10) 2

Locally monitored in the Stikine River area through the Alaska Herpetological Society's Stikine

Long-term Amphibian Monitoring Program (SLAMP), but data on statewide population trends are currently unavailable.

Knowledge of Factors Limiting Populations in Alaska (-10 to 10) 10

Very little is known about the ecology of this species in Alaska. Potential threats include pathogens and
climate-related habitat loss e.g. wetland drying (MacDonald 2010).

Action Total: 24

Supplemental Information - variables do not receive numerical scores. Instead, they are used to sort taxa to answer specific biological or management questions.

Harvest:	None or Prohibited
Seasonal Occurrence:	Year-round
Taxonomic Significance:	Monotypic species
% Global Range in Alaska:	<10%
% Global Population in Alaska:	<25%
Peripheral:	Yes

References

Alaska Center for Conservation Science (ACCS). 2017a. Wildlife Data Portal. University of Alaska Anchorage. Available online: http://aknhp.uaa.alaska.edu/apps/wildlife

Alaska Center for Conservation Science (ACCS). 2017b. Alaska Amphibian Database. University of Alaska Anchorage, AK, USA. Available online: https://accscatalog.uaa.alaska.edu/dataset/alaska-amphibian-occurrence-records

Alaska Department of Fish and Game (ADFG). 2004. Policy and requirements for fish resource permits. Juneau, AK, USA.

ARCTOS. 2016. ARCTOS database: Fish, amphibian, mammal, bird and reptile collections. University of Alaska Museum of the North, Fairbanks, AK, USA. Available online: http://arctos.database.museum/

Carstensen, R., M. Willson, and R. Armstrong. 2003. Habitat use of amphibians in northern Southeast Alaska. Report to the Alaska Department of Fish and Game by Discovery Southeast, Juneau, AK, USA.

Efford, I. E., and J. A. Mathias. 1969. A Comparison of Two Salamander Populations in Marion Lake, British Columbia. Copeia 1969(4):723-736.

Gotthardt, T., J. Reimer, T. Nawrocki, C. Greenstein, and K. Walton. 2015. Prince of Wales Island amphibian surveys 2013 and 2014. Alaska Natural Heritage Program, University of Alaska Anchorage. Anchorage, AK, USA. Available online: https://accs.uaa.alaska.edu/publications/

Hanifin, C. T., E. D. Brodie, and E. D. Brodie. 2003. Tetrodotoxin levels in eggs of the rough-skin newt, Taricha granulosa, are correlated with female toxicity. Journal of Chemical Ecology 29:1729–1739. 10.1023/A:1024885824823

MacDonald, S. O. 2010. The amphibians and reptiles of Alaska: A field handbook. Version 2.0, May 2010. Alaska Natural Heritage Program, University of Alaska Anchorage, AK, USA.

Neish, I. C. 1970. A comparative analysis of the feeding behaviour of two salamander populations in Marion Lake, B.C. Ph. D. thesis, University of British Columbia, Vancouver, B.C., CAN.

Oliver, M. G., and H. M. McCurdy. 1974. Migration, overwintering, and reproductive patterns of Taricha granulosa on sounthern Vancouver Island. Canadian Journal of Zoology 52(4):541-545. DOI: 10.1139/z74-068

Ream, J. T. 2016. Local herpetological knowledge in the north. PhD thesis, University of Alaska Fairbanks, AK, USA.

Ream, J. T., D. Zabriskie, and J. Andrés López. 2019. Herpetological inventory of the Stikine River region, Alaska, 2010-2018. Northwestern Naturalist 100:102–117.

Taylor, J. 1984. Comparative Evidence for Competition between the Salamanders Ambystoma gracile and Taricha granulosa. Copeia 1984(3):672–683.

Waters, N. D. L. 1992. Habitat associations, phenology, and biogeography of amphibians in the Stikine River basin and Southeast Alaska. Report of the 1991 pilot project, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, California Cooperative Fishery Research Unit, and Humboldt State University, Arcata, CA, USA.

Alaska Center for Conservation Science
Alaska Natural Heritage Program
University of Alaska Anchorage
Anchorage, AK