

1 **Monitoring the EU protected *Geomalacus maculosus* (Kerry Slug): what are the factors**
2 **affecting catch returns in open and forested habitats?**

3 Erin Johnston¹, Gesche Kindermann¹, Jack O'Callaghan¹, Daniel Burke¹, Cillian
4 McLaughlin¹, Sinéad Horgan¹, Rory Mc Donnell², Christopher Williams³, Michael
5 Gormally¹

6
7 ¹ Applied Ecology Unit, Centre for Environmental Science, National University of Ireland
8 Galway, Galway, Ireland

9 ² Department of Crop and Soil Science, Oregon State University, Corvallis OR 97331, USA

10 ³ School of Natural Sciences and Psychology, Liverpool John Moores University, Liverpool,
11 L3 3AF, United Kingdom

12

13 **Abstract**

14 *Geomalacus maculosus* is a slug species protected under EU law with a distribution limited to
15 the west of Ireland and north-west Iberia. The species, originally thought to be limited within
16 Ireland to deciduous woodland and peatland, has been found in a number of commercial
17 conifer plantations since 2010. While forest managers are now required to incorporate the
18 protection of the species where it is present, no clear species monitoring protocols are
19 currently available. This study examines the efficacy of De Sangosse refuge traps across three
20 habitats frequently found associated with commercial forest plantations in Ireland and
21 compares them with hand searching, a commonly used method for slug monitoring. Catch
22 data during different seasons and under different weather conditions are also presented.
23 Results indicate that autumn is the optimal time for sampling *G. maculosus* but avoiding
24 extremes of hot or cold weather. While refuge traps placed at 1.5m on trees in mature conifer
25 plantations and directly on exposed rock in blanket peatlands result in significantly greater
26 catches, hand searching is the most successful approach for clear-fell areas. Hand searches in
27 clear-fell preceded by rain are likely to result in greater numbers caught. The results of this
28 study form, for the first time, the basis for *G. maculosus* monitoring guidelines for forestry
29 managers

30 **Keywords:** Refuge traps, hand searching, sampling methods, Gastropods, protected species,
31 monitoring

Introduction

The phylum Mollusca, with 85,000 (approx.) described species across aquatic and terrestrial habitats (Chapman, 2009), is one of the most successful animal groups ranked after arthropods and vertebrates (South, 1992). Nevertheless, 42% of all animal extinctions since the 1500s have been molluscan species (Lydeard, 2004). The number of molluscan extinctions alone in the last 400 years outweighs that of birds, mammals, reptiles and amphibians put together (Bouchet *et al.*, 1999). Within Ireland, 150 species of native non-marine molluscs have been evaluated for conservation status and *Geomalacus maculosus* Allman is one of six legally protected mollusc species under European legislation (Byrne *et al.*, 2009). Given the restricted distribution of the species to the west of Ireland and north-west Iberia, *G. maculosus* is protected under Appendix II of the Berne Convention, as well as Annex II and IV of the European Union Habitats Directive (92/43/EC). Irish populations are considered to be of international importance as the Iberian range of the species has been reported as severely threatened and declining (Platts & Speight, 1988; Byrne *et al.*, 2009) and *G. maculosus* is currently listed as vulnerable in Spain (Verdú & Galante, 2006).

Platts and Speight (1988) described *G. maculosus* in Ireland as a “handsome” crepuscular slug, coloured either brown with yellow spots, or grey/black with white spots. Brown specimens are commonly found in woodlands and grey/black specimens in the more open habitats such as blanket bog and heath (Rowson *et al.*, 2014), although some crossover has been found to occur (Platts & Speight, 1988). Originally discovered in Co. Kerry in the south-west of Ireland by Allman in 1842, the species was subsequently found in 1873 and in Portugal and in 1886 in Spain and (Platts & Speight, 1988) with recent research by Reich *et al.*, (2015) indicating that Irish populations are genetically close to those in northern Spain. Given that the species is not found in countries such as France and Britain which lie between north-west Iberia and Ireland (i.e. it has a disjunct distribution), *G. maculosus* is referred to as a Lusitanian species, Lusitania being originally a Roman province corresponding to Portugal and parts of Spain today. In Ireland, *G. maculosus* was traditionally considered to be restricted to the southwest of the country, and within this distribution only in areas of deciduous woodland, blanket bog, unimproved oligotrophic open moor and on lake shores (Anon, 2010). In 2010, however, it was found breeding in a commercial conifer plantation in Co. Galway (Kearney, 2010) 200km (approx.) north of its previously known distribution. Since then, *G. maculosus* has also been discovered in numerous conifer plantations in the south-west of Ireland (Mc Donnell *et al.*, 2011; Reich *et al.*, 2012).

65 The Republic of Ireland is one of the least forested countries in Europe, with just over 10% of
66 the land under forest in 2012 of which 68% consists of commercial forestry (Department of
67 Agriculture Food and Marine (DAFM, 2015). Over half of the national forest estate is owned
68 by the state and of this 93% is owned by the state sponsored company Coillte (NFI, 2012).
69 *Picea stichensis* (Bong.) Carr. is the predominant tree planted in commercial plantations in
70 Ireland (DAFM, 2015) and the Forest Service aims to increase forest cover in Ireland to 17%
71 by 2030, primarily through increases in commercial forestry cover (Forest Service 2008).
72 Forestry management is now considered one of the main threats to *G. maculosus* along with
73 invasive species, agricultural reclamation and habitat fragmentation (NPWS, 2013). Prior to
74 2011, the recommended method for surveying the species was through hand searching
75 (National Roads Authority, 2009). No effective or repeatable trapping method for *G.*
76 *maculosus* existed until Mc Donnell and Gormally (2011) trialled a range of refuge traps and
77 established that De Sangosse refuge traps were the most effective for surveying *G.*
78 *maculosus*. De Sangosse traps (0.25m x 0.25m) consist of a layer of absorbent material
79 sandwiched between an upper reflective surface and a black plastic, perforated lower surface.
80 In addition, while Reich *et al.* (2012) used these traps to determine the influence of
81 environmental factors (e.g. temperature) on *G. maculosus* and successfully captured the
82 species for the first time on tree stumps in a forest clear-fell, their data were sourced from a
83 single commercial plantation only.

84 The presence of *G. maculosus* in commercial conifer plantations in Ireland means that
85 forestry managers are legally obliged to protect the species while undertaking day-to-day
86 forestry practices (e.g. clear-felling). In addition, managers seeking Forest Stewardship
87 Council (FSC) certification (Principle 6) (2016) are required to conserve biodiversity. This
88 requires the development of standardised monitoring protocols so that managers can
89 determine: a) whether *G. maculosus* is present on site; and b) if present, incorporate
90 appropriate management strategies to ensure its protection. However, standardised protocols
91 are not currently available since the optimal positioning of De Sangosse refuge traps in
92 forests and associated habitats such as clear-fell and unplanted areas has not yet been
93 determined. In addition, no comparison to date has been undertaken to compare the
94 effectiveness of using refuge traps with simple hand searching, another commonly used
95 sampling method for *G. maculosus* (NRA, 2009) and other terrestrial gastropods (Hunter
96 1968). This provided the incentive for this study which for the first time, examines different
97 trapping methods across a range of open and forested sites.

98 **Aims**

- 99 1. Assess the impact of De Sangosse refuge trap position in forested and open habitats
100 on *G. maculosus* catches and compare these with hand searching.
101 2. Quantify the effects of seasonal variation on catches to determine the optimum
102 sampling season for site assessment.
103 3. Determine the influence of temperature and rainfall in forested and open habitats on
104 catches to inform optimum weather conditions during which to undertake sampling.
105

106 **Materials and Methods**

107 Study areas

108 Two studies, one carried out over twelve months (Long-term study) and one over four
109 months (Short-term study) were undertaken in and near commercial conifer plantations
110 within the range of *G. maculosus* in the south-west of Ireland. Four study sites (Fig. 1) were
111 chosen within which were selected:

- 112 1. Compartments (forestry management unit) of mature commercial conifers
113 (predominantly *P. stichensis*) planted on peatland in the early 1970s (Coillte, 2015).
114 2. A compartment, which was clear-felled in 2013 and, at the time of the study, was
115 dominated by *P. stichensis* tree stumps interspersed with *Digitalis purpurea* L.,
116 *Juncus effusus* L. and mosses.
117 3. An adjacent area of unplanted peatland containing predominantly *Molinia caerulea*
118 (L.) Moench, and *Calluna vulgaris* (L.) Hull.

119 While another slug species (*Lehmania marginata* Müller) was also found in conifer
120 plantations during the study, catches were, on average, 96% lower than those for *G.*
121 *maculosus*, the focal species for this investigation.

122 Long-term Study

123 The aim of the long-term study was to record catches of *G. maculosus* from a range of
124 habitats over a full calendar year with a view to determining the optimum season for
125 sampling using refuge traps (De Sangosse, Pont du Casse, France, hereafter referred to as
126 “trap”). In each mature compartment, a stand of nine trees in a 3 x 3 grid was selected, at
127 least 10m from the edge of the forest. As in Mc Donnell & Gormally (2011), a single trap

128 was fixed to the north side of each tree (using nails and string) at 1.5m above ground (Fig.
129 2a). Similarly, in each of the clear-fell compartments, individual traps (secured using nails
130 and string) were placed on the north side and top of 3 x 3 tree stumps (Fig. 2b) situated at
131 least 10m from the compartment edge. At each of the peatland sites, nine traps were placed
132 on rocks as per Mc Donnell & Gormally (2011) using tec7 glue, nails and string (Fig 2c). In
133 addition, in each mature conifer and clear-fell compartment and in the peatland sections (at a
134 minimum distance of 45m from the tree, stump or rock traps respectively), nine (3 x 3) traps
135 (1.5m apart) were secured (using tent pegs) over vegetation/bare soil on the ground between
136 the traps on trees, tree stumps and rocks. These traps (hereafter referred to as “ground traps”)
137 were deployed because McDonnell & Gormally (2011) have shown that *G. maculosus* can
138 move between trees.

139 Slug catches under the traps were recorded each day for five consecutive days every month
140 for 12 months from September 2014 to August 2015 and because of this, traps were not
141 baited as in Mc Donnell & Gormally (2011) since bait degradation would occur between
142 sampling months, thereby influencing the catches on day 1 of each monthly sampling period.
143 The age (i.e. adult or juvenile) and location (i.e. on tree, stump, rock, or ground) of every *G.*
144 *maculosus* found under the traps were recorded. As the size of *G. maculosus* is difficult to
145 measure, and weighing individuals was problematic in the field, slugs greater than 1cm in
146 diameter when rolled into a defensive ball were deemed to be adults.

147 Short-term study

148 During the final four months of the long-term study, an additional investigation was
149 undertaken to compare the sampling protocols of Mc Donnell and Gormally (2011) with
150 previously untried sampling methods. This study was completed at additional locations
151 within each of the four field sites above but using the same protocol regarding distances
152 between traps. The aims were to compare:

153 a) Efficacy of traps placed on mature trees at 1.5m versus 0.2m above ground

154 For this study, two additional mature stands of nine trees (3 x 3) were selected within each of
155 the mature compartments included in the long-term study. Traps were placed on the north
156 side of the trees at a standard height of 1.5m (stand 1) and at a height of 0.2m from the base
157 of the tree (stand 2). To avoid any potential bias related to individual trees, traps placed at
158 0.2m were relocated to 1.5m on the same tree and vice-versa at the end of each sampling
159 week. Sampling regime followed that of the long-term study.

b) Efficacy of traps versus hand searching

Hand searches were also undertaken in the mature and clear-felled compartments, and in the adjacent peatland at a distance of 45m from all other trapping locations. Hand searches were completed on nine trees (3 x 3) in the mature compartment, nine stumps (3 x 3) in the clear-fell compartment and over a marked area of similar size (5m x 5m), respectively on the peatland outcrops. Hand searches for both adult and juvenile *G. maculosus* were carried out by two people for five minutes per person in each of the designated areas giving a total of ten minutes searching for each sampling day between June and September 2015. This is equivalent to the minimum amount of time it took to check traps for catches within the compartments. Searches involved examining primarily lichens and mosses on tree trunks (to a maximum height of approximately 2m), stumps and rocks in addition to examining the areas in between these features.

Temperature and rainfall data collection

TinyTag Plus 2 (TGP-4500) environmental data loggers were used to collect temperature data with readings taken every 20 minutes from 19th of September 2014 to the 31st of August 2015. Each data logger, placed 1m above ground in a Stephenson's Type Screen (ACS-5050, TinyTag), was placed in each mature conifer and clear-fell compartment and in the peatland sections between the groups of traps. The Screen protects TinyTag loggers from direct sunlight and precipitation when monitoring outdoors (TinyTag, 2016). Hourly rainfall data were obtained from the nearest Met Éireann (Irish National Meteorological Service) stations in Cork Airport, Co. Cork, and Valentia, Co. Kerry to allow for an assessment of the influence of rainfall on capture success. These weather stations were selected as Site 1 was nearest (31 km) to Valencia and Sites 2 (53km), 3 (48km), and 4 (53km) were closest to Cork airport.

Statistical analyses

All analyses were undertaken using SPSS version 21. Where the assumptions of normality and homogeneity of variance were violated, Welch's T test or ANOVA was used followed by a Games-Howell *post hoc* test to determine pair-wise differences where more than two groups were examined. Where the assumption of normality was violated but the homogeneity of variance was not, the Kruskal Wallis H test was used followed by a Dunn's *post hoc* test to compare pair-wise differences. Curve estimation was also used to assess the relationship of examined variables to each other. Where linear relationships were found two-tailed Spearman

rank correlations were performed. Mean temperature over seasons was calculated by averaging readings taken every twenty minutes from data loggers over the course of the investigation.

Results

Comparison of trap position and hand searching on *G. maculosus* catches in forested /open habitats (Short-term Study)

Six hundred and fifty-six adult and 63 juvenile (8.8% of total catch) *G. maculosus* were caught on 135 sampling occasions in the mature forest compartments with all individuals caught by hand searching found on tree trunks only (Table 1). Adult / juvenile catches were greatest using traps placed on tree trunks 1.5m above ground (412 / 39), followed by traps placed at 0.2m above ground (219 / 21), hand searching (20 / 3) and traps placed directly on the ground (5 / 0). For adults statistically significant differences were found between all sampling methods ($P < 0.001$, Welch's ANOVA followed by Games-Howell *post-hoc* analysis) except between traps placed directly on the ground and hand searches. For juveniles statistically significant differences were found only between traps placed at 1.5m and hand searching ($P = 0.020$, Welch's ANOVA with Games-Howell *post-hoc* analysis). No juveniles were found beneath ground traps. Where juveniles were caught the percentage of the overall catch consisting of juveniles for individual sampling methods was greatest for hand searching (13% of total catch) compared to traps at 1.5m (8.6% of total catch) or 0.2m above ground (9.5% of total catch).

One hundred and forty-four adult and 29 juvenile (16.8% of total catch) *G. maculosus* were caught over 80 sampling occasions in the clear-felled compartments (Table 2). Adult / juvenile catches were greatest using hand searching (99 / 27), followed by traps placed on stumps (36 / 2), and traps placed directly on the ground (9 / 0). For adults statistically significant differences were found between all three methods ($P < 0.001$, Welch's ANOVA with Games-Howell *post-hoc* analysis). For juveniles, statistically significant differences were found between hand searches and traps placed on tree stumps ($P = 0.037$, Welch's T-test with Games-Howell *post-hoc* analysis). No juveniles were found beneath ground traps and all adults and juveniles (126 in total) caught by hand searching were found on tree

223 stumps only. Where juveniles were caught the percentage of the overall catch consisting of
224 juveniles for individual sampling methods was greatest for hand searching (21.4% of total
225 catch) compared to tree stump traps (5.3% of total catch).

226
227 Forty-four adult and 17 juvenile (27.9% of total catch) *G. maculosus* were caught over 80
228 sampling occasions on the rock outcrops on the peatland (Table 3). Adult and juvenile
229 catches were greatest using rock traps (42 / 14), followed by hand searching (2 / 3), and none
230 were captured under traps placed directly on the vegetation between the rocks (ground traps).
231 Statistically significant differences were found between rock traps and hand searching for
232 both adults and juveniles ($P = 0.029$, Welch's T-test). All adults and juveniles (5 individuals)
233 caught by hand searching were found on rocks only. Where juveniles were caught the
234 percentage of the overall catch consisting of juveniles for individual sampling methods was
235 greatest by hand searching (60% of total catch) compared to rock traps (25% of total catch).

236
237

238 Seasonal variation in *G. maculosus* catches (Long-term study)

239

240 Catches are reported as mean number of *G. maculosus* caught per sampling occasion to allow
241 for comparison across the seasons (Table 4). Mean number of adults caught using traps was
242 greatest in the autumn (4.62), followed by spring (2.43) and summer (1.62), with lowest
243 catches occurring in the winter (1.43). Mean number of juvenile caught was also greatest in
244 autumn (0.38), followed by summer (0.36), spring (0.14) and winter (0.12). Autumn catches
245 for both adults and juveniles were significantly greater ($P = 0.000$; $P = 0.001$ respectively)
246 than winter and spring catches ($P < 0.001$; $P = 0.002$ respectively), Welch's ANOVA with
247 Games-Howell post-hoc analysis. Additional significant differences in adult and juvenile
248 catches between seasons can be seen in Table 4. The percentage of the total catch represented
249 by juveniles was greatest in the summer (18.3%) followed by winter (7.9%), autumn (7.7%)
250 and spring (5.4%).

251

252 In the mature conifer compartments lowest mean catch in winter corresponded with the
253 lowest average temperatures and second lowest catch success in summer corresponded with
254 the highest mean temperatures (Fig. 3). In both the clear-fell compartments and peatland

sections the lower catches generally occurred in winter and spring (peatland) and winter, spring and summer (clear-fell) (Fig. 3).

G. maculosus catches in relation to temperature and rainfall (Long and short term studies)

Significant, but weak, quadratic relationships (Fig. 4) were found between total capture success using refuge traps placed at 1.5m and average temperature during the 24 hour period prior to sampling in mature conifer compartments ($P < 0.001$, $r_s = 0.069$) and in clear-felled compartments ($P < 0.001$, $r_s = 0.053$) (Fig. 4). There was no significant relationship between temperature and capture success in peatland areas ($P = 0.167$, $r_s = 0.020$). Significant, but weak, quadratic relationships were also found between capture success and average temperature over the twenty minutes it took to assess traps in mature conifer compartments ($P < 0.001$, $r_s = 0.067$) and in clear-felled compartments ($P = 0.024$, $r_s = 0.029$) (Fig. 4). There was no significant relationship between temperature and capture success in peatland areas ($P = 0.072$, $r_s = 0.024$).

Significant, but weak, negative Spearman's rank-order correlations were found between individuals caught using hand searches and both the average temperature during the 24 hour period prior to sampling and the temperature during hand searching ($P = 0.038$, $r_s = -0.268$, and $P = 0.012$, $r_s = -0.279$ respectively) in clear fell compartments. No significant correlations were found between hand search catch success and average temperature during the 24 hour period prior to sampling in either mature conifer compartments ($P = 0.689$, $r_s = 0.040$) or peatland sections ($P = 0.651$, $r_s = 0.060$). Furthermore, no significant correlations were found between hand search catch success and temperature during hand searching in either mature conifer compartments ($P = 0.689$, $r_s = 0.040$) or peatland sections ($P = 0.651$, $r_s = 0.060$).

A significant, moderate positive Spearman's rank-order correlation was found between individuals caught using hand searches and the average rainfall during the 24 hour period prior to sampling ($P = 0.001$, $r_s = 0.371$) in clear-fell compartments. No significant correlations were found between hand search catch success and average rainfall during the 24 hour period prior to sampling in either mature conifer compartments ($P = 0.368$, $r_s = -0.078$) or peatland sections ($P = 0.226$, $r_s = 0.137$). Additionally, no significant correlations were

287 found between hand search catch success and rainfall during hand searching in either mature
288 conifer compartments ($P = 0.242$, $r_s = -0.101$), clear-fell compartments ($P = 0.487$, $r_s = 0.079$),
289 or peatland sections ($P = 0.334$, $r_s = -0.109$).

290 Discussion

291 Trap position / hand searching and *G. maculosus* catches

292 Within the mature forest compartments, traps placed at a standard height of 1.5m had greater
293 catch success for adults and juveniles combined (63% of total catch) compared to traps
294 placed at 0.2m (33%), hand searching (3%) and ground traps (< 1%). While Platts & Speight
295 (1988) list the forest floor in deciduous forests as a potential microhabitat for *G. maculosus*, a
296 small study by Mc Donnell & Gormally (2011) in a native oak-birch-holly woodland found
297 more individuals under identical traps placed at 1.5m on tree trunks than under ground traps
298 albeit made of a range of different materials. It is, therefore, likely that individual trees are an
299 important microhabitat for *G. maculosus* with most slug activity in commercial conifer
300 plantations occurring on trees rather than on the ground between trees. The fact that ground
301 traps in mature plantations resulted in the least number of catches and no slugs were caught
302 on the forest floor during hand searches further strengthens this conclusion. While lichens,
303 the primary food plant of *G. maculosus* (Reich *et al.*, 2012), are more species rich in the
304 upper third of trees in Sitka spruce plantations (Coote *et al.*, 2007), humidity also decreases
305 with increasing elevation on trees (Hosokawa *et al.*, 1964). It is probable that while slugs may
306 forage in the upper parts of the tree, they return to the more humid, shaded conditions found
307 in the lower parts of the trees to avoid desiccation. This being the case, the first trap they
308 would encounter as they move down the tree would be the trap placed at 1.5m where almost
309 twice as many individuals were caught in comparison to catches under traps placed at 0.2m.
310 The likely movement of individuals up and down the tree trunks may have contributed to the
311 relatively poor efficacy of hand searching in the mature conifer compartments simply
312 because, for practical reasons, counts of slugs on tree trunks were limited to a maximum
313 height of 2m.

314

315 In clear-felled compartments, hand searching yielded the greatest catches of adults and
316 juveniles combined (73% of total catch) compared to tree stump traps (22%) and ground traps
317 (5%). Allowing for differences in numbers of traps employed and numbers of sampling
318 occasions at the mature forest and clear-felled compartments, catches at the mature forest
319 compartments overall were almost double those at the clear-felled compartments. While this
320 is likely to be a reflection of the actual numbers in each habitat type, another possible reason
321 for the relatively low capture rates using traps, in particular, is that the exposed nature of

322 clear-fell areas often resulted in the area immediately beneath the traps drying out, making
323 them less attractive to slugs wishing to use them as shelters. In comparison, traps deployed on
324 tree trunks in plantations tended to remain damp for longer possibly due to the flow of water
325 down the trunk of trees following rainfall (Ovington, 1954) in conjunction with the more
326 shaded conditions beneath the tree canopy. Given that only 23% of all individuals captured
327 on tree stumps were found beneath traps compared to 77% by hand searching also suggests
328 that traps did not function at an optimal level in this habitat. In addition, the total number of
329 captures using traps in the clear-fell (47) is close to that found beneath traps in the other
330 exposed habitat studied i.e. peatland (56) with exactly the same sampling effort. That no
331 slugs were found between stumps when hand searching could be the result, in some cases, of
332 the presence of *J. effusus* and *D. purpurea* making it difficult to see specimens. Indeed,
333 McDade and Maguire (2005) have noted that when surface conditions are more structurally
334 complex it becomes more difficult to detect slugs using hand searching.

335 In peatland sections traps placed on rocky outcrops had the greatest catches of adults and
336 juveniles combined (92% of total catch) compared to hand searching (8%), with no
337 individuals found beneath traps placed directly on the ground between rocks. This mirrors the
338 findings by Mc Donnell & Gormally (2011) who successfully captured *G. maculosus* with
339 traps placed on rocky outcrops in peatland. Individuals captured using hand searching were
340 also found only on rocky outcrops within the hand searching area. It is likely that successful
341 capture of slugs was limited to rocks because of the presence of an abundant source of lichens
342 on which *G. maculosus* feeds (NRA, 2009). The absence of individuals found either by hand
343 searching and under traps placed on the ground between rocks indicates the importance of
344 outcrops as a habitat feature for the species in peatland habitats. Having said that, dense
345 vegetation in peatlands, particularly the presence of *M. caerulea*, may reduce the
346 effectiveness of hand searching. In addition, the absence of catches under ground traps placed
347 between rocks in this study may reflect genuinely low abundances in that *G. maculosus* has
348 only been rarely seen on open peatland vegetation (Mc Donnell, *pers.comm.*). It is, however,
349 possible that higher levels of moisture in peatland vegetation may reduce the attractiveness of
350 the traps as a refuge from desiccation unlike those in the drier conifer compartments.

351 In terms of juvenile capture success, while overall numbers caught were lower than those of
352 the adults, trends observed followed those of the adults in each of the three habitats. Although
353 greatest numbers of juveniles were caught using traps (excepting ground traps) in both
354 mature conifer compartments and peatland, the proportion of juveniles caught in each of the

three habitats was consistently greater using hand searching compared to using traps. Rollo and Wellington (1979) found that adults of *Deroceras reticulatum* Müller, four *Arion* species and *Limax maximus* L. tended to be more aggressive than juveniles which resulted in juveniles being unable to compete with the larger adult slugs for shelters. In addition, Rollo (1982) in a later study found that juvenile slugs (*Deroceras* species, *Arion* species and *L. maximus*) spent a larger portion of their active period foraging. It is, therefore, possible that a combination of competition for shelter and more time spent foraging resulted in lower proportions of juveniles found under traps. Where there are time constraints and simply presence or absence data are required, initial hand-searching under appropriate weather conditions and during the appropriate season is probably sufficient. Hand searching at night (using torches) could yield interesting results and the effect on catches of searching at different times of the day is worth further investigation. If no specimens are found by hand-searching, traps could be placed subsequently to confirm the presence or absence of the species. Traps are also useful in instances where personnel undertaking hand-searching are inexperienced and in cases where long term monitoring is required. Weighing of slugs in the field (time permitting) would permit researchers to separate with more precision the different age stages and further our understanding of *G. maculosus* population dynamics in the field.

Geomalacus maculosus catches – in relation to temperature and rainfall

While *G. maculosus* was collected year round, results of the long-term study indicate that capture success varies across the seasons. Capture success for both adults and juveniles was greatest during the autumn months and least in winter. After autumn, spring and summer catches were the next highest for adults and juveniles respectively. The results suggest that *G. maculosus* monitoring surveys and / or relocation prior to clear-felling should be undertaken during autumn to ensure optimal catch success. The second peak in juvenile catches in summer is likely to be the result of egg laying by adults in the spring (Wisniewski, 2000). Summer surveys would therefore provide useful information on the health of the population by indicating the extent of breeding and recruitment by juveniles. Further research whereby populations are monitored over a number of years (ideally with different weather patterns) would further refine optimum sampling seasons for the species. Significant but weak quadratic relationships were detected between temperatures during the 24-hour period prior to and at the time of sampling with capture success using traps in both mature conifer and clear-felled compartments. No significant relationship was found in the peatland sections where trap catches were overall substantially less. The quadratic nature of the relationships

suggests that both low and high temperatures have a negative effect on numbers of individuals found beneath traps in mature conifer/ clear-felled compartments. It is likely that the oceanic nature of climate in Ireland with its relatively small temperature range (Met Éireann, 2016) may have contributed to the weak relationship between temperatures and slug catches. Nevertheless, catches at each of the three sites were lowest in winter (corresponding to the lowest mean temperatures) and although catches were next lowest in summer (highest mean temperatures) at the mature conifer plantations, this was not the case for the clear-fell and peatland habitats where numbers of catches were substantially lower. It is interesting to note that in clear-fell compartments, where hand searching was most successful, there was a negative correlation between numbers of individuals caught by hand searching and average temperatures prior to and during sampling. Coupled with this was the positive correlation between individuals caught using hand searches in clear-fells and the average rainfall during the 24 hour period prior to sampling. Given that hand searching has been reported as being highly dependent on weather (Bruelheide & Scheidel, 1999), there are clearly a number of factors at play relating to the attractiveness of traps coupled with levels of slug activity under different weather conditions.

As previously mentioned, it is possible that at higher air temperatures the surface beneath the traps dries out, particularly in clear-felled compartments, making them less attractive to *G. maculosus* thereby resulting in lower catches. Terrestrial slugs are known to be extremely susceptible to dehydration (Cameron, 1970), and seek to avoid exposure to unfavourable conditions as a means of protecting themselves (Rollo, 1982). Additionally, slugs in general are known to move down through the soil profile to avoid freezing temperatures (Cook, 2004). In support of this the authors have observed *G. maculosus* sheltering below ground and under the moss cover at the bases of trees, stumps and rocks during warm and dry weather, as well as during cold weather. With regard to rainfall, it is interesting to note that no significant relationship was found between rainfall at the time of sampling and hand search capture success in any of the habitats. This finding is somewhat surprising given that *G. maculosus* is reported to be only diurnally active during or after rain (Taylor 1906; Platts & Speight, 1988). Given that rainfall data were sourced from weather stations more than 30km from the sites, they may not have reflected local variation in rainfall accurately. In addition, Ovington (1954) found that duration and intensity of rainfall are the most important factors dictating the amount of rainfall that reaches the ground in conifer plantations. It has been widely reported that temperature and rainfall are important factors influencing slug

activity in general (Barnes & Weill, 1945; Webley *et al.*, 1964; Young, 1991; Shirley *et al.*, 2001; Choi *et al.*, 2006) and this is, to some extent, reflects the results of this study. Although logistics in this study did not permit the recording of weekly catch data, future studies incorporating on-site weather data, particularly rainfall measurements in addition to weekly catch data would further refine the relationship between weather conditions and catch success.

The results of this study clearly indicate for the first time that approaches to monitoring *G. maculosus* needs to take into account the habitat under investigation. Of the sampling strategies investigated in this study, traps placed at a height of 1.5m on trees in mature conifer plantations will likely result in optimal numbers of catches of *G. maculosus*. In clear-fell areas, hand searching under suitable weather conditions, preferably when rain has fallen in the previous twenty-four hours, is recommended. For peatlands, traps should be placed on exposed rock. Overall, autumn is the preferred time of sampling for adult slugs, while summer sampling is recommended if breeding and recruitment studies are required. Sampling during extremes of hot and cold weather should be avoided as results are likely to give an underestimation of slug densities, which could lead to the implementation of poor management decisions. While the results of this study form the basis for guidelines to forestry managers who are legally obliged to protect *G. maculosus* when undertaking routine forestry practices, further work regarding the presence of the species in the upper canopy is required. In addition, measuring humidity and temperature beneath traps using probes in conjunction with numbers of slug catches will further refine how best to maximise the use of trap data for the protection of *G. maculosus* in the future.

Acknowledgements

We are grateful to Aidan O'Hanlon, Inga Reich, Clément Teillet, Declan McGovern, Lorenzo Sardo, Frank O'Grady, Mark Welch and Úna Ní Rourke for assistance with fieldwork. We would also like to thank Stacey Bradly, Eamon Drohan, Joan O'Connor, Ted Kelleher, Padraig McMahon, and Ciaran Walsh (Coillte) for providing information on the sites and Coillte for permitting access to the sites. Thank you to Dr Aileen O Sullivan (Coillte) and Dr Orla Fahy (Forest Service) for their assistance. We acknowledge, with thanks, the Wildlife Licensing Unit (National Parks & Wildlife Service) for providing us with license No.

452 C069/2014. Finally, we thank the Department of Agriculture, Food and the Marine for
453 funding this research under the FIRM/RSF/CoFoRD 2013 Research Call.

454 **Funding:** This research was funded by the Department of Agriculture, Food and the Marine
455 under the FIRM/RSF/CoFoRD 2013 Research Call.

456 **Conflicts of interest:** The authors declare that they have no conflict of interest.

457 **References**

458 ANON (2010). Threat Response Plan Kerry Slug *Geomalacus maculosus*. National Parks
459 & Wildlife Service.

460 Barnes HF, Weil JW (1945). Slugs in gardens: their numbers, activity and distribution.
461 Part II. J. Anita. Ecol. 14: 71-105. DOI: 10.2307/1386

462 Bouchet P, Falkner G, Seddon MB (1999). Lists of protected land and freshwater
463 molluscs in the Bern Convention and European Habitats Directive: Are they relevant to
464 conservation? Biol Cons 90(1): 21–31. DOI: 10.1016/S0006-3207(99)00009-9

465 Bruelheide H, Scheidel U (1999). Slug herbivory as a limiting factor for the geographical
466 range of *Arnica montana*. J Ecol 87(5): 839–848. DOI: 10.1046/j.1365-
467 2745.1999.00403.x

468 Byrne A, Moorkens EA, Anderson R, Killeen IJ, Regan EC (2009). Ireland Red List No.
469 2 – Non- Marine Molluscs. National Parks and Wildlife Service, Department of the
470 Environment, Heritage and Local Government, Dublin, Ireland.

471 Cameron RAD, (1970). The effect of temperature on the activity of three species of
472 Helicid snail (Mollusca: Gastropoda). J Zool (London), 162(3): 303–315.
473 DOI:10.1111/j.1469-7998.1970.tb01267.x

474 Chapman AD, (2009). Numbers of living species in Australia and the world.
475 Toowoomba, Australia: 2nd edition. Australian Biodiversity Information Services.

476 Cook RT (2004). The tolerance of the field slug *Deroceras reticulatum* to freezing
477 temperatures. CryoLetters 25(3): 187–194. PMID:15216383

478 Choi Y H, Bohan DA, Powers SJ, Wiltshire CW, Glen DM, Semenov MA, (2004).
479 Modelling *Deroceras reticulatum* (Gastropoda) population dynamics based on daily

temperature and rainfall. *Agric Ecosyst Environ*, 103(3): 519-525.
 DOI:10.1016/j.agee.2003.11.012

Coillte (2015). Inventory list for fieldwork surveys (full). Coillte Teoranta.

Coote L, Smith GF, Kelly DL, O'Donoghue S, Dowding P, Iremonger S, Mitchell FJG (2007). Epiphytes of Sitka spruce (*Picea sitchensis*) plantations in Ireland and the effects of open spaces. *Biodivers Conserv* 16(14): 4009–4024. DOI:10.1007/s10531-007-9203-5

DAFM (2015) Ireland's Forests – Annual Statistics. Department of Agriculture, Food and the Marine.

Douglas MR, Tooker JF (2012). Slug (Mollusca: Agriolimacidae, Arionidae) ecology and management in no-till field crops, with an emphasis on the mid-Atlantic region. *JIPM* 3(1): 1–9. DOI: 10.1603/IPM11023

Forest Service (2008). Irish Forests – A Brief History. Department of Agriculture, Fisheries and Food.

FSC (2016). The 10 Principles. Ten rules for responsible forest management. Retrieved from: <https://ic.fsc.org/en/certification/principles-and-criteria/the-10-principles>. Last accessed: 15/05/2016

Hill MO (1979). The development of a flora in even-aged plantations. In: Ford ED, Malcolm DC, Atterson J (eds.). *The ecology of even-aged forest plantations*. Cambridge, Institute of Terrestrial Ecology 175-192. ISBN 0 904282 33 3

Hosokawa T, Odani N, Tagawa H (1964). Causality of the Distribution of Corticolous Species in Forests with Special Reference to the Physio-Ecological Approach. *ABLS* 67(4): 396–411. DOI: 10.2307/3240764

Hommay G, Kienlen JC, Gertz C, Hill A (2001). Growth and Reproduction of the Slug *Limax Valentianus* Firussac in Experimental Conditions. *J Mollusc Stud* 67(2):191–207. DOI: 0.1093/mollus/67.2.191

Hunter P (1968). Studies on slugs of arable ground: I. Sampling methods. *Malacologia* 6: 369-377

507 Kearney J (2010). Kerry slug (*Geomalacus maculosus* Allman, 1843) recorded at
508 Lettercraffroe, Co. Galway. *Ir Nat J* 31(1): 68–69.

509 South A (2012). *Terrestrial slugs: biology, ecology and control*. Springer Science &
510 Business Media. ISBN 978-94-011-2380-8

511 Lydeard C, Cowie RH, Ponder WF, Bogan AE, Bouchet P, Clark SA, Cummings KS,
512 Frest TJ, Gargominy O, Herbert DG, Hershler R, Perez KE, Roth B, Seddon M, Strong
513 EE, Thompson FG (2004). The global decline of non-marine Mollusks. *BioScience* 54(4):
514 321–330. DOI: 10.1641/0006-3568(2004)054[0321:TGDONM]2.0.CO;2

515 Macdonald N (2009). Factsheet 02/09: Slug control in field vegetables. Retrieved from
516 <http://www.ahdb.org.uk/slugcontrol/HDC> 05 Aug 2010

517 Met Éireann (2016) Climate of Ireland. Retrieved from:
518 <http://www.met.ie/climate/climate-of-ireland.asp>. Last accessed 10/05/2015.

519 McDade KA, Maguire CC (2000). Comparative effectiveness of three techniques for
520 salamander and gastropod land surveys. *Am Midl Nat* 153(2): 309–320.
521 DOI:10.1674/0003-0031(2005)153[0309:CEOTTF]2.0.CO;2

522 Mc Donnell R, Gormally M (2011). A live trapping method for the protected european
523 slug, *Geomalacus maculosus* Allman 1843 (Arionidae). *J Conchol* 1843: 483–485.

524 NFI (2012). The second national forest inventory, Republic of Ireland, Main Findings.
525 Department of Agriculture, Food and the Marine.

526 NPWS (2013). The Status of EU Protected Habitats and Species in Ireland. Species
527 Assessments Volume 3. Version 1.0. National Parks & Wildlife Services. Department of
528 Arts, Heritage and the Gaeltacht, Dublin, Ireland.

529 NRA (2009). Ecological surveying techniques for protected flora and fauna during the
530 planning of National Road Schemes. National Roads Authority, Dublin

531 Ovington JD (1954). A comparison of rainfall in different woodlands. *Forestry* 27(1):41–
532 53. DOI: 10.1093/forestry/27.1.41

533 Platts E A, Speight MCD (1988). The taxonomy and Distribution of the Kerry Slug
534 *Geomalacus maculosus* Allman, 1843 (Mollusca: Arionidae) with a Discussion of Its

Status as a Threatened Species. Ir Nat J 22(10): 417–430.
<http://www.jstor.org/stable/25539243>

Reich I, O’Meara K, Mc Donnell RJ, Gormally MJ, (2012). An assessment of the use of conifer plantations by the Kerry Slug (*Geomalacus maculosus*) with reference to the impact of forestry operations. Irish Wildlife Manuals, No. 64. National Parks and Wildlife Service, Department of Arts, Heritage and the Gaeltacht, Ireland.

Reich I, Gormally M, McDonnell R, Allcock AL, Castillejo J, Iglesias J, Quinteiro J, Smith CJ (2015). Genetic study reveals close link between Irish and Northern Spanish specimens of the protected Lusitanian slug *Geomalacus maculosus*. Biol J Linn Soc 116:156-168. DOI: 10.1111/bij.12568

Rollo CD (1982). The regulation of activity in populations of the terrestrial slug *Limax maximus* (Gastropods: Limacidae). Res Popul Ecol (Kyoto) 24: 1–32. DOI: 10.1007/BF02515586

Rollo CD, Wellington WG (1979). Intra-and inter-specific agonistic behavior among terrestrial slugs (Pulmonata: Stylommatophora). Can J Zool 57(4): 846-855. DOI: 10.1139/z79-104

Rowson B, Turner J, Anderson R, Symondson B (2014). Slugs of Britain and Ireland. Identification, understanding and control. Field Studies Council, Telford

Shirley MDF, Rushton SP, Young AG, Port GR (2001). Simulating the long-term dynamics of slug populations: a process-based modelling approach for pest control. J Appl Ecol 38:401-411. DOI: 10.1046/j.1365-2664.2001.00606.x

South A (1989). A Comparison of the life cycles of the slugs *Deroceras Reticulatum* (Müller) and *Arion Intermedius* Normand on permanent pasture. J Mollusc Stud, 55(1), 9–22. Doi:10.1093/mollus/55.1.9

Speight MCD (1995). *Geomalacus maculosus* Allman, 1843. Background information on invertebrates of the Habitats Directive and the Bern Convention. Part III—Mollusca and Echinodermata. Nature and environment, 81, 433-437.

Taylor JW (1906). Monograph of the land and freshwater Mollusca of the British Isles. 2. Taylor Brothers, Leeds.

TinyTag (2016). Accessories, ACS-5050. Retrieved from:
<http://www.geminidataloggers.com/accessories/other/acs-5050> Last Accessed:
10/05/2016

Verdú JR, Galante E (2005). *Libro Rojo De Los Invertebrados De Espana. Madrid.*

Webley D (1964). Slug activity in relation to weather. *Ann App Biol* 53:407-414. DOI:
DOI: 10.1111/j.1744-7348.1964.tb07254.x

Wisniewski PJ (2000). Husbandry and breeding of Kerry spotted slug *Geomalacus maculosus* at the Endangered Species Breeding Unit, Martin Mere. *Int Zoo Yearb* 37: 319–321. DOI: 10.1111/j.1748-1090.2000.tb00736.x

Young AG, Port GR, Emmett BJ, Green DI (1991). Development of a forecast of slug activity: models to relate slug activity to meteorological conditions. *Crop Prot* 10(5): 413–415. DOI:10.1016/S0261-2194(06)80034-7

589 **Table 1** Mature Forest: Total and mean (\pm SD) catch of adult and juvenile *G. maculosus* using
590 traps placed on trees 1.5m above ground, 0.2m above ground, directly on the ground and
591 using ten minute hand searches from June to September 2015 (N = 135 sampling occasions).

	1.5m traps	0.2m traps	Ground traps	Hand search
<i>Adult</i>				
Total catch	412	219	5	20
Mean \pm SD	3.05 \pm 5.00	1.62 \pm 3.41	0.05 \pm 0.23	0.15 \pm 0.38
1.5m trap	-	-	-	-
0.2m trap	0.033	-	-	-
Ground traps	0.000	0.000	-	-
Hand search	0.000	0.000	0.080	-
<i>Juvenile</i>				
Total catch	39	21	0	3
Mean \pm SD	0.34 \pm 1.24	0.16 \pm 0.67	0	0.02 \pm 0.15
1.5m trap	-	-	-	-
0.2m trap	0.081	-	-	-
Ground trap	-	-	-	-
Hand search	0.020	0.296	-	-

592 **Adult:** Test statistic = 26.635; df = 3; $P < 0.001$, Welch's ANOVA. P values given in bold
593 indicate significant differences between trapping methods, Games-Howell multiple
594 comparison test; **Juvenile:** Test statistic = 4.696; df = 2; $P = 0.010$, Welch's ANOVA. P
595 values given in bold indicate significant differences between trapping methods, Games-
596 Howell multiple comparison test.
597

598
599
600
601
602
603
604
605
606
607
608
609
610
611
612
613
614

615 **Table 2** Clear-felled compartments: Total and mean (\pm SD) catch of adult and juvenile *G.*
616 *maculosus* using traps placed on tree stumps, on the ground and using ten minute hand
617 searches from June to September 2015 (N=80 sampling occasions)

	Tree stump traps	Ground traps	Hand search
<i>Adult</i>			
Total catch	36	9	99
Mean \pm SD	0.45 \pm 0.81	0.11 \pm 0.36	1.82 \pm 2.82
Tree stump traps	-	-	-
Ground traps	0.003	-	-
Hand search	0.011	0.000	-
<i>Juveniles</i>			
Total catch	2	0	27
Mean \pm SD	0.03 \pm 0.16	0	0.34 \pm 1.31
Tree stump traps	-	-	-
Ground traps	-	-	-
Hand search	0.037	-	-

618 **Adult:** Test statistic = 14.690; df = 2; $P < 0.001$, Welch's ANOVA. *P* values given in bold
619 indicate significant differences between trapping methods, Games-Howell multiple
620 comparison test; **Juvenile:** Test statistic = 4.478; df = 1; $P = 0.037$, Welch's T-test. *P* values
621 given in bold indicate significant differences between trapping methods, Games-Howell
622 multiple comparison test.
623
624

625

626

627

628

629

630

631

632

633

634 **Table 3** Peatland: Total and mean (\pm SD) catch of adult and juvenile *G. maculosus* using
635 refuge traps placed on rocks (rock traps, on vegetation among rocks (ground traps) and using
636 ten minute hand searches from June to September 2015 (N = 80 sampling occasions)

	Rock traps	Ground traps	Hand search
<i>Adult</i>			
Total catch	42	0	2
Mean \pm SD	0.53 \pm 0.84	0 \pm 0	0.03 \pm 0.16
Rock traps	-	-	-
Ground traps	-	-	-
Hand search	0.000	-	-
<i>Juveniles</i>			
Total catch	14	0	3
Mean \pm SD	0.18 \pm 0.50	0 \pm 0	0.38 \pm 0.25
Rock traps	-	-	-
Ground traps	-	-	-
Hand search	0.029	-	-

637 **Adults:** Test statistic = 27.288; df = 1 $P < 0.001$ Welch's T test. P values given in bold
638 indicate significant differences between trapping methods; **Juveniles:** Test statistic = 4.890;
639 df = 1 $P = 0.029$ Welch's T test. P values given in bold indicate significant differences
640 between trapping methods.

641
642

643

644

645

646

647

648

649

650

651

652

653

Table 4 Seasonal variation: Adult and juvenile *G. maculosus* catches in autumn (N=230), winter (N=245), spring (N=245), and summer (N= 225) across all three habitats using refuge traps (mature forest, clear-fell and peatland).

	Autumn 14	Winter 14/15	Spring 15	Summer 15
<i>Adult</i>				
Total catch	1062	349	596	358
Mean ± SD	4.62 ± 6.53	1.43 ± 2.70	2.43 ± 3.95	1.64 ± 2.97
Autumn	-	-	-	-
Winter	0.000	-	-	-
Spring	0.000	0.006	-	-
Summer	0.000	0.0837	0.068	-
<i>Juvenile</i>				
Total catch	88	30	34	80
Mean ± SD	0.38 ± 0.96	0.12 ± 0.44	0.14 ± 0.42	0.36 ± 0.95
Autumn	-	-	-	-
Winter	0.001	-	-	-
Spring	0.002	0.975	-	-
Summer	0.997	0.003	0.006	-

Adults: Test statistic = 17.813; df = 3; $P < 0.001$, Welch's ANOVA. *P* values given in bold indicate significant differences between seasons Games-Howell multiple comparison test.
Juveniles: Test statistic = 9.280; df = 3; $P < 0.001$, Welch's ANOVA. *P* values given in bold indicate significant differences between seasons Games-Howell multiple comparison test




Fig. 1 Location of the four study sites in the south-west of Ireland: Site 1 (Tooreenafersha), Site 2 (Derrynasaggert), Site 3 (Rathgaskig/Coomlibane) and Site 4 (Barnagowlane) (G. Kindermann, 2016)



Fig. 2 Traps placed on a tree (a), a tree stump (b), and a rock (c) (G. Kindermann, 2016)




Fig. 3 Mean (\pm SE) *G. maculosus* individuals (bar graph) caught (using traps) in mature conifer compartments (a), clear-felled compartments (b), and peatland compartments (c) with mean temperature ($^{\circ}$ C \pm SE) (line graph) for each season, from September 2014 to November 2014 (autumn), December 2014 to February 2015 (winter), March to May 2015 (spring) and June to August 2015 (summer).




Fig 4 Quadratic relationship (line) between *G. maculosus* individuals caught (using traps) and average temperature (°C) 24 hours prior to sampling in mature conifer compartments (a), and in clear-fell compartments (b). Quadratic relationship (line) between *G. maculosus* individuals caught (using traps) and temperature (°C) during sampling in mature conifer compartments (c), and in clear-fell compartments (d) between October 2014 and August 2015.

Formatted: English (United Kingdom)