

[Search USGS](#)

Techniques and Methods 2–A5

**U.S. GEOLOGICAL SURVEY**

**Chapter 5 of**

**Section A, Biological Science**

**Book 2, Collection of Environmental Data**

## Herpetological Monitoring Using a Pitfall Trapping Design in Southern California

By Robert Fisher, Drew Stokes, Carlton Rochester, Cheryl Brehme, and Stacie Hathaway, U.S. Geological Survey; and Ted Case, University of California

Cover Photo

### Abstract

The steps necessary to conduct a pitfall trapping survey for small terrestrial vertebrates are presented. Descriptions of the materials needed and the methods to build trapping equipment from raw materials are discussed. Recommended data collection techniques are given along with suggested data fields. Animal specimen processing procedures, including toe- and scale-clipping, are described for lizards, snakes, frogs, and salamanders. Methods are presented for conducting vegetation surveys that can be used to classify the environment associated with each pitfall trap array. Techniques for data storage and presentation are given based on commonly use computer applications. As with any study, much consideration should be given to the study design and methods before beginning any data collection effort.

### Contents

Abstract  
Introduction  
Background and Justification  
Array Design  
Array Materials and Trap Construction  
Array Installation  
Array Operation  
Survey Data Management  
Acknowledgments  
References Cited  
Appendix 1. Materials and supplies needed to build, maintain, and sample a pitfall trapping array.  
Appendix 2. Species codes and abbreviations.

This report is available online in Portable Document Format (PDF). If you do not have the [Adobe Reader](#), it is available for free download from Adobe Systems Incorporated.

[Download the report \(PDF, 1.75 MB\)](#)

Document Accessibility: Adobe Systems Incorporated has information about PDFs and the visually impaired. This information provides tools to help make PDF files accessible. These tools convert Adobe PDF documents into HTML or ASCII text, which then can be read by a number of common screen-reading programs that synthesize text as audible speech. In addition, an accessible version of Adobe Reader 8.0 for Windows (English only), which contains support for screen readers, is available. These tools and the accessible reader may be obtained free from Adobe at [Adobe Access](#).

Send questions or comments about this report to the author, [R.N. Fisher](#), (619) 225-6422.



URL: <https://pubs.usgs.gov/tm/tm2a5>

Page Contact Information: [Publications Team](#)

Page Last Modified: Friday, 02-Dec-2016 15:48:29 EST

Pitfall traps containing a preservative have become the standard method of sampling for epigeal invertebrates such as carabid beetles and cursorial spiders. However, they often result in high levels of mortality for small mammals and amphibians. We compared the carabid, spider, and vertebrate captures within five pitfall trap types (conventional trap, funnel trap, shallow trap, Nordlander trap, and the ramp trap) to determine the trap type that would reduce vertebrate incidental catch without compromising the capture of invertebrates. A pitfall trap for large-scale trapping of Carabidae: comparison against conventional design, using two different preservatives. *Pedobiologia*, 43: 245-253. Luff, M.L. 1968. Some effects of formalin on the numbers of Coleoptera caught in pitfall traps. View Pitfall Traps Research Papers on [Academia.edu](#) for free. We tested the effectiveness of molluscs as indicators for monitoring by contrasting species richness and community structure in burned relative to unburned forests. Both species richness and community structure changed significantly with burning. Some mollusc species (e.g. *Macroptychia africana*) showed marked negative responses to burning, and these species have potential for use as indicators. We studied carabid beetle abundance at eight forest-farmland edges using pitfall traps across 60-m gradients (30 m into the forest, 30 m into the adjacent farmland) in southern Finland in May-August 2001. Pitfall traps with guidance barriers proved most effective in our study and showed coherent carabid beetle assemblage structures. These pitfall trap designs have been proposed several times in the past but have seen little use so far (Durkis & Reeves, 1982; Boetzel et al. (2018), *PeerJ*, DOI 10.7717/peerj.5078. 7/14. Figure 3 Carabid beetle species richness (A) and community weighted mean body size within the carabid assemblages (B) for the four different pitfall trap types. Means  $\pm$  95% CI. Different letters above indicate significant differences ( $p < 0.05$ ). *Herpetological Review* is a peer-reviewed quarterly that publishes, in English, articles and notes concerning the study of amphibians and reptiles, as well as book reviews, commentaries, regional and international herpetological society news, and letters from readers directed to the field of herpetology. Complete issues from the last five years are available to SSAR members. There is also a link to a downloadable EndNote library of HR references. Information for Contributors to *Herpetological Review*. *Herpetological Review* is a peer-reviewed