

Cal Poly Humboldt

Digital Commons @ Cal Poly Humboldt

IdeaFest 2022

2022

Resources vs Co2 on Humboldt Bees'

Alli Chevalier

Cal Poly Humboldt, amc220@humboldt.edu

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.humboldt.edu/ideafest2022>

Recommended Citation

Chevalier, Alli, "Resources vs Co2 on Humboldt Bees" (2022). *IdeaFest 2022*. 14.
<https://digitalcommons.humboldt.edu/ideafest2022/14>

This Poster is brought to you for free and open access by Digital Commons @ Cal Poly Humboldt. It has been accepted for inclusion in IdeaFest 2022 by an authorized administrator of Digital Commons @ Cal Poly Humboldt. For more information, please contact kyle.morgan@humboldt.edu.



Resources vs Co2 on Humboldt Bees'

By: Alii Chevalier
Cal Poly Humboldt University
Spring 2022

INTRODUCTION

The prediction is that bee richness will be higher in agricultural areas while abundance will be high in both agricultural and urban areas due to the open concept rather than 'natural' areas such as the neighboring red wood forest. Richness should be higher in agricultural areas as these areas have lower human and car activity and more areas for nesting and gathering. Urban developments have shown to have large amounts of various flower species and random open areas that could be appealing for bees which could increase activity in these areas but possibly have a higher Co₂ count (Leonard et al). The control will be the 'natural' areas that are located further into the forest with the least amount of human activity to compare.

The aim of this study is to pinpoint the areas of most benefit for bee richness and abundance and what mitigation steps that could be implemented for further progression of survival in the future while also revealing the Co₂ levels in the area to show correlations. Some of the questions we want answered include: What areas are productive for bees' species, and what species are those? Do the levels of Co₂ emissions impact the activity and abundance of bees? Do urban areas negatively impact bees, or do they provide a variety of food resources (Lanner et al)? What mitigations are needed in these areas to aid bee conservation?

METHODS

Traps were made to catch bee specimens and placed in 3 types of sites, that had two locations and two traps per location. These traps were made from solo cups, clear packers tap, mountain dew, and dish soap. For one trap to be made it required: two solo cups – One regular solo cup and the other will have the bottom cut out and placed in the solid cup with 2 in of space from the bottom, then the clear packer's tape was be placed around the cup's edges to secure both cups in place. Following this about ¼ cup of mountain dew was put in the trap with about 1 teaspoon of dish soap. This was recreated 12 times for this project, providing two traps per site. The mountain dew is the sweetener, and the dish soap aids in trapping by weighing down the bees in the liquid. A Co₂ meter was used to calculate the level of emissions in each area from vehicles, the units of measure are in ppm (parts per million). Observational data was also collected such as, bee counts, resources, habitats, weather, etc..

Fig 1




Fig 2





Fig 3



RESULTS

- Based on observational data, I found no bees in the forest, and >2x more bees in urban areas relative to agricultural sites (Fig. 1, F=9.76, df=2,21, P=0.001).
- Similarly, flower abundance was greater in urban compared to agricultural areas (Fig.1, F=3.24, df=2,21, P=0.058). There were no flowers in the forest.
- Co₂ Levels revealed that there was an unusually positive correlation with Co₂ and bee presence. Despite Co₂ levels being higher in urban areas were more bees in these areas (Fig. 2, R²=0.73, P=0.019).
- Bee abundance increased over my study period (Fig. 3, Urban: R² = 0.94 , P= 5.62662E-05 Agricultural: R² = 0.93, P= 7.98E-05).



DISCUSSION

The data shows that bee abundance is reliant upon Flower abundance regardless of Co₂ levels in the area. It was originally predicted that agricultural areas would hold higher abundance of bees as well as richness. From this experienment we see that abundance is higher in urban areas possibly due to these 'flower pockets' that have a wide variety of exotic and native flowers. Urban gardens and floral décor could be attracting these bees to the area where they decide to live due to the constant food sources. I was also able to notice that bee activity was especially higher in urban neighborhoods that had these open drainage fields left to be overgrown or have natural growth with no trees. This could allow for open habitat as well as additional resources. The reson behind the reduced number of bees observed and captured in Agracultural areas can be due to the lack of floral diversity or presence. Many farms lacked any flowers or natural growth even if they had less Co₂ levels, bees naturally gravitated towards the areas with better food availability.



Acknowledgements

McKinleyville, Eureka, Arcata areas and <https://www.pngall.com/bee-png>