

G C Em Am G F G

---

C G Am C  
Said the folks on the Hill keep that Great Land great still,

F C D G  
The fish and the wildlife you must conserve

C G Am C  
In their natural diversity amid adversity

F G C G  
Every fish, bird and bug on the Kenai reserve

----

C Em Am G F G (instrumental)

----

C G Am C  
In '04 through '06 we swept up insects

F C D G  
To enable monitoring of communities Pinned

C G Am C  
and vialled all those bugs 15,000+ bugs

F G C G (Am)  
This guy did his best by morphology

---

Am G  
But No, it won't work

C Em Am G F G  
To monitor this way

---

C G Am C  
So we have been trying metabarcoding

F C D G  
Mushed bugs are sequenced and identified

C G Am C  
We tried a small test with pretty good success

F G C G (Am)  
Identifying things from 10 samples we tried.

---

Am G  
And it seemed a lot better

C Em Am G F G  
To monitor this way

---

C G Am C  
So in 2016 we tried monitoring

F C D G  
On a grid of 40 places at Slikok Creek

C G Am C  
We walked each place twice every time sweeping it twice.

F G C F C  
That's 160 samples - 4 sweeps each.

(talking now:)

But we only processed 125 samples.

What I want you to remember is that we took multiple samples at each site.

Remember that - It's important!

C G Am C  
'Cause you really can't tell if you missed something - well

F C D G  
It might not have been there or you might just have missed it!

C G Am C  
But with multiple samples and occupancy models

F G C G  
You can estimate the chance it was there and just missed

---

C Em Am G F G (instrumental)

---

C G Am C  
For each and every bug of 401

F C D G  
We figured out how likely if it's there we would see.

C G Am C  
So in short yes, it works to metabarcode bugs

F G C G (Am)  
For monitoring insect communities.

---

Am G  
So yes, it's feasible.

Am G  
It's far more reasonable

Am G  
And certainly more repeatable

C Em Am G F G C  
To use DNA