

11/10/2020 Tech Team

Attendees: Adam Collingwood, Danielle, Natalie, Sean

Reviewing Data Loose ends - view sheet for reference

- Adam will collect waterton datasets and send to natalie via email or drive
 - Waterton data sets are not included in FWMIS
- Danielle will send Natalie and Sean another possible distribution map for grizzly
- Adam will reach out to Clayton Apps
- Natalie will forward craig's FWMIS request emails to peggy, and peggy will nudge Craig
- Adam will reach out to Tony Cleavanger
- Mineral licks are used as surrogate for important habitat - AB only

BC Data Sources/Contacts

- On the leadership team, we just have someone from the Nature Conservancy of canada
- Adam will ask national parks folks if they have access to BC data sets
- Danielle will reach out to her BC friend for possible BC data contacts

Discussion on Lynx and Wolverine modeling (Danielle)

- AB does not have a gis data layer for lynx and wolverine
 - However! Prof. Jason Fisher has done lots of work on these species in the foothills of AB - species distribution models - Danielle shared thesis that have different coefficients needed to run model - need veg data layer - climate (spring snowcover) and footprint
 - These are the best data that we have - danielle has used these data in marxan before
 - Is this applicable to the whole CCE?
 - Jason believes it is region specific - not sure accuracy as we move south - Doesn't mean we can't use it, if it's best available
 - In the past, tended to ignore multispecies relationships (gets complicated - ie. coyote and red fox) - these are difficult parameters to include
 - Danielle can provide python script to show how they've done it - input different parameters
 - Wolverine looks at about 2.5km scale

- This is the method that danielle uses as well - usually doesn't add in the observations as well - has to put more thought into implications of this
 - Depending on the dataset that goes into zonal statistics, if raster, might have to reclassify to a cell value smaller than planning units - if you have raster larger than planning size, you end up with a bunch of holes
 - Create gis layers from the text files - join back to planning unit files
- Questions/Concerns
 - RSF is based on observation data, so are we double counting observation data, since suitability layers may contain observation?
 - We are averaging rather than summing, so not too much of a concern of double counting
 - Adam: be careful with observation data - will be heavily biased towards potential sinks (ie. roadsides) - happens to be where the most people are - wouldn't say a sighting is saying the same thing as suitable habitat
 - There is a difference between observation data and collar data
 - Observation data is biased to resource sinks rather than high quality habitat
 - Might be a good idea to overlay the CMP Grizzly Occupancy model with the output model
 - This approach may be more suitable for other species that aren't just wandering past - take a species specific approach
 - Once we have marxan, we can run different sensitivity analysis with and without observation data
 - This can happen at a later stage too