

## Marbled godwit Distribution Modeling



**Scientific Name:** *Limosa fedoa*

**Distribution Status:** Migratory Summer Breeder

**State Rank:** S4B

**Global Rank:** G5

### **Inductive Modeling**

**Model Created By:** Joy Ritter

**Model Creation Date:** May 14, 2012

**Model Evaluators:** Bryce Maxell and Joy Ritter

**Model Goal:** Inductive models will predict the distribution and relative suitability of breeding habitats at large spatial scales across the species' known breeding range in Montana.

### **Inductive Modeling Methods**

#### **Model Data and Species Range Information:**

Location Data Source	Montana Natural Heritage Program Point Observation Database
Total Number of Records	2069
Location Data Selection Rule 1	Spatially unique records associated with breeding activity with $\leq 1600$ meters of locational uncertainty
No. Locations Meeting Selection Rule 1	864
Location Data Selection Rule 2	No overlap in locations when buffered by the associated locational uncertainty in order to avoid spatial autocorrelation.
No. Locations Meeting Selection Rule 2	554
Season Modeled	Summer Breeding
No. Model Train Locations	408
No. Model Test Locations	136
No. Model Background Locations	28,149
Area of Species Range in State (Percent of Montana)	178,675 km <sup>2</sup> (46.9%)

**Environmental layer information:**

Layer	Identifier	Description
Aspect	CONTEWASP CONTNSASP	Continuous measure of east to west aspect Continuous measure of north to south aspect
Bias	BIAS	Categorical layer representing potential underlying biases inherent in the observation database as a result of proximity to roads and public lands
Elevation	CONTELEV	Continuous elevation in meters from the National Elevation Dataset
Geology	CATSDEGEOL	Categorical surficial geology - 931 categories
Land Cover	CATESYS	Categorical Level 2 Montana land cover framework with roads removed – 27 categories
Max Temp	CONTTMAX	Continuous estimated average maximum daily July temperature in degrees Fahrenheit for 1971-2000
Min Temp	CONTTMIN	Continuous estimated average minimum daily January temperature in degrees Fahrenheit for 1971 -2000
Precipitation	CONTPRECI	Continuous annual precipitation in 1cm intervals
Slope	CONTSLOPE	Continuous degrees of slope
Soil Temp	CATSOILTMP	Categorical soil temperature and moisture regimes – 12 categories
Stream Dist	CONTSTRMED	Continuous Euclidean distance from major streams in 1-meter intervals

**Maxent Model Input String:**Range wide

```
java -mx2048 -jar c:\MaxEnt\maxent.jar -a -z nowarnings noprefixes -P -J -o
U:\IndSpecies\Limo_fedo\2012_05_14\RangeOut -s
U:\IndSpecies\Limo_fedo\2012_05_14\Limo_fedo_train.csv -T
U:\IndSpecies\Limo_fedo\2012_05_14\Limo_fedo_test.csv -e I:\modelingSecondRoundInputLayers
nowriteclampgrid nowritemess maximumbackground=28149 writebackgroundpredictions noextrapolate
nodoclamp -N CONTVRM -t BIAS -t CATESYS -t CATSDEGEOL -t CATSOILTMP
```

Statewide

```
java -mx2048 -jar c:\MaxEnt\maxent.jar -a -z nowarnings noprefixes -P -J -o
U:\IndSpecies\Limo_fedo\2012_05_14\StateOut -s
U:\IndSpecies\Limo_fedo\2012_05_14\Limo_fedo_train.csv -T
U:\IndSpecies\Limo_fedo\2012_05_14\Limo_fedo_test.csv -e I:\modelingSecondRoundInputLayers
nowriteclampgrid nowritemess maximumbackground=60000 writebackgroundpredictions noextrapolate
nodoclamp -N CONTVRM -t BIAS -t CATESYS -t CATSDEGEOL -t CATSOILTMP
```

## Inductive Model Evaluation

### Model Performance:

Model appears to adequately reflect the distribution of Marbled Godwit nesting habitat at large spatial scales across Montana. Evaluation metrics suggest a good model fit (see table of evaluation metrics). The presence of Bias as a significant predictor variable suggests that survey efforts may be biased towards roads and public lands.

### Top contributing layers:

Variable	Percent Contribution	Permutation Importance
CATSDEGEOL	41.7	29.6
BIAS	13.7	5.2
CONTSLOPE	12.3	25.1
CONTTMIN	11.8	11.4
CATESYS	10.6	4.7
CONTELEV	3.6	5.2

### Evaluation metrics:

Metric	Value
Low Logistic Threshold <sup>a</sup>	0.029
Area of predicted low suitability habitat within species' range	71,291 km <sup>2</sup>
Medium Logistic Threshold <sup>b</sup>	0.24
Area of moderate suitability habitat within species' range	15,426 km <sup>2</sup>
Optimal Logistic Threshold <sup>c</sup>	0.62
Area of predicted optimal habitat within species' range	3,756 km <sup>2</sup>
Total area of predicted suitable habitat within species' range	90,473 km <sup>2</sup>
Absolute validation index (AVI) <sup>d</sup>	0.948
Avg Deviance (X +/- SD) <sup>e</sup>	1.95 +/- 2.08
Training AUC <sup>f</sup>	0.924
Test AUC <sup>g</sup>	0.902

- The logistic threshold between unsuitable and low suitable as determined by Maxent which balances training data omission error rates with predicted area.
- The logistic threshold value where the percentage of observations above the threshold is what would be expected if the observations were randomly distributed across logistic value classes. This is equivalent to a null model.
- The logistic threshold where the percentage of observations above the threshold is 10 times higher than would be expected if the observations were randomly distributed across logistic value classes.
- The proportion of test locations that fall above the low logistic threshold.
- A measure of how well model output matched the location of test observations. In theory, everywhere a test location was located, the logistic value should have been 1.0. The deviance value for each test location is calculated as 2 times the natural log of the associated logistic output value. Deviance values vary from 0, when test observations are associated with a logistic value of 1, to around 13.8, when logistic values approach 0.001. Deviances for individual test locations are plotted in Figure 3.
- The area under a curve obtained by plotting the true positive rate against 1 minus the false positive rate for model training observations. Values range from 0 to 1 with a random or null model performing at a value of 0.5.
- The same metric described in f, but calculated for test observations.

## Inductive Modeling Map Outputs




Figure 1. Continuous habitat suitability model output (logistic scale).




Figure 2. Continuous habitat suitability model output with training and test data.




Figure 3. Continuous habitat suitability model output with relative deviance for each test observation




Figure 4. Continuous habitat suitability model output with survey locations that could have detected the species (gray) and detections of species (black)




Figure 5. Model output classified into unsuitable (gray), low suitability (yellow), medium suitability (orange), and optimal suitability (red) habitat classes.

## **Deductive Model**

**Model Created By:** Bryce Maxell

**Model Creation Date:** May 14, 2012

**Model Evaluators:** Joy Ritter and Bryce Maxell

**Model Approval Date:** November 12, 2012

**Model Goal:** Deductive model is meant to represent species-habitat associations during summer breeding season. Species were classified as commonly or occasionally associated with ecological systems. See details on how ecological systems were associated with species and the suggested uses and limitations of these associations under individual species accounts in the Montana Field Guide at: <http://fieldguide.mt.gov>

### **Deductive Modeling Methods**

<b>Ecological System</b>	<b>Code</b>	<b>Habitat Association</b>
Greasewood Flat	9103	Common
Great Plains Prairie Pothole	9203	Common
Great Plains Riparian	9326	Common
Great Plains Mixedgrass Prairie	7114	Common
Mat Saltbush Shrubland	5203	Common
Big Sagebrush Steppe	5454	Common
Emergent Marsh	9222	Common
Great Plains Closed Depressional Wetland	9252	Common
Great Plains Open Freshwater Depression Wetland	9218	Common
Great Plains Saline Depression Wetland	9256	Common
Rocky Mountain Lower Montane-Foothill Riparian Woodland and Shrubland	9156	Common

### **Deductive Model Evaluation**

#### **Discussion of Model Performance:**

The model is representative of the large-scale distribution of breeding habitat for the species in the northern portion of its breeding range in Montana, but over predicts the presence of suitable habitats in the southern portion of its breeding range because the number of wetlands declines to the south and both Great Plains Mixed Grass Prairie and Big Sagebrush Steppe have higher percentages of shrub cover to the south.

#### **Evaluation metrics:**

<b>Metric</b>	<b>Value</b>
Area of commonly associated habitats (Km <sup>2</sup> )	74,833
Absolute validation index (AVI) for common habitat associations	0.80

## Deductive Model Output (Maps)




Figure 6. Common habitat association classes as determined by expert opinion (see Montana Field Guide species account).