Advancing Demographic Monitoring: Progress Report

INTERAGENCY GRIZZLY BEAR STUDY TEAM



Progress report

Integrated Population Models: quick primer

Preliminary findings

Implementation and next steps

This information is preliminary and is subject to revision. It is being provided to meet the need for timely best science. The information is provided on the condition that neither the U.S. Geological Survey nor the U.S. Government shall be held liable for any damages resulting from the authorized or unauthorized use of the information.



Monitoring challenges

- Long-term data
- Different types and sources of data
- Varying frequency of data collections
- Missing data
- Changes in methods
- Multiple jurisdictions
- Multiple scales



Traditional approach

Separately estimate:

- Survival
- Reproduction
- Population size
- Etc.

Can result in data discrepancies



Hypothetical example

Survival rate + mortality rate = 1.0

250 female bears

Total mortality = 25, mortality rate = 25/250 = 0.10

Survival rate = 0.95

Which estimate is wrong, or are they all wrong?



Hypothetical example

Survival rate + mortality rate = 1.0

250 female bears

Total mortality = 25, mortality rate = 25/250 = 0.10

Survival rate = 0.90



Hypothetical example

Survival rate + mortality rate = 1.0

500 female bears

Total mortality = 25, mortality rate = 25/500 = 0.05

Survival rate = 0.95



"Overlapping consensus"





"Overlapping consensus"





"Overlapping consensus"





Integrated Population Model (IPM)

"Any model that jointly analyses data on population size and demographic parameters" (Schaub and Abadi 2011)





Making the most of limited data Multiple models in one:

Process model: describes biology

 $N_{newborns} = N_{adult females} \times pregnancy rate \times litter size$

Observation models: relate data to parameters
N_{adult females} ← estimated (data)
Pregnancy rate ← test animals (data)
Litter size ← observed counts (data)

More data sources \rightarrow better inference



Key attributes of IPM

Make sense of multiple sources of imperfect data

- Unified framework for analysis of all monitoring data
- Establish current population status, predict future population

Self-consistent estimates

- Reconciles estimates from different data \rightarrow increases reliability

Useful outputs for management

• Greater transparency to inform management decisions

Flexible structure

- Incorporate new data, new methods, expert opinion, etc.
- Evaluate cost and contributions of different data sources



Enhancing wildlife governance

Wildlife Governance Principles (WMI)

- Strategic and adaptive thinking
- Evidence-based and broadly informed decision-making
- Transparency and accountability for decisions/actions
- Inclusive and diverse participation in decision-making
- Capacity to deliver conservation



IGBST: linking vital rates and abundance



Parameters are "self-reconciling" \rightarrow reliable inference



Implementation

SpeedGoat & Univ. Montana

- www.speedgoat.io/story
- Paul Lukacs, Josh Nowak
- Independent research entity

Web-based application

- Common interface
- Common data storage and management
- Analysis framework

Common results

- Everyone on team is seeing same structure and results
- Addresses scale issues





SPDGT - Dev

a ? ÷



SPDGT - Dev

≡

😢 🕸 👌 🕸





Vital rates: survival



IGBST

Vital rates: reproduction



IGBST

Population size





Ongoing and next steps

Incorporate updated Chao2 (16 km) into IPM



Update with 2019-2021 data and final testing



Final reporting to YES (Spring 2022)





Acknowledgments UM: Paul Lukacs, Josh Nowak, Hans Martin IGBST members and agencies















