State of Caribou Ranges

Cumulative Impacts Monitoring 2018 Estimates

Disturbance Models and Simulated Ranges of Natural Variation

Phil Elkie and Kevin Green



Summary - risk assessment



Probability of observing stable or positive growth ($\lambda \ge$ stable) of caribou populations over a 20-year period at varying levels of total range disturbance (fires ≤ 40 years + anthropogenic disturbances buffered by 500 m). Lambda (λ) was calculated using disturbance specific recruitment values from the metaanalysis and a mean annual adult female survival rate of 0.85, consistent with other components of the critical habitat assessment. Certainty of outcome, ecological risk, and management scenarios are illustrated along a continuum of conditions.

The following disturbance footprint estimates are plotted on the risk assessment graph based on - Environment Canada's – Scientific Assessment to Inform the Identification of Critical Habitat for Woodland Caribou (Rangifer tarandus caribou), Boreal Population in Canada 2011 update (Environment Canada, 2011)

Caribou Ranges in Ontario



Southern Ranges 2011 Disturbance State



* Buffered 500 metres.

Southern Ranges 2012 Disturbance State



* Buffered 500 metres.

Southern Ranges 2013 Disturbance State



* Buffered 500 metres.

Southern Ranges 2015 Disturbance State



* Buffered 500 metres.

Southern Ranges 2017 Disturbance State



* Buffered 500 metres.

Southern Ranges 2011 - 2017 Disturbance Range Indicator Trend



* Buffered 500 metres.

All Ranges 2015 Range Disturbance Indicator



* Buffered 500 metres.

All Ranges 2015 Range Disturbance Indicator





* Buffered 500 metres.

All Ranges 2017 Range Disturbance Indicator



* Buffered 500 metres.

All Ranges 2017 Range Disturbance Indicator





Statistics are approximate and may contain estimates from forest management planning annual work schedules.

47,683,974

8,385,207 ha

4,589,308 ha

12,974,515 ha

27.2 %

Missisa

Pagawachaur

Kesaga

Range 1: Berens 2011 Disturbance State

Landscape Statistics (ha)		
Range Extent: Water Area: FRI Extent: Non-FRI Extent:	2,793,021 434,971 1,605,737 1,187,284	
Range disturbance indica Anthropogenic:* Natural	ator 252,271 513,748	
Total	766,019	
Percent of range extent	27.4%	





* Buffered 500 metres.

Range 1: Berens 2012 Disturbance State

Landscape Statistics (na)		
Range Extent: Water Area: FRI Extent: Non-FRI Extent:	2,793,021 434,971 1,605,737 1,187,284	
Range disturbance indica Anthropogenic:* Natural	tor 222,684 542,019	
Total	804,703	
Percent of range extent	28.8%	





* Buffered 500 metres.

Range 1: Berens 2013 Disturbance State

Landscape Statistics (ha) Range Extent: 2,793,021 Water Area: 434,971 FRI Extent: 1,605,737 Non-FRI Extent: 1,187,284 Range disturbance indicator Anthropogenic:* 266,548 547,077 Natural 813,625 Total 29.1% Percent of range extent





* Buffered 500 metres.

Range 1: Berens 2015 Disturbance State

Landscape Statistics (ha)		
Range Extent: Water Area: FRI Extent: Non-FRI Extent:	2,793,021 434,971 1,605,737 1,187,284	
Range disturbance indica Anthropogenic:* Natural	tor 283,568 566,737	
Total	850,305	
Percent of range extent	30.4%	





* Buffered 500 metres.

Range 1: Berens 2017 Disturbance State

.

Landscape Statistics (na)		
Range Extent: Water Area: FRI Extent: Non-FRI Extent:	2,793,021 434,971 1,605,737 1,187,284	
Range disturbance indica Anthropogenic:* Natural	itor 308,243 567,944	
Total	876,187	
Percent of range extent	31.4%	





* Buffered 500 metres.

State of Caribou Range - Information Sheet

Range 1: Berens 2011 - 2017 Disturbance Range Indicator Trend

Trend------



* Buffered 500 metres.

Range 1: Berens 2015 Range Disturbance Indicator versus Simulated Range of Natural Variation



Range 2: Sydney 2011 Disturbance State

Landscape Statistics (ha)

Range Extent:	747,541
Water Area:	127,992
FRI Extent:	575,851
Non-FRI Extent:	171,690

Range disturbance indicator		
Anthropogenic:*	332,240	
Natural	125,717	
Total	457,957	
Percent of range extent	61.2%	





* Buffered 500 metres.

Range 2: Sydney 2012 Disturbance State

Landscape Statistics (ha) Range Extent: 747,541 Water Area: 127,992 FRI Extent: 575,851 Non-FRI Extent: 171,690 Range disturbance indicator Anthropogenic:* 345,617 120,846 Natural 466,462 Total Percent of range extent 62.4%





* Buffered 500 metres.

Range 2: Sydney 2013 Disturbance State

Landscape Statistics (ha)		
Range Extent: Water Area: FRI Extent: Non-FRI Extent:	747,541 127,992 575,851 171,690	
Range disturbance indicatorAnthropogenic:*368,035Natural119,670		
Total	487,705	
Percent of range extent	65.2%	





* Buffered 500 metres.

Range 2: Sydney 2015 Disturbance State

Landscape Statistics (ha) Range Extent: 747,541 Water Area: 127,992 FRI Extent: 575,851 Non-FRI Extent: 171,690 Range disturbance indicator Anthropogenic:* 379,337 113.962 Natural 493,339 Total 66% Percent of range extent





* Buffered 500 metres.

Range 2: Sydney 2017 Disturbance State

Landscape Statistics (ha) Range Extent: 747,541 Water Area: 127,992 FRI Extent: 575,851 Non-FRI Extent: 171,690 Range disturbance indicator Anthropogenic:* 376,260 105.296 Natural 481,556 Total Percent of range extent 64%





* Buffered 500 metres.

State of Caribou Range - Information Sheet

Range 2: Sydney 2011 - 2017 Disturbance Range Indicator Trend



* Buffered 500 metres.

State of Caribou Range - Information Sheet

Range 2: Sydney 2015 Range Disturbance Indicator versus Simulated Range of Natural Variation



Range 3: Churchill 2011 Disturbance State





* Buffered 500 metres.

SCENARIO

Range 3: Churchill 2012 Disturbance State





* Buffered 500 metres.

Range 3: Churchill 2013 Disturbance State





* Buffered 500 metres.

SCENARIO

Range 3: Churchill 2015 Disturbance State





* Buffered 500 metres.

0

MANAGEMEN SCENARIO 10 20

30 40 50 60 70

% Total Disturbance

Range 3: Churchill 2017 Disturbance State





* Buffered 500 metres.

0

MANAGEMENT SCENARIO 10 20

30 40 50 60 70

% Total Disturbance

State of Caribou Range - Information Sheet

Range 3: Churchill 2011 - 2017 Disturbance Range Indicator Trend



* Buffered 500 metres.

Range 3: Churchill 2015 Range Disturbance Indicator versus Simulated Range of Natural Variation



Range 4: Brightsand 2011 Disturbance State



* Buffered 500 metres.

Range 4: Brightsand 2012 Disturbance State



* Buffered 500 metres.
Range 4: Brightsand 2013 Disturbance State







* Buffered 500 metres.

Range 4: Brightsand 2015 Disturbance State



* Buffered 500 metres.

Range 4: Brightsand 2017 Disturbance State



* Buffered 500 metres.

Range 4: Brightsand 2011 - 2017 Disturbance Range Indicator Trend

Trend-----



* Buffered 500 metres.

Range 4: Brightsand 2015 Range Disturbance Indicator versus Simulated Range of Natural Variation



Range 5: Nipigon 2011 Disturbance State







* Buffered 500 metres.

Range 5: Nipigon 2012 Disturbance State

Landscape Statistics (ha) Range Extent: 3,847,309 Water Area: 781,854 FRI Extent: 3,370,311 Non-FRI Extent: 1,187,284 Range disturbance indicator Anthropogenic:* 1,325,934 166,712 Natural Total 1,493,646 Percent of range extent 38.8%





* Buffered 500 metres.

Range 5: Nipigon 2013 Disturbance State

Landscape Statistics (ha) Range Extent: 3,847,309 Water Area: 781,854 FRI Extent: 3,370,311 Non-FRI Extent: 1,187,284 Range disturbance indicator Anthropogenic:* 1,339,589 159,936 Natural Total 1,499,525

Percent of range extent

39.0%





* Buffered 500 metres.

Range 5: Nipigon 2015 Disturbance State

Landscape Statistics (ha) Range Extent: 3,847,309 Water Area: 781,854 FRI Extent: 3,370,311 Non-FRI Extent: 1,187,284 Range disturbance indicator Anthropogenic:* 1,346,223 167,171 Natural Total 1,513,394 Percent of range extent 39.3%





* Buffered 500 metres.

Range 5: Nipigon 2011 - 2015 Disturbance Range Indicator Trend

Trend-----



* Buffered 500 metres.

Range 5: Nipigon 2015 Range Disturbance Indicator versus Simulated Range of Natural Variation



* Buffered 500 metres.

Range 6: Pagwachuan 2011 Disturbance State



* Buffered 500 metres.

Range 6: Pagwachuan 2012 Disturbance State



* Buffered 500 metres.

Range 6: Pagwachuan 2013 Disturbance State



* Buffered 500 metres.

Range 6: Pagwachuan 2015 Disturbance State



* Buffered 500 metres.

Range 6: Pagwachuan 2017 Disturbance State



* Buffered 500 metres.

Range 6: Pagawachuan 2011 - 2017 Disturbance Range Indicator Trend



* Buffered 500 metres.

Range 6: Pagawachuan 2015 Range Disturbance Indicator versus Simulated Range of Natural Variation



Range 7: Kesagami 2011 Disturbance State







2011



* Buffered 500 metres.

Range 7: Kesagami 2012 Disturbance State



% Total Disturbance

Range Not Self-Sustaining



2012

Buffered 500 metres.

0 10 20 30 40 50 60 70

0.4

5

MANAGEMEN SCENARIO

Range 7: Kesagami 2013 Disturbance State







2013

Buffered 500 metres.

*

Range 7: Kesagami 2015 Disturbance State







2015

* Buffered 500 metres.

Range 7: Kesagami 2017 Disturbance State





2017

* Total Disturbance

0 10 20 30 40 50 60 70

5

Statistics are approximate and may contain estimates from forest management planning annual work schedules.

Range 7: Kesagami 2011 - 2017 Disturbance Range Indicator Trend

Trend------



Landscape Statistics (ha)

* Buffered 500 metres.

Range 7: Kesagami 2015 Range Disturbance Indicator versus Simulated Range of Natural Variation



Conventional Boreal Caribou Habitat Model Set

Degional Forest		Onset Age for Habitat (years)			
Units	Region	Winter Useable	Winter Preferred	Refuge	
BfDom	NW	not useable	not preferred	61	
BwDom	NW	not useable	not preferred	not refuge	
ConMx	NW	not useable	not preferred	71	
HrdMw	NW	not useable	not preferred	not refuge	
HrDom	NW	not useable	not preferred	not refuge	
OcLow	NW	51	not preferred	always	
OthHd	NW	not useable	not preferred	not refuge	
PjDom	NW	41	61	always	
PjMx1	NW	41	61	41	
PoDom	NW	not useable	not preferred	not refuge	
PrwMx	NW	not useable	not preferred	not refuge	
SbDom	NW	61	not preferred	41	
SbLow	NW	41	101	always	
SbMx1	NW	61	not preferred	41	
SF1	NE	not useable	not preferred	61	
BW1	NE	not useable	not preferred	not refuge	
MW1	NE	not useable	not preferred	71	
MW2	NE	not useable	not preferred	71	
LC1	NE	51	not preferred	always	
LH1/TH1	NE	not useable	not preferred	not refuge	
PJ1	NE	41	61	always	
PJ2	NE	41	61	41	
PO1	NE	not useable	not preferred	not refuge	
PW1/PR1/PWR	NE	not useable	not preferred	not refuge	
SP1	NE	61	not preferred	41	
SB1	NE	41	101	always	
SBOG	NE	41	101	always	

This table represents the forest unit based habitat models used in conventional boreal landscapes. These models include both a refuge (all year) and winter model. Winter is broken into two classes; useable (relatively low quality) and preferred (relatively high quality) habitats. Originally, as part of the Landscape Guide Project, simulated ranges of natural variation were estimated only in areas where forest management planning occurred. Consequently provincial landcover surfaces were used to estimate the natural condition outside of the forest management planning area. Provincial landcover surfaces do not contain the same thematic resolution as forest resource inventories. Useable and preferred winter habitat were grouped together for the purpose of estimating ranges of natural variation at the range level.

Clay-belt Boreal Caribou Habitat Model Set

		Onset Age for Habitat (years)		
Regional				
Forest Units	Region	Winter Suitable	Mature Conifer	
PR1	NE	not winter suitable	not mature conifer	
PW1	NE	not winter suitable	not mature conifer	
PRW	NE	not winter suitable	not mature conifer	
LH1	NE	not winter suitable	not mature conifer	
SBOG	NE	always	not mature conifer	
SB1	NE	51	101	
PF1	NE	41	71	
LC1	NE	51	not mature conifer	
PJ2	NE	41	71	
SP1	NE	51	not mature conifer	
SF1	NE	not winter suitable	not mature conifer	
PO1	NE	not winter suitable	not mature conifer	
BW1	NE	not winter suitable	not mature conifer	
MW1	NE	not winter suitable	not mature conifer	
MW2	NE	not winter suitable	not mature conifer	
TMS	NE	always	not mature conifer	
RCK	NE	always	always	

This table represents the forest unit based habitat models used in claybelt boreal landscapes. The models include both winter suitable and mature conifer. Originally, as part of the Landscape Guide Project, simulated ranges of natural variation were estimated only in areas where forest management planning occurred. Consequently, for winter suitable, provincial landcover surfaces were used to estimate the natural condition outside of the forest management planning area. Provincial landcover surfaces do not contain the same thematic resolution as forest resource inventories and therefore the mature conifer model was used only in areas that contained forest resource inventories

Geographic Model Application



Boreal East Forest Region Caribou

The seven caribou ranges and discontinuous zone. The conventional boreal models are used in the grey areas and the clay-belt models are used in the green area.

In areas where forest management occurs forest resource inventories are used. In areas where forest management does not occur provincial land cover is used.



Non-FRI, Provincial Landcover Caribou Habitat Model Sets

Conventional Boreal Model

Winter habitat: Forest Dense Coniferous, Forest Sparse*, Bog Treed, Treed FEN, Refuge Habitat: Forest Dense Coniferous, Forest Sparse*, Forest Dense Mixed, Bog Treed, Treed FEN. *Note: Range 1 and 2 forest sparse, unlike other ranges, is young open forest which resulted from recent burns and consequently is not considered habitat.

Clay-belt Boreal Model

Winter Suitable: bedrock, sparse forest, dense coniferous, open fen, treed fen, open bog, treed bog. Mature Conifer: Mature conifer is older conifer which is age dependent and consequently we were unable to classify from Landcover.

In areas where forest management occurs forest resource inventories are used. In areas where forest management does not occur provincial land cover is used.



Range 1: Berens 2011 – 2017, Habitat SRNV







Range 1: Berens 2011 – 2015, Winter Habitat SRNV by FMU



Range 1: Berens 2011 – 2015, Refuge Habitat SRNV by FMU



Range 2: Sydney 2011 - 2017, Habitat SRNV





Range 2: Sydney 2011 – 2015, Winter Habitat SRNV by FMU



Simulated Range of Natural Variation Caribou Winter Habitat

Range 2: Sydney 2011 – 2015, Refuge Habitat SRNV by FMU







Range 3: Churchill 2011 - 2017, Habitat SRNV




Range 3: Churchill 2011 – 2015, Winter Habitat SRNV by FMU



Range 3: Churchill 2011 – 2015, Refuge Habitat SRNV by FMU



Range 4: Brightsand 2011 – 2017, Habitat SRNV





Range 4: Brightsand 2011 - 2015, Winter Habitat SRNV by FMU



Range 4: Brightsand 2011 – 2015, Refuge Habitat SRNV by FMU



Range 5: Nipigon 2011 – 2017, Habitat SRNV





Range 5: Nipigon 2011 – 2015, Winter Habitat SRNV by FMU





Range 5: Nipigon 2011 – 2015, Refuge Habitat SRNV by FMU



Range 6: Pagwachuan 2011 – 2017, West Habitat SRNV



Range 6: Pagwachuan 2011 – 2015, West Winter Habitat SRNV by FMU





Range 6: Pagwachuan 2011 – 2015, West Refuge Habitat SRNV by FMU



Range 6: Pagwachuan 2011 – 2017, East Habitat SRNV



Range 6: Pagwachuan 2011 – 2015, East Mature Conifer Habitat SRNV by FMU



Range 6: Pagwachuan 2011 – 2015, East Suitable Habitat SRNV by FMU





Range 7: Kesagami 2011 – 2017, Habitat SRNV





Range 7: Kesagami 2011 – 2015, Mature Conifer Habitat SRNV by FMU



Range 7: Kesagami 2011 – 2015, Suitable Habitat SRNV by FMU





Range 1: Berens 2011 – 2017, Young Forest and Permanent Disturbance SRNV





Range 1: Berens 2011 - 2015, Young Forest and Permanent Disturbance SRNV by FMU



Range 2: Sydney 2011 – 2017, Young Forest and Permanent Disturbance SRNV



Range 2: Sydney 2011 – 2015, Young Forest and Permanent Disturbance SRNV by FMU



Range 3: Churchill 2011 – 2017, Young Forest and Permanent Disturbance SRNV



Range 3: Churchill 2011 – 2015, Young Forest and Permanent Disturbance SRNV by FMU



Range 4: Brightsand 2011 - 2017, Young Forest and Permanent Disturbance SRNV





Range 4: Brightsand 2011 - 2015, Young Forest and Permanent Disturbance SRNV by FMU



Range 5: Nipigon 2011 - 2017, Young Forest and Permanent Disturbance SRNV





Range 5: Nipigon 2011 - 2015, Young Forest and Permanent Disturbance SRNV by FMU



Simulated Range of Natural Variation



Range 6: Pagwachuan 2011 - 2017, Young Forest and Permanent Disturbance SRNV



Range 6: Pagwachuan 2011 - 2015, Young Forest and Permanent Disturbance SRNV by FMU



Range 7: Kesagami 2011 – 2017, Young Forest and Permanent Disturbance SRNV



Range 7: Kesagami 2011 – 2015, Young Forest and Permanent Disturbance SRNV by FMU



Range 1: Berens 2011 Simulation Pattern Results Winter Habitat – Landscape Diagrams



Arrangement of caribou winter habitat (Conventional Boreal Model) at 500 ha, 6,000 ha and 30,000 ha including 2011 and several example maps from the simulations.





Proportion class - hexagon occupancy

Caribou winter habitat texture histogram – 2011 compared to simulation means at the 500, 6,000 and 30,000 hectare levels.



Range 2: Sydney 2011 Simulation Pattern Results Winter Habitat – Landscape Diagrams



Arrangement of caribou winter habitat (Conventional Boreal Model) at 500 ha, 6,000 ha and 30,000 ha including 2011 and several example maps from the simulations.





Proportion class - hexagon occupancy

Caribou winter habitat texture histogram – 2011 compared to simulation means at the 500, 6,000 and 30,000 hectare levels.



Range 3: Churchill 2011 Simulation Pattern Results Winter Habitat – Landscape Diagrams



Arrangement of caribou winter habitat (Conventional Boreal Model) at 500 ha, 6,000 ha and 30,000 ha including 2011 and several example maps from the simulations.
Range 3: Churchill 2011 Simulation Pattern Results Winter Habitat – Landscape Histograms



Proportion class - hexagon occupancy

Caribou winter habitat texture histogram – 2011 compared to simulation means at the 500, 6,000 and 30,000 hectare levels.



Range 4: Brightsand 2011 Simulation Pattern Results Winter Habitat – Landscape Diagrams



Arrangement of caribou winter habitat (Conventional Boreal Model) at 500 ha, 6,000 ha and 30,000 ha including 2011 and several example maps from the simulations.







Proportion class - hexagon occupancy

Caribou winter habitat texture histogram – 2011 compared to simulation means at the 500, 6,000 and 30,000 hectare levels.



Range 5: Nipigon 2011 Simulation Pattern Results Winter Habitat – Landscape Diagrams



Arrangement of caribou winter habitat (Conventional Boreal Model) at 500 ha, 6,000 ha and 30,000 ha including 2011 and several example maps from the simulations.





Proportion class - hexagon occupancy

Caribou winter habitat texture histogram – 2011 compared to simulation means at the 500, 6,000 and 30,000 hectare levels.



Range 6: Pagwachuan East 2011 Simulation Pattern Results Mature Conifer Habitat – Landscape Diagrams



Arrangement of caribou mature conifer habitat (Conventional Boreal Model) at 500 ha, 6,000 ha and 30,000 ha including 2011 and several example maps from the simulations.

Range 6: Pagwachuan East 2011 Simulation Pattern Results Mature Conifer Habitat – Landscape Histograms



Proportion class - hexagon occupancy

Caribou mature conifer habitat texture histogram – 2011 compared to simulation means at the 500, 6,000 and 30,000 hectare levels.



Range 7: Kesagami 2011 Simulation Pattern Results Mature Conifer Habitat – Landscape Diagrams



Arrangement of mature conifer habitat (Conventional Boreal Model) at 500 ha, 6,000 ha and 30,000 ha including 2011 and several example maps from the simulations.







Caribou mature conifer habitat texture histogram – 2011 compared to simulation means at the 500, 6,000 and 30,000 hectare levels.

