

1 Seismic pressure: the influence of landscape structure
2 on red squirrel (*Tamiasciurus hudsonicus*) distribution
3 in a human-altered boreal forest.

4 Introduction

5 Landscapes are complex matrices of habitat patches, resources, energy, and organisms (Forman
6 & Godron, 1981). The structure of the landscape arises from both its composition and configuration,
7 where 'composition' refers to the types and amounts of habitat, and 'configuration' to their spatial
8 arrangement (Dunning et al., 1992; Forman & Godron, 1981). Landscape structure plays a critical role in
9 mediating local species-habitat relationships. Variations in either habitat amount or spatial patterning of
10 these components can lead to markedly different distributions of organisms, ecological processes, and
11 community structures (Dunning et al., 1992; Tscharntke et al., 2012).

12 Human-caused alteration of landscapes is the dominant driver of changes to biodiversity globally
13 (Johnson et al., 2017; Maxwell et al., 2016). As the human footprint expands and increasingly encroaches
14 on wild spaces, species are increasingly displaced by anthropogenic land use, including natural resource
15 extraction, agriculture, and urban expansion (Johnson et al., 2017; Shackelford et al., 2018).
16 Disturbances fundamentally alter landscape structure through both direct and indirect mechanisms:
17 development changes (and typically reduces) the total amount of habitat available to wildlife, but it also
18 subdivides remaining habitat via fragmentation (Wilson et al., 2016). Habitat patches that are smaller,
19 more isolated, or containing higher proportions of edge habitat affect wildlife by influencing connectivity,
20 resource availability, and behaviour (Anderson & Boutin, 2002; Haddad et al., 2015; Pfeifer et al., 2017).
21 The matrix created by human-caused landscape change is not entirely inhospitable to wildlife. Although
22 biodiversity generally declines in heavily disturbed landscapes, some species may derive supplementary
23 or complementary resources in human-altered habitats (Fahrig, 2003; Magioli et al., 2019). The
24 differential behavioural- and population-level responses of species to habitat alteration have
25 fundamental consequences for the assembly and functioning of ecological communities (Sousa, 1984;
26 Swihart et al., 2006), highlighting the importance of understanding landscape structure for conservation
27 research.

28 Considerable recent scientific controversy and debate has attempted to clarify the relationships
29 between habitat loss, habitat configuration, and species diversity (Fahrig, 2017; Fletcher et al., 2018;
30 Martin, 2018). While the role of habitat amount (and loss thereof) in explaining terrestrial biodiversity is
31 widely accepted and supported by empirical evidence (Brooks et al., 2002), yet the role of habitat
32 configuration remains contentious and has even been dismissed altogether by some studies (e.g., Fahrig,
33 2013). Isolating the possible effects of landscape configuration—namely, fragmentation—is challenging
34 since fragmentation is collinear with and hierarchically connected to habitat loss in many real-world
35 ecological systems: most habitat loss also results in net fragmentation (Didham et al., 2012; Ruffell et al.,

36 2016). Nevertheless, discriminating among the ecological mechanisms arising from each type of habitat
37 alteration is critical for predicting outcomes for wildlife (Côté et al., 2016). The effects of habitat
38 fragmentation are likely context-dependent, varying non-linearly along a gradient of suitable habitat
39 amount within the landscape matrix (Andrén, 1994; Didham et al., 2012; Villard & Metzger, 2014). At low
40 or intermediate amounts of suitable habitat—where configuration has the most variability—
41 fragmentation may produce ecological impacts distinct from those predicted by habitat loss alone
42 (Andrén, 1994; Villard & Metzger, 2014). Thus, the direct and indirect effects of landscape structure likely
43 require explicit empirical testing instead of assumption across taxa and environmental contexts (Püttker
44 et al., 2020).

45 The ecological uncertainty surrounding landscape structure compels a focused investigation in
46 the Nearctic boreal forest, where landscapes form a heterogeneous mosaic of vegetation and biophysical
47 traits, including wetlands, aspen parkland, conifer lowland, and forests in a variety of successional stages
48 (Kenkel et al., 1997). The boreal forest has been stewarded and developed by humans for generations
49 (Lewis, 1982; Timoney, 2003), but in recent decades the Boreal Plains have undergone unprecedented
50 structural changes at the collective hands of the timber, mining, and energy industries. Superimposed on
51 the naturally ‘patchy’ ecosystems of the Boreal Plains is a pervasive network of cut blocks, roads, seismic
52 lines, well pads, and processing facilities dedicated to the extraction, refinement, and transportation of
53 natural resources (Pasher et al., 2013; Pickell et al., 2015). In the last twenty years, *in situ* oil and gas
54 extraction has eclipsed all other industries, as well as natural environmental processes, as the dominant
55 driver of landscape change in the boreal forest (Pickell et al., 2015). Although energy sector disturbances
56 constituting less than 2% of the footprint of Alberta’s boreal forest by area (Alberta Biodiversity
57 Monitoring Institute, 2023), their staggering density and persistence have fundamentally transformed
58 boreal landscape composition and configuration. For instance, over 1.8 million kilometers of seismic
59 lines—persistent linear features used to map underground oil and gas deposits—stretch across Alberta’s
60 forest, producing disproportionate amounts of early-seral vegetation, forest edge habitat, and
61 movement corridors through otherwise intact tracts of boreal habitat (Dabros et al., 2017, 2018; Lee &
62 Boutin, 2006). The cumulative effects of intense industrial development have given rise to an
63 unparalleled spatial patterning of habitat and resources, creating new complexity in boreal landscape
64 structure (Pickell et al., 2015).

65 Confronted by these novel landscapes, the resident wildlife of the Boreal Plains are forced to
66 compete for space with natural resource development with widespread consequences for ecosystems
67 and species persistence (Venier et al., 2014). A large body of research indicates that virtually all
68 terrestrial mammals have responded to landscape change induced by natural resource development in
69 the Boreal Plains (Curveira-Santos et al., 2024; Fisher & Burton, 2018; Wittische et al., 2021). Past
70 research has heavily emphasized the effects of habitat and disturbance *amount* on boreal mammals,
71 wherein changes in resource availability have evoked a multitude of complex changes to population
72 sizes, wildlife behaviours, and trophic and competitive interactions among species (Burgar et al., 2019;
73 Fisher et al., 2021; Fisher & Burton, 2018; McKenzie et al., 2012; Tattersall et al., 2020). There has been
74 comparatively little attention given to the effects of landscape *configuration* in boreal research (notable
75 exception: Smith et al., 2024).

76 Red squirrels (*Tamiasciurus hudsonicus*) are one boreal species for which the spatial distribution
77 of habitat may be an important ecological factor in landscapes transformed by industrial land-use.
78 Ubiquitous throughout the Nearctic boreal forest, red squirrels are seed predators with a strong
79 dependence on conifer forest ecosystems that has been demonstrated across multiple spatial scales and
80 ecozones (Fisher et al., 2005; Larsen, 2009; McDermott et al., 2020; Rusch & Reeder, 1978). Both natural
81 and anthropogenic sources of disturbance—namely, wildfire and timber harvesting—directly affect red
82 squirrel density by removing key resources and decreasing the amount of suitable habitat within the
83 matrix (Fisher & Wilkinson, 2005; Russel et al., 2010). The influence of spatial configuration of habitat on
84 patterns of red squirrel distribution remains largely unexplored, though the behaviour and abundance of
85 squirrels has been noted to differ in heterogenous habitats or along forest edges (Anderson & Boutin,
86 2002; Bayne & Hobson, 2000; Fisher et al., 2005). Fragmentation of core red squirrel habitat by seismic
87 lines and other industrial disturbances could introduce changes to vegetation structure along forest
88 edges, abundance of co-occurring species (Tattersall et al., 2020), or functional responses of predators
89 (McKenzie et al., 2012), especially when suitable habitat amounts are low. Even in heavily disturbed
90 landscapes, the cumulative footprint of seismic lines rarely exceeds 4% by area; thus, habitat loss *sensu*
91 *stricto* experienced by red squirrels due to these features may be minimal since cleared anthropogenic
92 features offer few potential resource subsidies. Disentangling the influences of composition and
93 configuration on red squirrel distribution may yield valuable insights into the effects of landscape
94 structure on ecological processes in one of the most rapidly changing ecosystems in the world.

95 As such, in this paper I will investigate the degree to which habitat composition and
96 configuration influence red squirrel distribution in Boreal Plains landscapes with a gradient of habitat
97 and disturbance characteristics. Aligning with conceptual frameworks of fragmentation (Didham et al.,
98 2012), I hypothesize that: (i) both habitat loss and fragmentation from industrial development
99 influencing red squirrel distribution, but (ii) the independent effects of habitat fragmentation are
100 greatest in landscapes where the amount of suitable natural habitat available to squirrels is low. To
101 accomplish my objectives, I deployed 438 motion-activated cameras across the Boreal Plains to measure
102 the relative abundance of red squirrels in landscapes with variable proportions and spatial configurations
103 of forest habitat, seismic lines, cut blocks, and other industrial disturbances. I will derive several key
104 metrics representing the composition (proportion of natural land cover or disturbance footprint) and
105 configuration (edge density, core habitat area) of each local landscape. I expect that the relative
106 abundance of red squirrels will be highest in areas with a high proportion of conifer forest relative to
107 other natural habitat types. I also predict that squirrel relative abundance will be negatively related to
108 the proportion of cleared anthropogenic features (well pads, roads, and seismic lines) in all landscapes—
109 but negatively related to edge density and positively related to core habitat area in landscapes with a
110 low proportion of conifer forest, indicative of effects of fragmentation independent of habitat amount.

112 **References**

- 113 Alberta Biodiversity Monitoring Institute. (2023). *Wall-to-Wall Human Footprint Inventory - Year 2021*.
114 <https://abmi.ca/data-portal/46.html>
- 115 Anderson, E. M., & Boutin, S. (2002). Edge effects on survival and behaviour of juvenile red squirrels (*Tamiasciurus*
116 *hudsonicus*). *Canadian Journal of Zoology*, 80(6), 1038–1046. <https://doi.org/10.1139/z02-087>
- 117 Andrén, H. (1994). Effects of Habitat Fragmentation on Birds and Mammals in Landscapes with Different
118 Proportions of Suitable Habitat: A Review. *Oikos*, 71(3), 355–366. <https://doi.org/10.2307/3545823>
- 119 Bayne, E., & Hobson, K. (2000). Relative use of contiguous and fragmented boreal forest by red squirrels
120 (*Tamiasciurus hudsonicus*). *Canadian Journal of Zoology*, 78(3), 359–365. <https://doi.org/10.1139/z99-219>
- 121 Brooks, T. M., Mittermeier, R. A., Mittermeier, C. G., Da Fonseca, G. A. B., Rylands, A. B., Konstant, W. R., Flick, P.,
122 Pilgrim, J., Oldfield, S., Magin, G., & Hilton-Taylor, C. (2002). Habitat Loss and Extinction in the Hotspots of
123 Biodiversity. *Conservation Biology*, 16(4), 909–923. <https://doi.org/10.1046/j.1523-1739.2002.00530.x>
- 124 Burgar, J. M., Burton, A. C., & Fisher, J. T. (2019). The importance of considering multiple interacting species for
125 conservation of species at risk. *Conservation Biology*, 33(3), 709–715. <https://doi.org/10.1111/cobi.13233>
- 126 Côté, I. M., Darling, E. S., & Brown, C. J. (2016). Interactions among ecosystem stressors and their importance in
127 conservation. *Proceedings of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences*, 283(1824), 20152592.
128 <https://doi.org/doi:10.1098/rspb.2015.2592>
- 129 Curveira-Santos, G., Marion, S., Sutherland, C., Beirne, C., Herdman, E. J., Tattersall, E. R., Burgar, J. M., Fisher, J. T.,
130 & Burton, A. C. (2024). Disturbance-mediated changes to boreal mammal spatial networks in industrializing
131 landscapes. *Ecological Applications*, 34(6), e3004. <https://doi.org/10.1002/eap.3004>
- 132 Dabros, A., James Hammond, H. E., Pinzon, J., Pinno, B., & Langor, D. (2017). Edge influence of low-impact seismic
133 lines for oil exploration on upland forest vegetation in northern Alberta (Canada). *Forest Ecology and*
134 *Management*, 400, 278–288. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.foreco.2017.06.030>
- 135 Dabros, A., Pyper, M., & Castilla, G. (2018). Seismic lines in the boreal and arctic ecosystems of North America:
136 environmental impacts, challenges, and opportunities. *Environmental Reviews*, 26(2), 214–229.
137 <https://doi.org/10.1139/er-2017-0080>
- 138 Didham, R. K., Kapos, V., & Ewers, R. M. (2012). Rethinking the conceptual foundations of habitat fragmentation
139 research. *Oikos*, 121(2), 161–170. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1600-0706.2011.20273.x>
- 140 Dunning, J. B., Danielson, B. J., & Pulliam, H. R. (1992). Ecological Processes That Affect Populations in Complex
141 Landscapes. *Oikos*, 65(1), 169–175. <https://doi.org/10.2307/3544901>
- 142 Fahrig, L. (2003). Effects of Habitat Fragmentation on Biodiversity. *Annual Review of Ecology, Evolution, and*
143 *Systematics*, 34(1), 487–515. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.ecolsys.34.011802.132419>
- 144 Fahrig, L. (2013). Rethinking patch size and isolation effects: the habitat amount hypothesis. *Journal of*
145 *Biogeography*, 40(9), 1649–1663. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jbi.12130>

- 146 Fahrig, L. (2017). Ecological Responses to Habitat Fragmentation Per Se. *Annual Review of Ecology, Evolution, and*
147 *Systematics*, 48(Volume 48, 2017), 1–23. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-ecolsys-110316-022612>
- 148 Fisher, J. T., Boutin, S., Hannon, & Susan, J. (2005). The protean relationship between boreal forest landscape
149 structure and red squirrel distribution at multiple spatial scales. *Landscape Ecology*, 20(1), 73–82.
150 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10980-004-0677-1>
- 151 Fisher, J. T., & Burton, A. C. (2018). Wildlife winners and losers in an oil sands landscape. *Frontiers in Ecology and*
152 *the Environment*, 16(6), 323–328. <https://doi.org/10.1002/fee.1807>
- 153 Fisher, J. T., Grey, F., Anderson, N., Sawan, J., Anderson, N., Chai, S.-L., Nolan, L., Underwood, A., Maddison, J. A.,
154 Fuller, H. W., & Frey, S. (2021). Indigenous-led camera-trap research on traditional territories informs
155 conservation decisions for resource extraction. *FACETS*, 6, 1266–1284. <https://doi.org/10.1139/facets-2020-0087>
- 157 Fisher, J. T., & Wilkinson, L. (2005). The response of mammals to forest fire and timber harvest in the North
158 American boreal forest. *Mammal Review*, 35(1), 51–81. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2907.2005.00053.x>
- 159 Fletcher, R. J., Didham, R. K., Banks-Leite, C., Barlow, J., Ewers, R. M., Rosindell, J., Holt, R. D., Gonzalez, A., Pardini,
160 R., Damschen, E. I., Melo, F. P. L., Ries, L., Prevedello, J. A., Tscharntke, T., Laurance, W. F., Lovejoy, T., &
161 Haddad, N. M. (2018). Is habitat fragmentation good for biodiversity? *Biological Conservation*, 226, 9–15.
162 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biocon.2018.07.022>
- 163 Forman, R. T. T., & Godron, M. (1981). Patches and Structural Components for A Landscape Ecology. *BioScience*,
164 31(10), 733–740. <https://doi.org/10.2307/1308780>
- 165 Haddad, N. M., Brudvig, L. A., Clobert, J., Davies, K. F., Gonzalez, A., Holt, R. D., Lovejoy, T. E., Sexton, J. O., Austin,
166 M. P., Collins, C. D., Cook, W. M., Damschen, E. I., Ewers, R. M., Foster, B. L., Jenkins, C. N., King, A. J.,
167 Laurance, W. F., Levey, D. J., Margules, C. R., ... Townshend, J. R. (2015). Habitat fragmentation and its lasting
168 impact on Earth's ecosystems. *Science Advances*, 1(2). <https://doi.org/10.1126/sciadv.1500052>
- 169 Johnson, C. N., Balmford, A., Brook, B. W., Buettel, J. C., Galetti, M., Guangchun, L., & Wilmshurst, J. M. (2017).
170 Biodiversity losses and conservation responses in the Anthropocene. *Science*, 356(6335), 270–275.
171 <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.aam9317>
- 172 Kenkel, N., Walker, D., Watson, P., Caners, R., & Lastra, R. (1997). Vegetation dynamics in boreal forest ecosystems.
173 *Community Ecology*, 12, 97–108.
- 174 Larsen, K. W. (2009). Dispersal in a gradient of habitats: Activity by juvenile North American red squirrels
175 (*Tamiasciurus hudsonicus*) in varying-age forest stands. *Écoscience*, 16(1), 75–83.
176 <http://www.jstor.org/stable/42902023>
- 177 Lee, P., & Boutin, S. (2006). Persistence and developmental transition of wide seismic lines in the western Boreal
178 Plains of Canada. *Journal of Environmental Management*, 78(3), 240–250.
179 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jenvman.2005.03.016>
- 180 Lewis, H. T. (1982). A Time for Burning. 17. *Boreal Institute for Northern Studies, University of Alberta*.

- 181 Magioli, M., Moreira, M. Z., Fonseca, R. C. B., Ribeiro, M. C., Rodrigues, M. G., & Ferraz, K. M. P. M. de B. (2019).
182 Human-modified landscapes alter mammal resource and habitat use and trophic structure. *Proceedings of*
183 *the National Academy of Sciences*, 116(37), 18466–18472. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1904384116>
- 184 Martin, C. A. (2018). An early synthesis of the habitat amount hypothesis. *Landscape Ecology*, 33(11), 1831–1835.
185 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10980-018-0716-y>
- 186 Maxwell, S. L., Fuller, R. A., Brooks, T. M., & Watson, J. E. M. (2016). Biodiversity: The ravages of guns, nets and
187 bulldozers. *Nature*, 536(7615), 143–145. <https://doi.org/10.1038/536143a>
- 188 McDermott, J. P. B., Whitaker, D. M., & Warkentin, I. G. (2020). Constraints on range expansion of introduced red
189 squirrels (*Tamiasciurus hudsonicus*) in an island ecosystem. *Canadian Journal of Forest Research*, 50(10),
190 1064–1073. <https://doi.org/10.1139/cjfr-2019-0369>
- 191 McKenzie, H. W., Merrill, E. H., Spiteri, R. J., & Lewis, M. A. (2012). How linear features alter predator movement
192 and the functional response. *Interface Focus*, 2(2), 205–216. <https://doi.org/10.1098/rsfs.2011.0086>
- 193 Pasher, J., Seed, E., & Duffe, J. (2013). Development of boreal ecosystem anthropogenic disturbance layers for
194 Canada based on 2008 to 2010 Landsat imagery. *Canadian Journal of Remote Sensing*, 39(1), 42–58.
195 <https://doi.org/10.5589/m13-007>
- 196 Pfeifer, M., Lefebvre, V., Peres, C. A., Banks-Leite, C., Wearn, O. R., Marsh, C. J., Butchart, S. H. M., Arroyo-
197 Rodríguez, V., Barlow, J., Cerezo, A., Cisneros, L., D'Cruze, N., Faria, D., Hadley, A., Harris, S. M., Klingbeil, B. T.,
198 Kormann, U., Lens, L., Medina-Rangel, G. F., ... Ewers, R. M. (2017). Creation of forest edges has a global
199 impact on forest vertebrates. *Nature*, 551(7679), 187–191. <https://doi.org/10.1038/nature24457>
- 200 Pickell, P. D., Andison, D. W., Coops, N. C., Gergel, S. E., & Marshall, P. L. (2015). The spatial patterns of
201 anthropogenic disturbance in the western Canadian boreal forest following oil and gas development.
202 *Canadian Journal of Forest Research*, 45(6), 732–743. <https://doi.org/10.1139/cjfr-2014-0546>
- 203 Püttker, T., Crouzeilles, R., Almeida-Gomes, M., Schmoeller, M., Maurenza, D., Alves-Pinto, H., Pardini, R., Vieira, M.
204 V., Banks-Leite, C., Fonseca, C. R., Metzger, J. P., Accacio, G. M., Alexandrino, E. R., Barros, C. S., Bogoni, J. A.,
205 Boscolo, D., Brancalion, P. H. S., Bueno, A. A., Cambui, E. C. B., ... Prevedello, J. A. (2020). Indirect effects of
206 habitat loss via habitat fragmentation: A cross-taxa analysis of forest-dependent species. *Biological
207 Conservation*, 241, 108368. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biocon.2019.108368>
- 208 Ruffell, J., Banks-Leite, C., & Didham, R. K. (2016). Accounting for the causal basis of collinearity when measuring
209 the effects of habitat loss versus habitat fragmentation. *Oikos*, 125(1), 117–125.
210 <https://doi.org/10.1111/oik.01948>
- 211 Rusch, D. A., & Reeder, W. G. (1978). Population Ecology of Alberta Red Squirrels. *Ecology*, 59(2), 400–420.
212 <https://doi.org/10.2307/1936382>
- 213 Russel, R. E., Lehmkuhl, J. F., Buckland, S. T., & Saab, V. A. (2010). Short-Term Responses of Red Squirrels to
214 Prescribed Burning in the Interior Pacific Northwest, USA. *The Journal of Wildlife Management*, 74(1), 12–17.
215 <https://doi.org/10.2193/2008-342>

- 216 Shackelford, N., Standish, R. J., Ripple, W., & Starzomski, B. M. (2018). Threats to biodiversity from cumulative
217 human impacts in one of North America's last wildlife frontiers. *Conservation Biology*, 32(3), 672–684.
218 <https://doi.org/10.1111/cobi.13036>
- 219 Smith, R. M., Fisher, J. T., & Shackelford, N. (2024). *Evaluating the impacts of anthropogenic development on large*
220 *mammals across protected and industrialized landscapes in Western Canada* [University of Victoria].
221 <https://doi.org/https://hdl.handle.net/1828/16338>
- 222 Sousa, W. P. (1984). The Role of Disturbance in Natural Communities. *Annual Review of Ecology and Systematics*,
223 15, 353–391. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2096953>
- 224 Swihart, R. K., Lusk, J. J., Duchamp, J. E., Rizkalla, C. E., & Moore, J. E. (2006). The roles of landscape context, niche
225 breadth, and range boundaries in predicting species responses to habitat alteration. *Diversity and*
226 *Distributions*, 12(3), 277–287. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1366-9516.2006.00242.x>
- 227 Tattersall, E. R., Burgar, J. M., Fisher, J. T., & Burton, A. C. (2020). Boreal predator co-occurrences reveal shared use
228 of seismic lines in a working landscape. *Ecology and Evolution*, 10(3), 1678–1691.
229 <https://doi.org/10.1002/ece3.6028>
- 230 Timoney, K. P. (2003). The changing disturbance regime of the boreal forest of the Canadian Prairie Provinces. *The*
231 *Forestry Chronicle*, 79(3), 502–516. <https://doi.org/10.5558/tfc79502-3>
- 232 Tscharntke, T., Tylianakis, J. M., Rand, T. A., Didham, R. K., Fahrig, L., Batáry, P., Bengtsson, J., Clough, Y., Crist, T. O.,
233 Dormann, C. F., Ewers, R. M., Fründ, J., Holt, R. D., Holzschuh, A., Klein, A. M., Kleijn, D., Kremen, C., Landis, D.
234 A., Laurance, W., ... Westphal, C. (2012). Landscape moderation of biodiversity patterns and processes - eight
235 hypotheses. *Biological Reviews*, 87(3), 661–685. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1469-185X.2011.00216.x>
- 236 Venier, L. A., Thompson, I. D., Fleming, R., Malcolm, J., Aubin, I., Trofymow, J. A., Langor, D., Sturrock, R., Patry, C.,
237 Outerbridge, R. O., Holmes, S. B., Haeussler, S., De Grandpré, L., Chen, H. Y. H., Bayne, E., Arsenault, A., &
238 Brandt, J. P. (2014). Effects of natural resource development on the terrestrial biodiversity of Canadian boreal
239 forests. *Environ Rev*, 22(4), 457–490. <https://doi.org/10.1139/er-2013-0075>
- 240 Villard, M.-A., & Metzger, J. P. (2014). REVIEW: Beyond the fragmentation debate: a conceptual model to predict
241 when habitat configuration really matters. *Journal of Applied Ecology*, 51(2), 309–318.
242 <https://doi.org/10.1111/1365-2664.12190>
- 243 Wilson, M. C., Chen, X.-Y., Corlett, R. T., Didham, R. K., Ding, P., Holt, R. D., Holyoak, M., Hu, G., Hughes, A. C., Jiang,
244 L., Laurance, W. F., Liu, J., Pimm, S. L., Robinson, S. K., Russo, S. E., Si, X., Wilcove, D. S., Wu, J., & Yu, M.
245 (2016). Habitat fragmentation and biodiversity conservation: key findings and future challenges. *Landscape*
246 *Ecology*, 31(2), 219–227. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10980-015-0312-3>
- 247 Wittische, J., Heckbert, S., James, P. M. A., Burton, A. C., & Fisher, J. T. (2021). Community-level modelling of boreal
248 forest mammal distribution in an oil sands landscape. *Sci Total Environ*, 755(2), 142500.
249 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2020.142500>
- 250