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# Introduction

Grasslands are one of the world’s most endangered ecosystems, with declines of 82.6-99.9% of tallgrass prairie, 30-99.9% of mixed-grass prairie, and 20-85.8% of short-grass prairie in the plains states and provinces of North America (Samson and Knopf 1994). Drivers of decline include land use conversion via agriculture and changes in fire and grazing regimes (Samson et al. 2004). Grassland report (Askin et al?). The already tenuous status of grassland birds is further threatened by conversion to new crops resulting in permanent land use changes (Wright and Wimberly 2013), generational changes in land use (Higgins et al. 2002), changes in conservation programs for grassland habitats (Klute et al. 1997), and alterations to vegetation (Alward 1999) and ecosystem structure (Brown et al. 1997) from climate change (McCarty 2001). Grassland bird species are declining faster than other groups of birds as well (Sampson and Knopf 1994) and thus continued to be imperiled by these new threats to their habitat.

Species distribution modeling uses predictors, usually climatic variables () but now expanding to biotic variables (), to predict what areas are most suitable for a given organism, and estimate what variables constrain a given species’ range. Range-wide predictions have been made for grassland birds (O’Connor et al. 1999) but some species with smaller ranges were not accurately modeled, perhaps because different drivers of distribution are important in different regions (Bakker et al. 2002). A new method called Spatiotemporal Exploratory Modeling (STEM) adds additional accuracy by using a stacked ensemble of smaller, regional models to account for local differences in variables that drive distributions (Fink et al. 2010). The original model was developed for data with a continent-wide scale and seasonal variation. Understanding impacts of changing land use and climate in a region with much ecosystem variety requires a dynamic approach to species distribution modeling, so we will use this approach of regional ensemble models at a smaller scale, within one state, within a single season (the breeding season). We will compare the spatially explicit ensemble’s effectiveness with a typical SDM at the statewide scale.

In the southern Great Plains, the U.S. state of Oklahoma contains a wide variety of grassland birds as its ecoregions range from tallgrass prairies in the east on the edge of eastern deciduous forests to several types of grasslands in the central part of the state and westward. Historically, each type of grassland comprised ?, ?, and ? ha, totaling ? ha (Sampson and Knopf paper). Modern estimates by comparable schemes are not available. Agriculture accounts for over $2.8 billion in the state’s gross domestic product in the study years (U.S. Bureau of Economic Analysis, 2017). Major crops in the state use. Land use is also for ranching, with ?? animals. This combination of the state’s agricultural importance and forecast impact by climate change makes Oklahoma’s grassland birds vulnerable, and models to predict what factors will affect their distribution are important to effective management. The objectives of our study are to estimate the current distribution of Oklahoma grassland birds and understand what variables are important in their distribution. These data will allow managers to make decisions on what areas are important for populations, what land use practices and trends may impact populations, and how climate change interacts with these. Considering management at the local scale is also important because many land use changes are made there (citation??).

We will examine three aspects of Oklahoma grassland bird distribution. First, what is the current distribution of these species? We will use point count, transect, and citizen science data to create density estimates (from point count and transect data, comparing estimates because they are different habitats) and species distribution models (from all three data sources). We will create statewide distribution models for each species of interest and compare these with spatially explicit ensemble models at three scales. Second, what predictor variables determine the distribution of each species and as such what land use changes might make these species vulnerable? We look at land use, conservation easements, and climatic variables, and ask which variables were most important in the statewide species distribution model for each species. Finally, how will distributions change with climate change forecasts and potential land use changes? We use predicted climate change forecasts and estimates of potential land use change (soil distribution maps??) to estimate risks for Oklahoma’s grassland birds.

# Methods

## Study area

Brief discussion of ecoregions in Oklahoma, range of precipitation and temperature across the state, and what types of grasslands (and what areas exist) are here.

## Response data

We focused on grassland birds (Table 2).

* Survey methods
  + Point counts
  + Transects
* Citizen science data
  + eBird: All complete data (points and transects) for 2013 and 2014 for training data. 2011 and 2012 spatially sampled data for evaluation data.
  + Because some observers entered sightings from before and during our surveys into eBird.org, we eliminated ?? counts that were within two hours of the actual survey start time and within 15 km of the survey start location in 2013 and 2014.

## Predictors

We used climate, land use, and land cover variables to predict bird distribution. Table 1 shows the variables, sources, and their definitions. Neighborhood predictors were calculated by the values in rectangular areas around each point, at the scale of 5 x 5 pixels (150 x 150 m) and 15 x 15 pixels (450 x 450 m) (Fink et al. 2010). We looked at proportion of each land cover class and proportion of summed open space land covers (grasslands, hay/pasture, cropland, herbaceous wetlands, and barren land) since grassland bird occupancy can be influenced by the total non-structural cover (McDonald 2017). Neighborhoods were created in QGIS 2.14 with the GRASS r.neighbors processing tool (QGIS CITATION HERE).

## Analyses

### Density estimations

* Using distance sampling, possibly including detectability from repeated surveys
  + Comparison of point count vs transect effectiveness if sample size large enough for each and geographical overlap sufficient. However, point counts go along road and transects usually walking off-road. Alternative: comparison of estimations from road pcs vs “off road” transects?

### Species distribution models

To model species distributions based on our predictors, we created four models for each species at varying spatial scales: a single model statewide and three spatially explicit ensemble models. The statewide model will allow ranking of variable importance. This gives us interpretable models for which we can make specific predictions about what predictor variables are influencing distribution in what ways for each piece of the ensemble. The remaining models are three spatiotemporal exploratory models (STEM) (Fink et al. 2010) at varying scales. STEM are merged over different spatial extents per Fink et al. 2010. The original STEM was used on continent-scale survey data and can be used with any base model (Fink et al. 2010, Fink et al. 2013). The spatially explicit ensembles are likely to give more accurate predictions (Fink et al. 2010) but models with increasing local accuracy are harder to interpret and generalize (James et al. 2013). We see whether it is useful at a smaller scale by adapting the scale of our support sets to the state extent. With the diverse habitats and climatic variables found across Oklahoma, it should provide better predictions than the statewide model. Using both the statewide and spatially-explicit models give us complementary information on factors affecting species distribution in Oklahoma.

For all base models we used random forest classification trees (Breiman 2001). Random forest gives results competitive to other machine learning techniques such as boosted regression trees and bagged decision trees, with minimal tuning parameters required (Caruana and Niculescu-Mizil 2006, Cutler et al. 2007, Guo et al. 2010), including for species distribution models (Prasad et al. 2006, Lorena et al. 2011). The random forest algorithm bootstraps a subset of the data, fits some proportion of the predictor variables, and gives the error rate on training data using the “out of bag” sample (the portion of data not used in the bootstrap for each tree) (Hastie et al. 2001). This, each random forest model is an ensemble (citation).

We used 7605 complete checklists (from survey and eBird data in 2013 and 2014) as the training set for models. For the eBird data, we did not include casual counts. The statewide model was trained with the full training set (7065 checklists). We tested the models with spatially sampled (see below) eBird data from 2011 and 2012 (n checklists). Using data from different years results in a better evaluation of whether the model generalizes well. As our survey goals are to determine breeding distribution only, we did not specify temporal windows for this model (unlike Fink et al. 2010) and used data from April-June in all years. Hence, we will refer to our models as “spatially explicit” in this paper while adapting Fink et al’s spatial averaging ensemble design.

All models were created using random forest classification trees in the R package randomForest (package citation). A single random forest model was created for the statewide scale, with a prediction raster created using the predict function in the R package ‘raster’ (package citation here). For the spatially explicit models, we created 1000 random points in the study area and created a square of size small (), medium (), or large () around these points. Each support set included all checklists from the training dataset located within its boundaries. The support set was discarded if it contained fewer than 25 checklists. As for the statewide model, we created a prediction raster for each support set model. All support set rasters for a given scale were stacked using the raster::mosaic() function to get the mean value of each pixel, creating the spatially explicit ensemble (Hastie et al. 2001, Fink et al. 2010, Oppel et al. 2012) made of the random forest ensembles. This process was repeated at the three support set spatial scales, resulting in three spatially explicit ensembles per species.

To determine which predictors were important in species distributions, for each species we ranked variables using the statewide model. We used the mean decrease in accuracy and mean decrease in Gini index (define here) given by the randomForest R package (citation here) to rank variable importance. We created partial dependence plots of the top 10 variables for each statewide model.

To evaluate model performance and choose between the four models for each species, we tested the models on the temporally independent evaluation dataset. To ensure spatially uniform testing (Fink et al. 2010), we created a statewide grid of ? x ? m cells. We randomly sampled no more than 5 observations from each grid cell in the evaluation dataset (? Checklists from 2011 and 2012). We repeated the spatial sampling procedure randomly 50 times to get a distribution of the model performance for each model (Fink et al. 2010). We tested four models in this way for each species and chose the scale (small, medium, large, statewide) with best performance measures for each species.

# Results

Map for STEM-type, basic model, and distance sampling estimates for each species.

# Discussion

We should be careful extrapolating climate change to extinction (Schwartz et al. 2006).
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# Tables

Table . Predictors used in models.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Predictor | Definition | Source |
| NRCS Conservation Easement Areas by State | Presence or absence of a conservation easement | <http://gws.ftw.nrcs.usda.gov/GWDL/3276698/easements_EASEAREA_ok_3276698_01.zip> |
| NRCS Conservation Easement Areas by State Calculated Area | Size of the conservation easement in which the pixel exists | <http://gws.ftw.nrcs.usda.gov/GWDL/3276698/easements_EASEAREA_ok_3276698_01.zip> |
| NLCD2011 Landcover | NLCD class | <http://gws.ftw.nrcs.usda.gov/GWDL/3276698/land_use_land_cover_NLCD_ok_3276698_02.zip> |
| NLCD 2.25 and 20.25 ha neighborhoods | 5 x5 and 15 x 15 pixel neighborhoods |  |
|  | Open space (11, 31, 71, 81, 82, 95) |  |
|  | Open water 11 |  |
|  | Developed open space |  |
|  | Low intensity development (22) |  |
|  | Medium intensity development (23) |  |
|  | High intensity development (24) |  |
|  | Barren (31) |  |
|  | Forest (41, 42, 43) |  |
|  | Scrub/shrubland 52 |  |
|  | Grasslands 71 |  |
|  | Pasture and hay 81 |  |
|  | Croplands 82 |  |
|  | Woody wetlands 90 |  |
|  | Herbaceous wetlands 95 |  |
| Year |  |  |
| Day of year |  |  |
| Hour |  |  |
| Longitude |  |  |
| Latitude |  |  |
| Human population density | Number per square km |  |
| Bioclim variables |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

Table 2. Study species with their conservation status.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Species | Breeding bird survey trend since YEAR | Oklahoma status | Federal status | IUCN status |
| Dickcissel |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |

# Figures