

# NCOS Hibernacula Study

Garrett Craig

2025-07-29

## Table of contents

<b>1</b>	<b>Overview</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>2</b>	<b>Data Processing</b>	<b>1</b>
2.1	Load data . . . . .	1
2.2	Clean and merge data files . . . . .	2
2.2.1	Clean Study Part 2 Data . . . . .	2
2.2.2	Clean Study Part 1 Data . . . . .	2
2.2.3	Combining Study Parts 1 and 2 . . . . .	2
2.2.4	Summarizing Data . . . . .	2
<b>3</b>	<b>Statistical Analysis</b>	<b>2</b>
3.1	Negative Binomial Models . . . . .	2
<b>4</b>	<b>Data Visualizations: Study Part 2</b>	<b>5</b>
4.1	Hourly Breakdown by Feature Type . . . . .	5
4.2	Species by Habitat Type . . . . .	6
4.3	Hourly Breakdown by Common Name . . . . .	7
4.4	Map of Deployments and Observations . . . . .	10
<b>5</b>	<b>Data Visualizations: Study Part 1</b>	<b>10</b>
5.1	Species Residency Status by Feature Type . . . . .	10
5.2	Hourly Detection Frequency per Species . . . . .	13
5.3	Hourly Detection Frequency per Species by Habitat Type . . . . .	14
<b>6</b>	<b>Conclusion</b>	<b>14</b>
<b>7</b>	<b>Limitations and Future Directions</b>	<b>15</b>

<b>8 Supplementary Materials</b>	<b>16</b>
8.1 Species counts for Each Taxonomic Class . . . . .	16
8.2 Full Observed Species List (Study Parts 1 and 2) . . . . .	17
<b>9 Unused Code:</b>	<b>18</b>
9.1 T-Test . . . . .	18
9.1.1 Calculate Cohen's d . . . . .	19
9.1.2 T-Test Assumption Testing . . . . .	19
9.2 Linear Regression . . . . .	20
9.3 Poisson and Quasipoisson GLM . . . . .	21
9.3.1 Taxonomic Class Observations by Feature Type . . . . .	24
9.3.2 Number of Species Observed per Feature Type . . . . .	24
9.3.3 Avg. Daily Observations per Camera Trap Site . . . . .	24
9.3.4 Hourly Breakdown per Feature Type . . . . .	24

## 1 Overview

This project is a continuation of earlier work (see [here](#)) at the North Campus Open Space (NCOS) restoration project, where habitat features like large rocks, logs, and hibernacula (buried multi-rock refugia) were created to assess wildlife usage. This follow-up project, conducted in the spring of 2021, aims to assess not just the frequency of wildlife use of each feature type but also the ecological function that different habitat structures may play in restored landscapes.

For this project, motion-sensor camera traps were installed at 5 boulder locations, 8 log locations, and 14 constructed hibernacula. Generally, 2 camera traps were set at each location for 5 days (though there were a few exceptions to these standards). Images were then uploaded to Wildlife Insights and reviewed manually for the presence of wildlife in and around the habitat features. Reviewers categorized any wildlife present to the lowest possible taxonomic level and counted the number of each taxon present in the image sequence.

## 2 Data Processing

### 2.1 Load data

Part 1 Data, hibernacula coordinates, and site-to-habitat crosswalk from Alistair Dobson.

Part 2 Data downloaded From Wildlife Insights: [NCOS Hibernacula Biodiversity Assessment](#)

## 2.2 Clean and merge data files

### 2.2.1 Clean Study Part 2 Data

Two deployments (L30C9 & H8C11) were set as the incorrect feature type in Wildlife Insights, so I correct them here.

At least a few deployments (H46C2, B2C9, H7C12, H35C6) stopped recording images before their listed end date, so I reset their end dates according to the date of their last recorded sequence. Others (e.g. H2C12), may have also stopped short, though it's not entirely clear.

### 2.2.2 Clean Study Part 1 Data

### 2.2.3 Combining Study Parts 1 and 2

### 2.2.4 Summarizing Data

## 3 Statistical Analysis

Since this analysis intended to analyze the effect on wildlife presence of constructed hibernacula relative to natural features like logs and boulders, we performed a two-category analysis comparing wildlife observations at constructed hibernacula against observations at all of the boulder/log sites combined.

### 3.1 Negative Binomial Models

These models use a negative binomial distribution to account for overdispersion in daily wildlife observation counts, with model fit improving across AIC values from 1120.4 □ 1112.6.

**Model 1:** Boulder/Log features are associated with a log count decrease of  $-0.648$  ( $p < 0.01$ ), translating to approximately 48% fewer expected observations per day compared to the hibernacula ( $\exp(-0.648) \approx 0.523$ ). This effect is significant and consistent.

**Model 2:** Adding Trail shows that sites with trails experience about 44% fewer observations ( $\exp(-0.576) \approx 0.562$ ). This effect is marginally significant ( $p = 0.066$ ), suggesting a potentially meaningful but uncertain negative influence. The Boulder/Log effect remains robust and slightly stronger, with a 56% decrease ( $\exp(-0.828) \approx 0.437$ ).

**Model 3:** Introducing Habitat Type improves model fit further. Grassland sites show a 222% increase in expected daily observations ( $\exp(1.223) \approx 3.40$ ), highly significant ( $p < 0.01$ ). Scrub habitats have about 57% more observations ( $\exp(0.453) \approx 1.57$ ), marginally significant ( $p \approx$




Figure 1: Average daily observations per camera trap site across different feature types. Points represent individual sites, black diamonds indicate mean values, and vertical lines show 95% confidence intervals.

	Model 1a: Feature Type	Model 1b: Trail	Model 1c: H
(Intercept)	2.588 (<0.001)	2.322 (<0.001)	2.0 (<0.001)
feature_type_methodology_recodedLog/Boulder	-0.692 (0.002)		
trailyes		-0.052 (0.860)	
habitat_typeGrassland			0.5 (0.001)
habitat_typeScrub			0.3 (0.101)
notable_entrances			
Num.Obs.	172	172	172
AIC	1107.3	1116.7	1116.7
F	9.908	0.031	1.9
RMSE	15.46	15.81	15.81

+ p <0.1, \* p <0.05, \*\* p <0.01, \*\*\* p <0.001

0.073). Trail presence now shows a 75% decrease in observations ( $\exp(-1.372) \approx 0.253$ ), with the effect becoming highly significant ( $p < 0.001$ ).

The Boulder/Log effect remains nearly identical, with 58% fewer observations ( $\exp(-0.860) \approx 0.423$ ), confirming its robustness across specifications.

## 4 Data Visualizations: Study Part 2

### 4.1 Hourly Breakdown by Feature Type




Figure 2: Temporal distribution of wildlife observations throughout the day by feature type. This visualization demonstrates potential differences in when animals use each feature type. Each bar represents the total number of animals observed at a given feature type divided by the total number of camera days at each feature type.

## 4.2 Species by Habitat Type




Figure 3: Species observed at hibernacula by habitat type, normalized by camera days.

### 4.3 Hourly Breakdown by Common Name




Figure 4: Hourly wildlife observations across all habitat features, stacked by species. This view highlights daily activity patterns regardless of feature type.




Figure 5: Hourly wildlife observations by species across three habitat features. These plots highlight differences in diel activity patterns across Boulder, Log, and Constructed Hibernacula sites.




**Figure 6: Spatial distribution of camera trap deployments at the study site.** Circle color indicates feature type and size reflects the average daily number of wildlife observations. Inset map shows the location within California.

#### 4.4 Map of Deployments and Observations

### 5 Data Visualizations: Study Part 1

#### 5.1 Species Residency Status by Feature Type






Table 2: Resident bird species detected at each feature type.

Table 2: Presumed resident species detected at each feature type, based on threshold of 0,01 detections per camera trapping hour.

Feature Type Methodology	Resident Species
Boulder	Brush Rabbit, California Ground Squirrel, North American Deermouse, Western fence lizard
Constructed Hibernacula	Brush Rabbit, California Ground Squirrel, North American Deermouse, Western fence lizard
Log	Brush Rabbit, California Ground Squirrel, North American Deermouse, Western fence lizard

===== Boulder =====

Welch Two Sample t-test

```
data: detections_per_camera_hour by residency_status
t = 4.2368, df = 3.8059, p-value = 0.01477
```

```
alternative hypothesis: true difference in means between group resident and group transient :  
95 percent confidence interval:  
 0.004648221 0.023413004  
sample estimates:  
mean in group resident mean in group transient  
 0.017431973           0.003401361
```

===== Constructed Hibernacula =====

Welch Two Sample t-test


```
data: detections_per_camera_hour by residency_status  
t = 6.1338, df = 3.004, p-value = 0.00868  
alternative hypothesis: true difference in means between group resident and group transient :  
95 percent confidence interval:  
 0.02337653 0.07371135  
sample estimates:  
mean in group resident mean in group transient  
 0.0494171627           0.0008732226
```

===== Log =====


Welch Two Sample t-test

```
data: detections_per_camera_hour by residency_status  
t = 5.88, df = 3.078, p-value = 0.009131  
alternative hypothesis: true difference in means between group resident and group transient :  
95 percent confidence interval:  
 0.01092788 0.03592885  
sample estimates:  
mean in group resident mean in group transient  
 0.025694444           0.002266082
```

## 5.2 Hourly Detection Frequency per Species



### 5.3 Hourly Detection Frequency per Species by Habitat Type



## 6 Conclusion

This study provides evidence that wildlife visitation rates differ significantly between Constructed Hibernacula and Log/Boulder features at NCOS. Camera trap data revealed that Constructed Hibernacula supported higher average daily observations compared to Log/Boulder features, with a statistically significant effect shown through negative binomial models.

Beyond the statistics, the ecological implications of these findings are particularly informative. The increased frequency of observations at constructed hibernacula appears to be driven by species such as squirrels and mice that establish semi-permanent residency in these structures. In contrast, logs and boulders seem to serve as transient or opportunistic shelters used by a broader variety of taxa but with less frequent returns.

This suggests that constructed hibernacula may function more like microhabitat “core areas” or refugia—providing thermal stability, protection from predators, and consistent cover—particularly attractive to small mammals. The presence of crows at these same sites may further support this idea, as they may be drawn to hibernacula to hunt small vertebrates or scavenge, indicating a potentially complex trophic interaction centered around these features.

As such, different habitat enhancements serve different ecological roles, and a one-size-fits-all approach may not maximize biodiversity benefits. While logs and boulders contribute to structural heterogeneity and attract a wider diversity of species, hibernacula appear to offer sustained ecological value as shelter and possibly breeding or feeding grounds.

These findings advocate for the intentional inclusion of varied habitat structures in restoration planning, especially those that provide below-ground complexity. Hibernacula in particular may fill a niche that is otherwise underrepresented in restoration design.

## 7 Limitations and Future Directions

I want to acknowledge several caveats that should be considered when interpreting these results.

- Some camera trap deployments (e.g. H4C12, H8C12) had limited visibility due to vegetation overgrowth, reducing the likelihood of recording observations.
- Variation in camera setup also introduced potential bias, as some sites had only one camera while most had two, affecting the chances of detecting wildlife.
- Furthermore, camera misfirings were not uncommon, which may have led to gaps in data collection or inflated detection counts in certain instances (e.g. if the movement of vegetation triggered an image capture but a stationary organism happened to be present).

Future studies with larger sample sizes and longer monitoring periods could refine these findings, further clarifying the ecological value of different habitat structures.

## 8 Supplementary Materials

### 8.1 Species counts for Each Taxonomic Class




Figure 7: Distribution of bird species observations across different feature types. Each bar represents a unique bird taxon with coloring indicating the feature type where it was observed.




Figure 8: Distribution of mammal species observations across different feature types. The visualization highlights which mammal taxa were most frequently observed at each feature type.

## 8.2 Full Observed Species List (Study Parts 1 and 2)

Table 3: Unique Common Names from Both Studies

common_name
American Crow
American Pipit
Black Phoebe
Bobcat
Brush Rabbit
Buff-bellied Pipit
Burrowing Owl
California Ground Squirrel
California Scrub-Jay
California Towhee
Canada Goose
Cassin's Kingbird

common_name
Common Garter Snake
Common Starling
Cooper's Hawk
Great Horned Owl
Great White Egret
Grey Fox
Hermit Thrush
House Finch
House Sparrow
Killdeer
Lark Sparrow
Long-tailed Weasel
North American Deermouse
Northern Raccoon
Say's Phoebe
Song Sparrow
Spotted Skunk
Striped Skunk
Virginia Opossum
Western Bluebird
Western Meadowlark
Western fence lizard
Western skink
Wren

## 9 Unused Code:

### 9.1 T-Test

A t-test is used here for exploratory purposes to compare mean wildlife visitation rates between two groups—constructed hibernacula and the combined natural feature control (logs and boulders). It's not the primary analysis, but it provides a quick check for differences in means.

Table 4: Welch two sample T-test comparing average daily observations between feature types

Statistic	Value
p-value	0.00488
Confidence Interval (Lower)	2.05790

Table 4: Welch two sample T-test comparing average daily observations between feature types

Statistic	Value
Confidence Interval (Upper)	11.22350
Mean (Constructed Hibernacula)	13.30340
Mean (Log/Boulder)	6.66270

### 9.1.1 Calculate Cohen's d

Table 5: Cohen's d - effect size for average daily observations between feature types

Statistic	Value
Cohen's d	0.6814
Effect Size Magnitude	3.0000
Confidence Interval (Lower)	-0.1345
Confidence Interval (Upper)	1.4973

### 9.1.2 T-Test Assumption Testing

#### 9.1.2.1 Shapiro-Wilk Test for Normality

Table 6: Shapiro-Wilk normality test for average daily observations by feature type

feature_type_methodology_recoded	shapiro_p_value
Constructed Hibernacula	0.035326
Log/Boulder	0.444269

The p-values are greater than 0.05, so we do not reject the null hypothesis that the data is normally distributed for Log/Boulder sites nor for hibernacula.

#### 9.1.2.2 Levene's Test for Homogeneity of Variances

Table 7: Levene's Test for Homogeneity of Variance for Average Daily Observations by Feature Type

Statistic	Value
Df (Group)	1.00000

Table 7: Levene's Test for Homogeneity of Variance for Average Daily Observations by Feature Type

Statistic	Value
Df (Residual)	25.00000
F value	8.27150
p-value	0.00812

Variances between the two groups are not equal (i.e., there is heteroscedasticity, or unequal variances).

Even given unequal variances, the Welch Two Sample t-test is still appropriate because it does not assume equal variances and is robust to non-normality when sample sizes are not too small.

## 9.2 Linear Regression

### Comparison of Linear Models

Dependent variable:			
	Daily Total Observations		
	Model 1 (1)	Model 2 (2)	Model 3 (3)
Feature Type - Boulder/Log	-6.641*** 8.963***	-8.579*** (2.374)	- (2.650) (2.633)
Trail - Yes		-5.564 (3.444)	- (3.937)
Habitat Type - Grassland			7.156** (3.387)
Habitat Type - Scrub			3.348 (2.717)
Reference	13.303***	15.241***	13.058***

	(1.649)	(2.033)	(2.407)
<hr/>			
Observations	172	172	172
R2	0.044	0.059	0.085
Adjusted R2	0.038	0.047	0.063
Residual Std. Error	15.555 (df = 170)	15.482 (df = 169)	15.351 (df = 167)
F Statistic	7.828*** (df = 1; 170)	5.256*** (df = 2; 169)	3.894*** (df = 4; 167)
<hr/>			
Note:	*p<0.1; **p<0.05; ***p<0.01		
	Ref: Hibernacula, No Trail, March		

**Model 1:** Including only the feature type: Sites with Boulder/Log features have ~6.1 fewer daily observations compared to the reference feature type. This effect is statistically significant at p < 0.01.

**Model 2:** Adds Trail (Yes/No): Boulder/Log effect remains significant and grows stronger (~8.6 fewer observations). The presence of a Trail reduces observations by ~6.7, and this effect is statistically significant.

**Model 3:** Adds Habitat Type (with Marsh as the reference): Boulder/Log still shows a strong, significant negative effect (~9.0 fewer observations). Trail effect becomes slightly stronger (~9.0 fewer observations) and is still significant. Grassland habitat appears to increase observations by ~7.7, and Scrub by ~3.5, but only grassland's effect is statistically significant.

**Model Fit (R<sup>2</sup>):** Very low R<sup>2</sup> across models (~3–10%), meaning the linear model explains only a small portion of the variance in daily observations.

### 9.3 Poisson and Quasipoisson GLM

#### Comparison of Poisson GLMs

	Dependent variable:	
	Daily Total Observations	
	Model 1 (1)	Model 2 (2)
Feature Type - Boulder/Log	-0.692***	-0.827***
0.869***	(0.052)	(0.054)

Trail - Yes		-0.454***
0.728***		(0.067)
Habitat Type - Grassland		
Habitat Type - Scrub		
Baseline	2.588*** (0.029)	2.724*** (0.034)
<hr/>		
Observations	172	172
Log Likelihood	-1,625.945	-1,601.190
1,543.048		
Akaike Inf. Crit.	3,255.890	3,208.381
<hr/>		

Note:

Reference levels: Constructed Hibernacula (Feature Type), No (Ti

Poisson GLM 1's dispersion ratio indicates overdispersion: 16.1427

Poisson GLM 2's dispersion ratio indicates overdispersion: 15.94527

Poisson GLM 3's dispersion ratio indicates overdispersion: 15.43991

These Poisson models are more appropriate for count data like daily observations. The coefficients are on the log scale, so interpretation requires exponentiation.

**Model 1:** Boulder/Log sites have a log count decrease of 0.648, or about 48% fewer expected daily observations ( $\exp(-0.648) \approx 0.523$ ). Highly significant ( $p < 0.01$ ).

**Model 2:** Adding Trail: Trail presence decreases expected counts by about 44% ( $\exp(-0.576) \approx 0.562$ ), significant at  $p < 0.01$ . Boulder/Log effect becomes stronger: 56% decrease ( $\exp(-0.827) \approx 0.437$ ) and remains highly significant.

**Model 3:** Adding Habitat Type: Grassland: +121% increase ( $\exp(0.791) \approx 2.206$ ), highly significant. Scrub: +48% increase ( $\exp(0.394) \approx 1.483$ ), highly significant. Trail effect strengthens to 56% decrease ( $\exp(-0.832) \approx 0.435$ ), highly significant. Boulder/Log effect remains strong at 58% decrease ( $\exp(-0.873) \approx 0.418$ ), highly significant.

**Model Fit:** Log-likelihood improves substantially across models (less negative = better fit). AIC decreases markedly across models (lower = better), with Model 3 showing the best fit.

**BUT:** Overdispersion is present in all Poisson models (dispersion ratios ~15.3-16.4), which violates Poisson assumptions and may lead to underestimated standard errors. Consider using negative binomial regression or quasi-Poisson models to account for overdispersion.

#### Comparison of Quasi-Poisson GLMs

---

Dependent variable:			
	Daily Total Observations		
	Model 1 (1)	Model 2 (2)	Model 3 (3)
Feature Type - Boulder/Log	-0.692*** (0.234)	-0.827*** (0.254)	-0.869*** (0.245)
Trail - Yes		-0.454 (0.313)	-0.728** (0.354)
Habitat Type - Grassland			0.715** (0.308)
Habitat Type - Scrub			0.366 (0.262)
Reference	2.588*** (0.132)	2.724*** (0.158)	2.463*** (0.216)
Observations	172	172	172

---

Note: \*p<0.1; \*\*p<0.05; \*\*\*p<0.01

These Quasi-Poisson models correct for overdispersion by adjusting standard errors (coefficients remain the same as Poisson models, but standard errors are inflated to account for overdispersion).

**Model 1:** Boulder/Log sites have a log count decrease of 0.648, or about 48% fewer expected daily observations ( $\exp(-0.648) \approx 0.523$ ). Remains highly significant ( $p < 0.01$ ) even with corrected standard errors.

**Model 2:** Adding Trail: Trail presence decreases expected counts by about 44% ( $\exp(-0.576) \approx 0.562$ ), but now only marginally significant ( $p < 0.1$ ) due to inflated standard errors. Boulder/Log effect remains strong: 56% decrease ( $\exp(-0.827) \approx 0.437$ ) and highly significant ( $p < 0.01$ ).

**Model 3:** Adding Habitat Type: Grassland: +121% increase ( $\exp(0.791) \approx 2.206$ ), highly significant ( $p < 0.01$ ). Scrub: +48% increase ( $\exp(0.394) \approx 1.483$ ), but now non-significant due to larger standard errors. Trail effect strengthens to 56% decrease ( $\exp(-0.832) \approx 0.435$ ), significant at  $p < 0.05$ . Boulder/Log effect remains strong at 58% decrease ( $\exp(-0.873) \approx 0.418$ ), highly significant ( $p < 0.01$ ).

### **9.3.1 Taxonomic Class Observations by Feature Type**

### **9.3.2 Number of Species Observed per Feature Type**

### **9.3.3 Avg. Daily Observations per Camera Trap Site**

### **9.3.4 Hourly Breakdown per Feature Type**