**Manuscript 1: Expert elicitation of salamanders**

**Title:**

* Predicting salamander occurrence when data is lacking using expert opinion

**Journal:**

* Conservation evidence (Making amphibian conservation more effective; Meredith et al. 2016)
* Conservation biology (martin et al. 2012, Addison et al. 2015)

**Overview:** Elicite parameter values and model beliefs from experts for predicting effects of climate, land use, and brook-trout presense on catchment-level occupancy of three stream-salamander species occuring throughout the northeastern US. Use this model to forecast current distributions of salamanders under differnce climate scenarios and compare to exisiting published distributions.

**\* Step 1: build the catchment-level salamander occupancy model**

**\* Step 2: create expert elicitation survey for model parmaeters and beliefs (means only, use 20+ experts to get variance in mean expected values instead of eliciting confidence)**

**\* Step 3: identify salamander experts based on snow-ball or publication criteria**

**\* Step 4: provide a list of literature for experts to consult prior to elicitation**

**\* Step 5: compare expert opinions and host webinar/call if large discrepancys suggesting lack of understanding of the questions (repeat elicitation if needed)**

**\* Step 6: forecast salamander occupancy based on expert elicitation**

**\* Step 7: conduct sensititivly analysis for major uncertainties (hold all constant at the mean and vary one parmaeter at a time)**

**Introduction:**

**Why has expert knowledge been in conservation – what’s the problem?**

* Expert knowledge is widely used in conservation b/c of the complexity of problems, relative lack of empirical data and imminent nature of decisions.
* This knowledge typically takes the form of mental models without explicit consideration of biases (i.e., experts are called on to express opinions in a qualitative and non-transparent way). In fields where there is extensive expert knowledge, yet little published data, the use of expert information as priors for ecological models is a cost-effective way of making more confident predictions about the effect of management on biodiversity.
* Use of expert elicitation to consolidate the current state of knowledge is valuable when the status of a species is uncertain, yet there is general recognition that the species is sub- ject to multiple, often synergistic, threats to its persistence in the wild.

**This is well-accepted method and increasing in use**

* Increasing use of expert elicitation methods to help inform conservation decisions (identify important hypothesis and parameter uncertainties to resolve). Probabilistic framework that accounts for uncertainty (confidence) of multiple experts.
* The use of expert knowledge is growing as a tool for synthesizing diverse sources of information into a reliable representation of the current state of scientific knowledge, including its uncertainties when elicited with the same level of rigour pro- vided in the collection and use of empirical data.
* When empirical measures are required for evaluating alternative actions, but are not available, expert judgment can help develop plausible estimates that most effectively inform decisions (Speirs-Bridge et al. 2010; Martin et al. 2012). Expert opinions are valuable in the management of threatened species, where the need to make urgent decisions leaves little time for the collection of further information (?).
* Expert elicitation can be conducted within a probabilistic framework, which accounts for uncertainty (confidence) of multiple experts. Also used to parameterize models in the absence of data and as Bayesian priors to supplement sparse data and improve confidence in predictions (Yamada et al., 2003; Martin et al., 2005; Denham and Mengersen, 2007; Griffiths et al., 2007; Mac Nally, 2007; O’Neill et al., 2008; Low Choy et al., 2009; O’Leary et al., 2009; Murray et al., 2009; James et al., 2010)
* Some chance that expert opinions alone (w/ no data) may not be as useful? Yet, when lacking data, expert opinion does not necessarily offer an improvement (Cox, 2000; Pearce et al., 2001; Seoane et al., 2005).
* Examples of expert elicitation used to parameterize models that inform management decisions (from Martin et al. 2012):
  + Johnson et al. 2010 – use to parameterize Bayesian network to evaluate population viability of cheetahs (X experts)
  + Runge et al. 2011 – use to identify alternative hypotheses and uncertainties affecting mgt of whooping cranes (X experts)
  + O’Neill et al. 2008 – used to quantify trends and range of effects of climate change on polar bears (10 experts)
  + Martin et al. 2005 and Kuhnert et al. 2005 – used to evaluate effects of livestock grazing intensity on austrialian woodland birds in Bayesian GLM (20 experts)
  + Smith et al. 2011 – Bayesian networks
* Examples from Charney 2012:
  + Expert opinion is increasingly used to parameterize models in the absence of data and as Bayesian priors to supplement sparse data (Yamada et al., 2003; Martin et al., 2005; Denham and Mengersen, 2007; Griffiths et al., 2007; Mac Nally, 2007; O’Neill et al., 2008; Low Choy et al., 2009; O’Leary et al., 2009; Murray et al., 2009; James et al., 2010). Yet, when lacking data, expert opin- ion does not necessarily offer an improvement (Cox, 2000; Pearce et al., 2001; Seoane et al., 2005).
* Canessa: Where empirical measures of the required parameters for a situation of interest are not available, expert judgment can help develop plausible estimates that most effectively inform decisions (Speirs-Bridge et al. 2010; Martin et al. 2012). Such methods can prove especially valuable in the management of threatened species, where the need to make urgent decisions leaves little time for the collection of further information.

**What do we mean by "expert" - who are the experts?**

* An expert is someone who has substantial information on a particular topic that is not widely known by others and who is offered deferred to for their knowledge and interpretation.
* Expert knowledge can be defined as substantive information on a particular topic that is not widely known by others (Martin et al., 2012).
* Experts are distinguished from non-experts by having training or experience with respect to a topic of interest (Fazey et al., 2006).

**What are the steps for expert elicitation?**

* Expert-elicitation (in general) is composed of 5 steps:
  + Deciding how information will be used (purpose and motivation)
  + Determining what to elicit (and identifying experts; creating a statistical model)
  + Designing elicitation process
  + Performing elicitation
  + Translating elicited information into quantitative statements that be used in ecological models (to ultimately help make decisions).
* Additional important steps:
  + How to work with multiple experts
  + How to combine multiple judgments (treat as equal or weights, average or ranges)
  + Minimizing bias in elicited information
  + Verifying accuracy of expert information

**Why conduct expert elicitation for predicting/forecasting stream salamander occupancy?**

* Limited information about amphibians (salamanders) region-wide and are in decline – call for experts to aid in identifying parameters to be used in both predictive and decision models to evaluate range of outcomes of conservation actions.
* Do predictions from experts vary from publications? (maybe compare in analysis or compare in discussion)
* Publications have to make lots of assumptions, we hope experts are considering these assumption and relaxing them, thus providing a more realistic understanding of drivers of occurrence.
* Three common stream salamdaner species occur across the northeastern streams (i.e., relevant for NECSC) and are known to co-occur in streams with fishes (brook trout; cite), an important predictor/competitor affecting salamander populations, and are sensitive to buffer and upland forest cover, stream temperature and discharge (and network structure).
* Current data availability:
* Direct threats include:
* Indirect threats include:
* Potentially competing hypotheses?
* Management-relevance (land-protection near buffer or upland?)
* 1. riparian vs. upland land protection is better for instream biota (downstream). Evidence that upland land protection can influence downstream habitat and species occurrence, yet conservation efforts are largely focused on riparian mgt first, then upland (we'll explore this in decision paper)
* 2. fish-interaction is strong or weak (brook trout-salamander interactions)
* 3. species-specific responses (how much do species vary?)
* 4. stream-network impacts on species-responses? some watersheds are more vulnerable than others (i.e., network structure, buffer vs. upland effects?)
* Increasing threat of climate change (temp and flow alterations)
* Range-wide assessments are lacking (studies are patchy in mostly forested landscapes with low forest loss, flow-impacts).
* Knowledge of that status and potential declines is needed to identify mangagement actions that can be implemented to reduce population declines in the future (act now to mitigate climate/land use threats)
* Current data on these species is patchy?
* No consistant monitoring method or field-studies across their range
* Thus they have high levels of uncertainty when extrapolating to even huc 10 (lowest level of mgt), state, or regional scales.
* Significant geographical gaps in estimates and trend in occupancy (need to come up with a list of current studies).
* Need address occupancy, trends, threats and effects of potential land-potection (buffer vs. upland) so that headwater stream mgt actions can be confidently employed to impact local and minimize species declines.
* Also, there are diverse experts opinions on occupancy/threats in various regions.

**Objectives of this elicitation/study:**

* Overall Motivation: To use a structured, expert elicitation methods for species in which empirical data are limited and expert opinions may vary (conflict among experts?), such that effectiveness of alternative mgt strategies may vary.
* Conduct expert elicitation for Plethedontide (stream obligate for at least some stage of life-history?): Desmognathus, Gyrinophilus, and Eurycea
* Specifically, G. porphyriticus; spring salamander, D. fuscus; dusky salamander, and E. bislineata; two-lined salamander
* These species occur across the northeastern streams (i.e., relevant for NECSC) and are known to co-occur in streams with fishes (brook trout; cite), an important predictor/competitor affecting salamander populations.
* Use insights from experts to build predictive co-occurrence models under climate change (Hocking et al. forecasting paper), and evaluate land-protections strategies (Kate et al. optimization paper).
* Questions:
  + How much do expert opinions agree with field-observations (do we have any? – see publication list that we’ll be sending to experts)
  + How variable are expert opinions (mean and confidence)? Where is the disagreement?
  + Which uncertainties are driving forecasts of occurrence (sensitivity analysis; tornado diagram)?
  + Does expert knowledge agree with recent field-observations / occupancy / distribution estimates? (why or why not? do we have any? – see publication list that we’ll be sending to experts for potential comparisons).

**Methods:**

*Identify experts*

*Variables to elicit:*

* Stats (mean and confidence): participants provide optimistic and pessimistic consequence estimates to represent 90% credible bounds (reflecting 3-point or 4-point elicitation approach (Speirs-Bridge et al. 2010)).
* Match scale of actions with scales for response (catchment-level actions = occupancy of salamanders).
* Should we elicit multi-state abundance responses (not occupancy) (0, low, medium, some, lots)?
* List of variables (Table 1):
  + Baseline/overall average state (intercept)
  + Stream size effect
  + Buffer-level effects (30-m percent forest)
  + Upland-level effects (percent forest > 30m buffer)
  + Regional-conditional effects (hierarchical; hyper parameter; intercept or slope interaction?)
  + Species (hyper-parameter; affecting slopes/betas)
  + Temperature effects (mean summer variability, maximum, annual average)
  + Streamflow metric (mean summer variability, maximum, minimum, annual average)
  + Fish effects on salamanders
  + Network-structure effects (only for author-experts (evan and will? and winsor?))

Table 1. List of variables to elicit (also see BBN).

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Variable | Description | Unit | Interpretation |
| Baseline occupancy |  | Probability (0 to 1) | Probability of any catchment, on average, being occupied (intercept) |
| Local Catchment Forest cover | The percent forest cover with a catchment influence occupancy of salamanders | 1 unit increase in forest cover (i.e., X acres randomly throughout the catchment) |  |
| Upstream Catchment Forest Cover |  |  |  |
| Local Forest Buffer |  |  |  |
| Upstream Catchment Forest Buffer |  |  |  |
| Stream Temperature |  |  |  |
| Fish Presence |  |  |  |
| Network Position |  |  |  |
| Local Catchment Wetland Cover |  |  |  |
| Upstream Catchment Wetland Cover |  |  |  |
| Conditional on region/province? (n= | Which responses are conditional on region | Appalachian Plateaus, Valley and Ridge Province, Blue Ridge Province, Piedmont Province, Coastal Plain, New England, Adirondack Province, Interior Low Plateaus | The effects of another variable varies depending on which province your in (due to underlying geology, ground-water connectivity, and other unexplained factors) |

*Salamander model:*

\*functional relationships will be determined by expert knowledge (i.e., expontential decline in occ with stream size, or quadratic relation with stream temp, etc).

s = species

1 = G. porphyriticus spring salamander

2 = D. fuscus dusky salamander

3 = E. bislineata two-lined

i = catchment

occupied[s,i]~beta(p(occupancy[s,i]))

logit (p(occupancy[s,i])) ~ grand.mean[s,i] + stream.size[s,i]...rest of covariates…

?grand.mean[s,i] <- B0[s] + B1[s,i] + B2[s,i] + B3[s,i]….

B0[s] = grand.mean.pocc[s]

B0[s] <-

B0[0,s] +

B0[1,s]\*physiographic province[coastal plain] +

B0[2,s]\*physiographic province[piedmont] +

B0[3,s]\*physiographic province[valley and ridge] +

B0[4,s]\*physiographic province[new england] +

B0[5-8,s]\*physiographic province[other 4 provinces in table 1]

B0[1-8,s]~normal(mean,confidence.90perc)

Elicitation question (4 point confidence; Speirs-Bridge et al. 2010):

1. Realistically, what is your most likely estimate for probability of occupancy in a coastal catchment?
2. Realistically, what do you think the lowest value could be?
3. Realistically, what do you think the highest value could be?
4. How confident are you that the interval you gave (lowest to highest) will capture the true value (please enter a number between 0 and 100% confident)?

Martin et al. 2005 (Eco Apps) only elicited the mean, and calculated the mean and precision using mean values across experts (did not elicit lowest, highest and confidence).

Example BBN for elicitation of variables (see Ban et al. 2015)

- identify important conditional probabilities

*Elicitation process (to manage bias):*

* Method: email survey, telephone interview, face-to-face interview, group meeting?
* Use a pre-defined elicitation program? http://www.expertsinuncertainty.net/Software/tabid/4149/Default.aspx
* Experts Identified:
  + Criteria – use snowball method question? Ask: Who would you go to for expert judgments on salamander ecology for these three species? Why?
  + Years of direct research on salamanders
  + Number of publications involving salamanders
  + Area of expertise
    - General salamander ecology (more than x publications?)
    - Plethedontide specialist (more than x publications?)
    - Desmognathus expert (more than x publications?)
    - Gyrinophilus expert (more than x publications?)
    - Eurycea expertise (more than x publications?)
    - Landscape effects on salamanders (more than x publications?)
    - Predation-fish effects on salamanders (more than x publications?)
* Experts will draw on their own expertise, scientific publications and management agency reports (we created a list of relevant documents and provided to experts; Table 1).

*Analysis*

* Comparisons of means and confidence across experts
* Weighted averages (various methods for combining experts?)
* Use to make simple salamander only-predictions (which uncertainties matter most?)

**Results**

* Number of experts
* Comparisons across experts (what was consistent and what wasn’t)
* Weighted averages across experts
* Which uncertainties influenced occupancy predictions the most?
* New hypothesis/insights from experts

**Discussion**
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Appendix A. List of experts requested to take this survey.

[NEARMI opinions]

enter 1 = yes considered expert for this study

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| last | first | affiliation | Use? (1= yes,  (0 = no) | gen\_eco | landuse | riparian | temp | fish | flow | occ | abun |
| Adams | Dean |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Adams | Mike | USGS |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Apodoca | JJ |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Baily | Larissa | ColoradoState |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Barrett | Kyle | Clemson | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Beachy | Chris |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Bonett | Ron |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Bruce | Dick |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Calhoun | Aram |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Camp | Carola |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Cecala | Kristen | Sewanee |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| David | Robert |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Earl | Julia |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Fields | Will | USGS |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Gorman | Tom |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Graham | Sean |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Grant | Evan | USGS | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Greenwald | Katie |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Green | Linda |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Harper | Elizabeth |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Highton | Dick |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Hill | Pierson |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Hocking | Dan | USGS | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Homyack | Jessica |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Houck | Lynne |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Hunter | Malcom |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Jaeger | Bob |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Kozak | Ken |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Kroll | AJ |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Lips | Karen | UMaryland |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Lowe | Winsor |  | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Maerz | John | UGA |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Mendelson | Joe |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Milanovich | Joe |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Miller | David | PennState |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Muths | Erin | USGS |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| O’Connell | Katie |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Patrick | David |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Pauley | Tom |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Peterman | Bill |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Pierson | Todd |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Price | Steven |  | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Rissler | Leslie |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Scott | David |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Steen | David | Auburn |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Stuart | X |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Sutton | Bill |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Tilley | Stephen |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Titus | Valorie |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Trauth | Stan |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Wake | David |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Walls | Susan |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Welsh | Hartwell |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |