An ecoregional approach to protected area monitoring using satellite remote sensing in British Columbia

Evan Muise1,✉, Nicholas Coops1, Txomin Hermosilla2, and Stephen Ban3

**Abstract:** Protected areas conservation is an effective means of conserving biodiversity and valuable ecosystem services. Currently, many nations and international governments use proportional area protected as a critical metric for assessing progress towards biodiversity conservation. However, these metrics do not assess the effectiveness of protected area networks, nor do they assess how representative PAs are at protecting the ecosystems they aim to protect. Within forest environments, forest structure can be a key indicator of biodiversity. To face these challenges, we examined the protected area network of British Columbia using satellite remote sensing data within British Columbia’s biogeoclimatic ecosystem classification (BEC) system. First, we examined BEC ecosystem and land cover class bias in protected areas by elevation, and harvesting and fire disturbance regimes by latitude. We then examined forest structural attributes in ecosystem subzones, comparing them using the student’s t-test by taking an equal sample of unharvested pixels in each subzone in protected and unprotected areas. We found that forest structural attributes are most often significantly different in protected and unprotected areas (426/496 significant at P < 0.01). We then examined a vector diagram of three structural attributes to determine the subzones with the most different structures in protected and unprotected areas. The results from this analysis will allow parks management to consider forest structure when examining new locations for protected areas in British Columbia, within the provincial ecosystem classification context.

**Keywords:** Protected Areas, Remote Sensing, Forest Structure, Disturbances, Land Cover, Ecological Classifications

1 Department of Forest Resource Management, 2424 Main Mall, University of British Columbia, Vancouver, British Columbia, V6T 1Z4, Canada  
2 Canadian Forest Service (Pacific Forestry Centre), Natural Resources Canada, 506 West Burnside Road, Victoria, BC V8Z 1M5, Canada  
3 BC Parks, Ministry of Environment and Climate Change Strategy, Victoria, British Columbia, Canada.

✉ Correspondence: [Evan Muise <[evanmuise@gmail.com](mailto:evanmuise@gmail.com)>](mailto:evanmuise@gmail.com)

# 1 Introduction

Protected areas (hereafter PAs) are an integral component of biological conservation, designed to preserve ecosystem services and biodiversity both inside the PAs and in some cases the surrounding regions (Chape et al. 2005, Watson et al. 2014). In recent decades, there has been a push to conserve varying portions of the terrestrial area of the globe, with the goals increasing as time has gone on (CBD 2004, 2010). In the 2010’s, the Aichi biodiversity target sought to protect 17% of the entire globe (CBD 2010). Nationwide, the Canadian government has set the goal of protecting 25% of Canada’s terrestrial area by 2025 (ECCC 2021). While increasing proportional ecosystem protection does in turn increase conservation, it does not guarantee that the protected ecosystems are representative of the entire ecosystem, or guarantee that all biodiversity will be conserved.

Many conservation goals, both global and regional, are commonly based on the proportion of area protected due in part to its ease of use and calculation (Chape et al. 2005, CBD 2010). However, while the area protected is a simple metric to report on, it is not always the most effective metric, as it does not convey how effective a given PA is for protecting the inherent ecosystem services or biodiversity in the area (Chape et al. 2005). In fact, many studies do not consider areal percentages to be an effective metric for indicating biodiversity protection (Butchart et al. 2015); the area metric heavily underestimates the global protected area required to adequately protect biodiversity, which research indicates is up to 50% of each ecoregion (Butchart et al. 2015, Dinerstein et al. 2017).

In response to issues associated with simply using protected area size as a metric for conservation, a number of other methodologies have been developed to evaluate the effectiveness of PAs (Parrish et al. 2003, Gaston et al. 2006, 2008, Hansen and Phillips 2018, Bolton et al. 2019). A commonly concept for PA effectiveness is e ecological integrity, defined by Parks Canada as an ecosystem having the expected “living and non-living pieces for the region,” and that ecological processes should occur in the PA at the expected frequency and intensity for the region (Parks Canada 2019). Subsequently, many potential ecological integrity indicator variables have been examined to capture these pieces and processes (Hansen and Phillips 2018). These indicators can then be interpreted manually or automatically, most often through examining temporal trends within the PAs or by comparing the indicators to areas in known healthy reference ecosystems (Woodley 1993).

Remote sensing technologies offer a key approach to deriving and monitoring indicators to assess PA effectiveness for monitoring ecological integrity (Parmenter et al. 2003, Olthof et al. 2006, Nagendra 2008, Fraser et al. 2009, Soverel et al. 2010, Burkhard et al. 2012, Pereira et al. 2013, Bolton et al. 2019) with demonstrated capacity to detect and monitor the pieces and processes found within PAs (Turner et al. 2003, Nagendra et al. 2013). Pieces, or components, of the environment, such as forested area, wetland area, rock and rubble, can be measured from space at broad spatial extents and temporal scales. While it can be difficult to directly monitor biodiversity, an integral “piece” of ecological integrity, using satellite remote sensing (Nagendra 2001, Turner et al. 2003, Gillespie et al. 2008), a number of methods have been developed to indirectly measure biodiversity, namely: canopy species mapping (Nagendra 2001), habitat classification (McDermid et al. 2005, Lucas et al. 2011), examining spectral information (and indices such as NDVI) (Feeley et al. 2005, Gillespie 2005, Nagendra et al. 2010), spectral heterogeneity (Rocchini et al. 2010), ecosystem structure (Cohen and Goward 2004, Goetz et al. 2007, Soverel et al. 2010, Pôças et al. 2011), and function (Skidmore et al. 2021). Processes, such as natural and anthropogenic disturbance regimes, including flooding, fires, harvesting, and insect outbreaks, are frequently monitored from satellite imagery (Kerr and Ostrovsky 2003, Alsdorf et al. 2007, Hermosilla et al. 2015b, Bolton et al. 2019), with biogeochemical cycles being observed throiugh measures of carbon sinks and sources (Myneni et al. 2001), vegetation productivity (Running et al. 2004), and vegetation dynamics (Zhang et al. 2003). While not a panacea for protected area monitoring, remote sensing does offer an important suite of tools for monitoring protected area networks (Nagendra 2001, Nagendra et al. 2013).

Remote sensing also offers a cost-effective method for deriving forest structure across large extents through the use of light detection and ranging (LiDAR). When combined with satellite optical remote sensing, LiDAR data can be imputed across large regions to generate wall-to-wall coverage of forest structural attributes (Wulder et al. 2012b). Diversity in vegetation structure measurements is a strong indicator of biodiversity, providing habitat, influencing food quality, and mediating microclimates (Gao et al. 2014, Guo et al. 2017). The natural variation in vertical and horizontal forest structure has been explored using LiDAR, as well as SAR (synthetic aperture radar) data, however, comparisons between protected and unprotected areas are less frequently drawn using these methods (Nagendra et al. 2013).

In recent years, many studies monitoring ecological integrity or related indicators using remotely sensed data are heavily relying on free and open-source data (Fraser et al. 2009, Soverel et al. 2010, Pôças et al. 2011, Bolton et al. 2019, Skidmore et al. 2021). By leveraging this cost-free data, conservation scientists are able to conduct studies across an entire jurisdiction’s PA network and examine temporal changes in protected areas (Turner et al. 2015, Buchanan et al. 2018). These changes can then be compared to unprotected areas, allowing for researchers and park managers to gauge the effectiveness of a given PA or the entire PA network (Soverel et al. 2010, Turner et al. 2015, Bolton et al. 2019). This methodological framework offers an improvement over using ecoregional (or global) area based approaches, in that it provides a better understanding of the efficacy of protected areas.

As Canada progresses towards the national goal of 25% of terrestrial area protected by 2025, there is a growing need to better understand how PAs compare to unprotected areas with respect to location, ecological classifications, elevations, productivity, and structure. This adds increasing importance for considering protected area conservation goals beyond just proportional coverage. Also relevant to consider, are the biases in PA placement, which have frequently been located in cheaper, low productivity regions both globally (Joppa and Pfaff 2009, Venter et al. 2014, Venter et al. 2018) and regionally, as is the case in British Columbia, Canada (Hamann et al. 2005, Environmental Reporting BC 2016, Wang et al. 2020). By comparing protected and unprotected areas in the province, differences can be shown across varying gradients, including latitude, elevation, and ecological classification.

In this study, we (1) seek to enshrine in peer-reviewed literature the results found of Environmental Reporting BC (2016), in that PAs in British Columbia are biased towards high-elevation, low-productivity regions of the province, and (2) identify gaps in forest structures in PAs in the province. To accomplish this, we examined the bias in PA placement by comparing ecoregional PA coverage and land cover classes by elevation, and disturbances by latitude across protected and unprotected areas in British Columbia. Following this, we calculated the zonal mean of forest structural attributes for each BEC zone in the province in order to determine the differences between PAs and unprotected areas. The results will allow parks management to better consider forest structure when planning PA acquisitions.

## 1.1 Dot Points

* Leverage open data to examine ecological integrity in BC PAs
* Compare these to nPAs (non-protected areas) at multiple scales, using t-test
  + BEC Zone scale for land cover and distrubance
    - Note that these have been previously explored
  + SUbzones for structural attributes
    - to my knowledge not explored yet
* results will
  + inform parks management on which bec zones accurately represent their environments
  + allow parks management to see what types of forest structures are missing from the PA network
  + provide novel information on the status of protected area forest structural attributes

# 2 Methods

## 2.1 Study Area

The province of British Columbia, Canada has an area of 94.4 million hectares - approximate 64% of which is forested (BC Ministry of Forests, 2003), and is home to a wide variety of biomes and ecosystems. This diversity of ecosystems are in part due to the its large size, as well as variations in topography and climate. The ecosystems of BC can be subdivided into zones that make up the province’s Biogeoclimatic Ecosystem Classification (BEC) system. At it’s broadest level, there are 16 zone classifications which are delineated based on macroclimate, climax vegetation species, and soil (Pojar et al. 1987). These classifications delineate the ecosystems of BC by examining relationships between form (vegetation, site), climate, and time (MacKinnon et al. 1992). Zones, the largest generalization, are further broken down into subzones, variants, and phases based on local microclimate, precipitation, and topography (Pojar et al. 1987, Meidinger and Pojar 1991). BEC zones vary in size, as well as number of subzones (Table 2.1).

Table 2.1: Number of subzones, total area, and percent protected by BEC Zone

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Zone | Zone Name | # of Subzones | Total Area (ha) | Percent Protected |
| BAFA | Boreal Altai Fescue Alpine | 2 | 6286778.8 | 30.1% |
| BG | Bunchgrass | 2 | 257072.1 | 11.8% |
| BWBS | Boreal White and Black Spruce | 5 | 16404143.0 | 8.6% |
| CDF | Coastal Douglas-fir | 1 | 251232.2 | 4.8% |
| CMA | Coastal Mountain-heather Alpine | 3 | 3574039.1 | 17.9% |
| CWH | Coastal Western Hemlock | 10 | 10795067.4 | 19.5% |
| ESSF | Engelmann Spruce – Subalpine Fir | 43 | 17465113.0 | 17.8% |
| ICH | Interior Cedar – Hemlock | 12 | 5538842.2 | 10.2% |
| IDF | Interior Douglas-fir | 12 | 4488085.9 | 5.9% |
| IMA | Interior Mountain-heather Alpine | 2 | 1257949.1 | 29.2% |
| MH | Mountain Hemlock | 6 | 4059301.2 | 19.8% |
| MS | Montane Spruce | 8 | 2863394.3 | 9.4% |
| PP | Ponderosa Pine | 1 | 294985.3 | 7.1% |
| SBPS | Sub-Boreal Pine – Spruce | 4 | 2265365.8 | 9.5% |
| SBS | Sub-Boreal Spruce | 11 | 10337497.4 | 6.7% |
| SWB | Spruce – Willow – Birch | 6 | 8655855.9 | 23.3% |

The protected area system in British Columbia is designed to serve as areas available for ecological conservation as well as human recreation (BC Parks 2012). The system consists of a network of PAs and PA complexes (multiple nearby PAs which share the same conservation goals), with large variations in size, ranging from 0.016 to 987899 ha (Figure 2.1). Both the British Columbian (BC Parks 2012) and Canada-wide protected areas mandates (Government of Canada, 2019) commit to conserving ecological integrity across the PA network, using the Canadian definition outlined in the introduction. Protected areas in the British Columbian network are frequently placed in mountainous, high elevation areas, leading to underrepresentation in high productivity ecosystems (Environmental Reporting BC 2016).




Figure 2.1: Map of terrestrial British Columbia including BEC zones and the location of PAs used in this study.

## 2.2 Data

### 2.2.1 Biogeoclimatic Ecosystem Classification

Boundaries for BEC zones and subzones were acquired using the **bcmaps** R package (Teucher et al. 2021). Two BEC subzones were entirely subsumed by PAs (Boreal White and Black Spruce - Very Wet Cool and Spruce – Willow – Birch - Very Wet Cool Shrub), whereas the Sub-Boreal Pine – Spruce - Moist Cool subzone has no PAs associated with it. Due to this, these subzones were excluded from hypothesis testing, but were included in zonal aggregations. In this paper, zones are used to examine categorical data (land cover and disturbance), while forest structure is compared at the subzone level between PAs and their unprotected counterparts in British Columbia.

### 2.2.2 Protected Areas

Boundaries for all parks and protected areas in British Columbia were obtained from the Canadian Protected and Conserved Areas Database (available from <https://cws-scf.ca/CPCAD-BDCAPC_Dec2020.gdb.zip>). This database contains spatial coverage of all PAs in Canada as of December 2020, and includes the IUCN classification for each PA. Protected areas were selected to be suitable for analysis following similar criteria to Bolton et al. (2019). Only parks which belonged to IUCN classes Ia, Ib, II, and IV were selected, as these categories are considered strictly protected. Protected areas smaller than 100ha in size were also excluded from the analysis. After selection, there were 745 suitable parks managed under various jurisdictions (provincial, federal, NGOs), which take up 15.4% of the total terrestrial area of British Columbia (Environmental Reporting BC 2016).

### 2.2.3 Digital Elevation Model

The Advanced Spaceborne Thermal Emission and Reflection Radiometer (ASTER) digital elevation model (GDEM V2) was used to examine biases in protected area land cover and ecological classification by elevation. This DEM was created by using stereo-paired images from the ASTER instrument aboard the TERRA satellite, and is available globally at a 30m resolution (Tachikawa et al. 2011).

### 2.2.4 Satellite Imagery

The opening of the Landsat archive in 2008 (Wulder et al. 2012a) has played a significant role in the use of satellite imagery in conservation monitoring (Nagendra 2008, Turner et al. 2015). The availability of the satellite archive since 1972 allows for assessment of temporal trends in satellite derived indicator variables (Nagendra et al. 2013, Hansen and Phillips 2018, Bolton et al. 2019), while the global coverage of many satellite data sources allows for comparisons between similar and differing ecosystems (Nagendra 2008, Wulder et al. 2012a).

With multiple images available for a given region for all portions of the year, a recent development in satellite remote sensing has been to create best-available-pixel (BAP) composites. These composites include the best single observation at each pixel for the catalog of available scenes, within certain temporal bounds such as seasons (White et al. 2014). This allows for the examination of trends on a yearly basis with high quality data, removing most missing data such as clouds, shadows, and sensor errors (White et al. 2014). This method does however have drawbacks: the revisit time of many sensors (e.g. Landsat’s 16 day revisit time) makes it difficult to compare a region intra-annually.

While Landsat provides an excellent dataset for picturing the environment in 2D (e.g. land cover, disturbances), airborne laser scanning allow for very detailed and accurate depictions of the 3D forest structure (Wulder et al. 2012b). One common problem associated with these airborne laser scanning datasets is their often limited spatial and temporal coverages. By combining airborne laser scanning with BAPs generated from the Landsat archive, these structural datasets can be imputed across time and space, providing coverage far beyond the initial spatial coverage of the LiDAR acquisitions (Matasci et al. 2018, Coops et al. 2021). The Landsat archive can now provide researchers and end-users with high quality, value-added datasets, such as land cover (Hermosilla et al. 2018), forest disturbances (Hermosilla et al. 2015b), and 3D forest structure (Matasci et al. 2018).

#### 2.2.4.1 Land Cover

Land cover information for Canada from 1984-2019 was produced following Hermosilla et al. (2018) using the Virtual Land Cover Engine framework. It includes eleven land cover classes, all of which are present in British Columbia. To accomplish this, an annual BAP surface reflectance image composite was created from Landsat imagery (Hermosilla et al. 2016), taking into consideration the annual forest changes generated while using the Composite 2 Change approach (Hermosilla et al. 2016). To classify the BAP composite, a random forest classifier was used, and a Hidden Markov Model was applied to ensure logical land cover transitions (Hermosilla et al. 2018).

#### 2.2.4.2 Forest Disturbances

Forest disturbance metrics were generated by Hermosilla et al. (2016) for the period of 1985-2019 using the BAP composites generated by Hermosilla et al. (2016). Forest disturbances were delineated by examining changes in the normalized burn ratio through time (White et al. 2014, Hermosilla et al. 2016). Hermosilla et al. (2016) used breakpoint (temporal) and contextual (spatial) analysis to ensure that changes were detected in the correct year (Hermosilla et al. 2015b). These changes were then classified into a change type (fire, harvesting, road, and non-stand replacing) via the object based image analysis approach described in Hermosilla et al. (2015b).

#### 2.2.4.3 Forest Structural Attributes

Forest structure metrics (lorey’s height, total aboveground biomass, elevation covariance, and canopy cover) were imputed across the forested area of British Columbia following methods utilized in Matasci et al. (2018), on an independant, per year basis. This process utilizes annual Landsat proxy surface reflectance composites across Canada produced following Hermosilla et al. (2015a), the forest disturbance layers produced via Hermosilla et al. (2015b), and LiDAR samples collected across the country (Matasci et al. 2018). Ancillary data such as topography was also used to fit the models. The forest structure metrics were imputed using a k-NN approach, and generated six LiDAR metrics and four forest inventory attributes in total. Accuracy for the forest structural attributes used in this study (lorey’s height, total aboveground biomass, elevation covariance, and canopy cover) were 0.666, 0.699, 0.125, and 0.642, respectively (Matasci et al. 2018).

## 2.3 Analysis

Our approach was as follows: first, we examined ecozonal and land cover proportions in British Columbia throughout the province, as well as on a elevation gradient between protected and unprotected areas. Secondly, we examined disturbance rates on a latitudinal gradient across the province. Finally, we examined forest structural attributes at a finer ecosystem classification level, statistically comparing between protected and unprotected areas, and compare forest structural attribute means in ecosystem subzones to determine which structures are missing from the PA network in British Columbia

### 2.3.1 Pre-processing

Forest cover classes (deciduous, broadleaf, mixed-wood, and wetland-treed) were used to generate land cover masks to focus the analysis on forested land cover pixels. Wetland classes (wetland, and wetland-treed) were also used to generate a wetland mask. Pixels harvested within the last 35 years were removed from forest structural attribute rasters in both protected and unprotected areas, in order to compare non-anthropogenically disturbed areas. BEC subzones and PA boundaries were intersected in order to create protected and unprotected BEC subzone masks for ease of processing. Each BEC subzone mask had tabular data created for analysis, in order to aggregate land cover, BEC zones, disturbances, by elevation and latitude.

BEC zones and land cover classifications were aggregated to protected and unprotected areas in order to determine the proportion of each zone under the protected classifications. This was further examined along an elevational gradient, at bin sizes of 50m. Forest disturbances were aggregated along a latitudinal gradient with bin sizes of 1000 pixels. The mean values for protected and unprotected areas forest structural attributes were calculated, in order to examine the differences in their distribution and determine which structures and zones differ between protected and unprotected areas.

### 2.3.2 Statistical Analysis

An equal sample of pixels (equal to the total number of pixels in protected or unprotected areas, whichever was lower) was taken from both protected and unprotected areas for each BEC subzone. For each forest structure variable and BEC subzone pair, a two-tailed T-Test was conducted, comparing protected and unprotected samples, and the Bonferroni correction was applied.

#### 2.3.2.1 Dot Points

* Mosaiced NTEMS data, with edges of UTM zones removed
* Forest masks generated from land cover
* Masked out non-forest pixels from forest structure data using forest masks
* BEC zones and PAs intersected to determine proportions of each bec zone protected
* Intersect turned into masks by BEC subzone and PA status
* Each pixel turned into csv for bec subzone and PA status
  + Includes: elevation, forest structure (canopy cover, lorey’s height, total biomass, canopy structure)  
    land cover, change attribution, change year, latitude, protected status, subzone, and year of data
* mean structure for each variable and bec zone and PA status generated
* equal random sample of forested pixels generated for PA and nPA for forest structure attributes
  + 2 sided t-tests ran; bonferroni correction applied
* Land cover aggregated by protected status and elevation
* BEC coverage aggregated by protected status and elevation
* disturbances aggregated by protected status and LATITUDE

# 3 Results




Figure 3.1: Diagram of proportion of the area of each BEC zone protected. Red dotted line indicates 2020 global protected area coverage goal, Blue dotted line indicates 2025 Canadian protected area coverage goal, and the green dotted line indicates the overall proportion of protected areas in British Columbia.

British Columbia’s ecosystems are protected at varying rates in the province (Figure 3.1). Of the 16 ecosystem zones present in British Columbia, seven are protected at rates above the Aichi biodiversity target (10%). Only two zones (Boreal Altai Fescue Alpine and Interior Mountain-heather Alpine) are currently protected at rates above the Canadian 2025 protection targets (25%). Zones with Douglas-fir as a primary component (Coastal Douglas-fir and Interior Douglas-fir) are the least proportionally represented zones in British Columbia, with 4.9% and 6.4% protected, respectively (Figure 3.1).




Figure 3.2: Proportion of BEC zone by elevation for both protected areas (left), and unprotected areas (centre). The rightmost figure represents the proportion of terrestrial area that is protected at each elevation.

As elevation increases in British Columbia, more and more terrestrial area is protected until ~4000m, where all terrestrial area in BC becomes protected (Figure 3.2). When comparing between protected and unprotected areas, some ecosystem zones are protected at differing rates. Zones commonly found at high elevations, such as the Boreal Altai Fesuce Alpine, are more common in protected areas than unprotected areas. The Coastal Western-hemlock ecosystem takes up more of the protected areas at low elevations, while Boreal White and Black Spruce takes up this area in unprotected areas. Other ecosystems are found at similar rates in both protected and unprotected areas (Figure 3.2).




Figure 3.3: Diagram of proportion of the area of each land cover class protected. Red dotted line indicates 2020 global protected area coverage goal, Blue dotted line indicates 2010 ecoregional protected area coverage goal, and the green dotted line indicates the overall proportion of protected areas in British Columbia.

Land cover classes also vary in their proportion of the landscape protected (Figure 3.3). Snow/ice, exposed/barren land, and rock/rubble have higher than average proportions of their terrestrial area protected. Mixedwood and broadleaf land cover classes are underrepresented in BC’s PA network. All other classes are found at rates similar to the overall proportion of the province protected (Figure 3.3).




Figure 3.4: Proportion of each land cover class by elevation for both protected areas (left), and unprotected areas (centre). The rightmost figure represents the proportion of terrestrial area that is protected at each elevation.

Similar to BEC zones (Figure 3.2, land cover classes also vary with elevation (Figure 3.4. Snow and ice make up a large proportion of PAs at high altitudes. The only water present in high elevations is found in lakes in protected areas, mostly above 3500m. At lower elevations in unprotected areas, mixedwood forest is a more common forest type than in PAs. Wetland classes are found less frequently in the 400-900m range in unprotected areas than in PAs.




Figure 3.5: Proportion of area disturbed by latitude from 1984 to 2019 in protected areas (left), and unprotected areas (centre). The rightmost figure represents the proportion of terrestrial area that is protected at each latitude.

Disturbance regimes in British Columbia since 1984 in protected and unportected areas are shown in Figure 3.5. Fire regimes are similar between both protected and unprotected strata at all latitudes. Harvesting is not common in PAs, while it is frequently found in unprotected areas. Within unprotected areas, harvesting is more common at lower latitudes.




Figure 3.6: Scatterplots of mean BEC subzone forest structure attributes in protected (x-axis), and unprotected (y-axis) areas of British Columbia. Dotted line indicates 1:1 line.

Figure 3.6 shows raincloud plots of various forest structural attributes. These plots show the distribution and boxplots of BEC subzone means by protected areas status for of aboveground biomass, canopy cover, canopy height, and canopy structure in protected and unprotected BEC subzones in British Columbia.




Figure 3.7: 3d vector diagram of BEC zones forest structure attributes across British Columiba. Dots indicate the protected area means, and arrowheads indicate unprotected area means.

Figure 3.7 displays a 3-dimensional vector diagram of the means of three forest structure attributes (forest height, vertical complexity, and canopy cover) from PAs (dots) to unprotected areas (arrowheads). Coastal Douglas-fir, interior mountain-heather alpine, and ponderosa pine all have large vectors, indicating a large difference in forest structural means in these subzones. Notably, in these three zones, forest heights are smaller in unprotected areas than in protected areas. Coastal western hemlock, bunchgrass, and boreal white and black spruce have medium sized vectors, showing more similarity between PAs and unprotected areas. All others have small vectors, indicating that their mean forest structural attributes are very similar between PAs and unprotected areas.




Figure 3.8: Boxplot of proportion of ecosystem subzone which have significant p-values from a two-tailed t-test with the Bonferroni correction (n = 496) applied at a significance level of 0.05.

Figure 3.8 shows the subzonal proportional significance (P < 0.01) by zone of the 496 t-tests by forest structural variable. Higher percentages indicate that a zone has more dissimilar subzones than lower percentages. At least half of all subzones in each zone are significantly different (exception being ponderosa pine, which has one subzone which is not significantly different in canopy structure). The median values for canopy height, canopy cover, and aboveground biomass are all 100% significantly different.

# 4 Discussion

*###i think this can be in the discussion as sort of limitations*

* While not all aspects of ecological integrity can be effectively monitored from space, those that can provide powerful insights into the effectiveness of PAs when examined spatially (when compared to unprotected areas), or temporally (Woodley 1993).
* Shown representation of proportions for bec zones is off, and also changes with elevation in PAs and nPA. Forest structure also differ in some cases. large samples sizes….
* Agrees with previous literature (Bolton & Soverel notably) about differences in protected area forests from unprotected areas. Follows latitudinal gradient. Additionally adds the elevation aspect and looks at the proportion of zone protection.
* Contributes to discussion about examining forests in protected and unprotected areas
* Real novel findings is that forest structure attributes vary between protected and unprotected areas.
* CDF is underepresented in PA proportions, AND its forest structure is different from the nPA.
* Future research: temporal, index of forest structure compared to nPA, compare to local envmt (bolton paper) but in forest structure context
* Overall, British Columbia did not meet the Aichi biodiversity target, having protected only 15.4% of the available terrestrial area, rather than 17%.
* Higher average height possibly indicating protection of older forests.
* Land cover classifications follow a similar trend to ecosystem zones, with high elevation (less productive) classes being more prevalent in protected areas
* Rather than using the genetics approach of Wang et al. (2020), we focused on the forest structural attributes that are currently found within the BEC zone framework.
* While elevation can be an important driver for land cover and ecosystem classifications, disturbances generally follow a latitudinal gradient.

# 5 Writing I may use in the future

Insights provided by remote sensing datasets can allow British Columbia to continue to assess the effectiveness of the BEC zones as a strata for PA ecological integrity. Due to the spatial variation in PA locations within BEC zones, it becomes important to consider if the PAs within a given BEC zone actually represent conditions throughout the remainder of the BEC zone, especially considering the tendency of PAs to be placed in lower productivity environments (Environmental Reporting BC 2016).

# 6 Journals

Ecological Applications (<https://www.resurchify.com/impact/details/20287>) - IF 4.248

Ecological Modelling (<https://www.journals.elsevier.com/ecological-modelling>) - IF 2.497

# 7 Acknowledgments

Add packages for both R and Python here.

# References

Alsdorf, D. E., E. Rodriguez, and D. P. Lettenmaier. 2007. Measuring surface water from space. Reviews of Geophysics 45:RG2002.

BC Ministry of Forests,. 2003. British columbia’s forests and their management.

BC Parks. 2012. Ecological Integrity in British Columbia’s Parks and Protected Areas. Page 12.

Bolton, D. K., N. C. Coops, T. Hermosilla, M. A. Wulder, J. C. White, and C. J. Ferster. 2019. Uncovering regional variability in disturbance trends between parks and greater park ecosystems across Canada (1985). Scientific Reports 9:1323.

Buchanan, G. M., A. E. Beresford, M. Hebblewhite, F. J. Escobedo, H. M. D. Klerk, P. F. Donald, P. Escribano, L. P. Koh, J. Martínez-López, N. Pettorelli, A. K. Skidmore, Z. Szantoi, K. Tabor, M. Wegmann, and S. Wich. 2018. Free satellite data key to conservation. Science 361:139–140.

Burkhard, B., F. Kroll, S. Nedkov, and F. Müller. 2012. Mapping ecosystem service supply, demand and budgets. Ecological Indicators 21:17–29.

Butchart, S. H. M., M. Clarke, R. J. Smith, R. E. Sykes, J. P. W. Scharlemann, M. Harfoot, G. M. Buchanan, A. Angulo, A. Balmford, B. Bertzky, T. M. Brooks, K. E. Carpenter, M. T. Comeros-Raynal, J. Cornell, G. F. Ficetola, L. D. C. Fishpool, R. A. Fuller, J. Geldmann, H. Harwell, C. Hilton-Taylor, M. Hoffmann, A. Joolia, L. Joppa, N. Kingston, I. May, A. Milam, B. Polidoro, G. Ralph, N. Richman, C. Rondinini, D. B. Segan, B. Skolnik, M. D. Spalding, S. N. Stuart, A. Symes, J. Taylor, P. Visconti, J. E. M. Watson, L. Wood, and N. D. Burgess. 2015. Shortfalls and Solutions for Meeting National and Global Conservation Area Targets. Conservation Letters 8:329–337.

CBD. 2004. CoP 7 decision VII/30. Strategic plan: future evaluation of progress. Goal 1 promote the conservation of the biological diversity of ecosystems, habitats and biomes; Target 1.1.

CBD. 2010. The strategic plan for biodiversity 2011-2020 and the Aichi biodiversity targests.

Chape, S., J. Harrison, M. Spalding, and I. Lysenko. 2005. Measuring the extent and effectiveness of protected areas as an indicator for meeting global biodiversity targets. Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences 360:443–455.

Cohen, W. B., and S. N. Goward. 2004. Landsat’s role in ecological applications of remote sensing. Bioscience 54:535–545.

Coops, N. C., P. Tompalski, T. R. H. Goodbody, M. Queinnec, J. E. Luther, D. K. Bolton, J. C. White, M. A. Wulder, O. R. van Lier, and T. Hermosilla. 2021. Modelling lidar-derived estimates of forest attributes over space and time: A review of approaches and future trends. Remote Sensing of Environment 260:112477.

Dinerstein, E., D. Olson, A. Joshi, C. Vynne, N. D. Burgess, E. Wikramanayake, N. Hahn, S. Palminteri, P. Hedao, R. Noss, M. Hansen, H. Locke, E. C. Ellis, B. Jones, C. V. Barber, R. Hayes, C. Kormos, V. Martin, E. Crist, W. Sechrest, L. Price, J. E. M. Baillie, D. Weeden, K. Suckling, C. Davis, N. Sizer, R. Moore, D. Thau, T. Birch, P. Potapov, S. Turubanova, A. Tyukavina, N. de Souza, L. Pintea, J. C. Brito, O. A. Llewellyn, A. G. Miller, A. Patzelt, S. A. Ghazanfar, J. Timberlake, H. Klöser, Y. Shennan-Farpón, R. Kindt, J.-P. B. Lillesø, P. van Breugel, L. Graudal, M. Voge, K. F. Al-Shammari, and M. Saleem. 2017. An Ecoregion-Based Approach to Protecting Half the Terrestrial Realm. BioScience 67:534–545.

ECCC. 2021, May 3. Canada Target 1 Challenge.

Environmental Reporting BC. 2016. Protected Lands and Waters in British Columbia. http://www.env.gov.bc.ca/soe/indicators/land/protected-lands-and-waters.html.

Feeley, K. J., T. W. Gillespie, and J. W. Terborgh. 2005. The Utility of Spectral Indices from Landsat ETM+ for Measuring the Structure and Composition of Tropical Dry Forests1. Biotropica 37:508–519.

Fraser, R. H., I. Olthof, and D. Pouliot. 2009. Monitoring land cover change and ecological integrity in Canada’s national parks. Remote Sensing of Environment 113:1397–1409.

Gao, T., M. Hedblom, T. Emilsson, and A. B. Nielsen. 2014. The role of forest stand structure as biodiversity indicator. Forest Ecology and Management 330:82–93.

Gaston, K. J., K. Charman, S. F. Jackson, P. R. Armsworth, A. Bonn, R. A. Briers, C. S. Q. Callaghan, R. Catchpole, J. Hopkins, W. E. Kunin, J. Latham, P. Opdam, R. Stoneman, D. A. Stroud, and R. Tratt. 2006. The ecological effectiveness of protected areas: The United Kingdom. Biological Conservation 132:76–87.

Gaston, K. J., S. F. Jackson, L. Cantú-Salazar, and G. Cruz-Piñón. 2008. The Ecological Performance of Protected Areas. Annual Review of Ecology, Evolution, and Systematics 39:93–113.

Gillespie, T. W. 2005. Predicting Woody-Plant Species Richness in Tropical Dry Forests: A Case Study from South Florida, Usa. Ecological Applications 15:27–37.

Gillespie, T. W., G. M. Foody, D. Rocchini, A. P. Giorgi, and S. Saatchi. 2008. Measuring and modelling biodiversity from space. Progress in Physical Geography: Earth and Environment 32:203–221.

Goetz, S., D. Steinberg, R. Dubayah, and B. Blair. 2007. Laser remote sensing of canopy habitat heterogeneity as a predictor of bird species richness in an eastern temperate forest, USA. Remote Sensing of Environment 108:254–263.

Government of Canada,. 2019, September 4. Canada national park act.

Guo, X., N. C. Coops, P. Tompalski, S. E. Nielsen, C. W. Bater, and J. John Stadt. 2017. Regional mapping of vegetation structure for biodiversity monitoring using airborne lidar data. Ecological Informatics 38:50–61.

Hamann, A., P. Smets, A. D. Yanchuk, and S. N. Aitken. 2005. An ecogeographic framework for in situ conservation of forest trees in british columbia. Canadian Journal of Forest Research 35:2553–2561.

Hansen, A. J., and L. Phillips. 2018. Trends in vital signs for Greater Yellowstone: Application of a Wildland Health Index. Ecosphere 9:e02380.

Hermosilla, T., M. A. Wulder, J. C. White, N. C. Coops, and G. W. Hobart. 2015a. An integrated Landsat time series protocol for change detection and generation of annual gap-free surface reflectance composites. Remote Sensing of Environment 158:220–234.

Hermosilla, T., M. A. Wulder, J. C. White, N. C. Coops, and G. W. Hobart. 2015b. Regional detection, characterization, and attribution of annual forest change from 1984 to 2012 using Landsat-derived time-series metrics. Remote Sensing of Environment 170:121–132.

Hermosilla, T., M. A. Wulder, J. C. White, N. C. Coops, and G. W. Hobart. 2018. Disturbance-Informed Annual Land Cover Classification Maps of Canada’s Forested Ecosystems for a 29-Year Landsat Time Series. Canadian Journal of Remote Sensing 44:67–87.

Hermosilla, T., M. A. Wulder, J. C. White, N. C. Coops, G. W. Hobart, and L. B. Campbell. 2016. Mass data processing of time series Landsat imagery: Pixels to data products for forest monitoring. International Journal of Digital Earth 9:1035–1054.

Joppa, L. N., and A. Pfaff. 2009. High and Far: Biases in the Location of Protected Areas. PLOS ONE 4:e8273.

Kerr, J. T., and M. Ostrovsky. 2003. From space to species: ecological applications for remote sensing. Trends in Ecology & Evolution 18:299–305.

Lucas, R., K. Medcalf, A. Brown, P. Bunting, J. Breyer, D. Clewley, S. Keyworth, and P. Blackmore. 2011. Updating the Phase 1 habitat map of Wales, UK, using satellite sensor data. ISPRS Journal of Photogrammetry and Remote Sensing 66:81–102.

MacKinnon, A., D. Meidinger, and K. Klinka. 1992. Use of the biogeoclimatic ecosystem classification system in British Columbia. The Forestry Chronicle 68:100–120.

Matasci, G., T. Hermosilla, M. A. Wulder, J. C. White, N. C. Coops, G. W. Hobart, D. K. Bolton, P. Tompalski, and C. W. Bater. 2018. Three decades of forest structural dynamics over Canada’s forested ecosystems using Landsat time-series and lidar plots. Remote Sensing of Environment 216:697–714.

McDermid, G. J., S. E. Franklin, and E. F. LeDrew. 2005. Remote sensing for large-area habitat mapping. Progress in Physical Geography: Earth and Environment 29:449–474.

Meidinger, D. V., and J. Pojar, editors. 1991. Ecosystems of British Columbia. Research Branch, Ministry of Forests, Victoria, B.C.

Myneni, R. B., J. Dong, C. J. Tucker, R. K. Kaufmann, P. E. Kauppi, J. Liski, L. Zhou, V. Alexeyev, and M. K. Hughes. 2001. A large carbon sink in the woody biomass of northern forests. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America 98:14784–14789.

Nagendra, H. 2001. Using remote sensing to assess biodiversity. International Journal of Remote Sensing 22:2377–2400.

Nagendra, H. 2008. Do parks work? Impact of protected areas on land cover clearing. Ambio 37:330–337.

Nagendra, H., R. Lucas, J. P. Honrado, R. H. G. Jongman, C. Tarantino, M. Adamo, and P. Mairota. 2013. Remote sensing for conservation monitoring: Assessing protected areas, habitat extent, habitat condition, species diversity, and threats. Ecological Indicators 33:45–59.

Nagendra, H., D. Rocchini, R. Ghate, B. Sharma, and S. Pareeth. 2010. Assessing Plant Diversity in a Dry Tropical Forest: Comparing the Utility of Landsat and Ikonos Satellite Images. Remote Sensing 2:478–496.

Olthof, I., D. Pouliot, R. Fraser, A. Clouston, S. Wang, W. Chen, J. Orazietti, J. Poitevin, D. Mclennan, J. Kerr, and M. Sawada. 2006. Using Satellite Remote Sensing to Assess and Monitor Ecosystem Integrity and Climate Change in Canadas National Parks. 2006 IEEE International Symposium on Geoscience and Remote Sensing. IEEE.

Parks Canada. 2019. Ecological Integrity. https://www.pc.gc.ca/en/nature/science/conservation/ie-ei.

Parmenter, A. W., A. Hansen, R. E. Kennedy, W. Cohen, U. Langner, R. Lawrence, B. Maxwell, A. Gallant, and R. Aspinall. 2003. Land use and land cover change in the Greater Yellowstone Ecosystem: 1975. Ecological Applications 13:687–703.

Parrish, J. D., D. P. Braun, and R. S. Unnasch. 2003. Are We Conserving What We Say We Are? Measuring Ecological Integrity within Protected Areas. BioScience 53:851.

Pereira, H. M., S. Ferrier, M. Walters, G. N. Geller, R. H. G. Jongman, R. J. Scholes, M. W. Bruford, N. Brummitt, S. H. M. Butchart, A. C. Cardoso, N. C. Coops, E. Dulloo, D. P. Faith, J. Freyhof, R. D. Gregory, C. Heip, R. Hoft, G. Hurtt, W. Jetz, D. S. Karp, M. A. McGeoch, D. Obura, Y. Onoda, N. Pettorelli, B. Reyers, R. Sayre, J. P. W. Scharlemann, S. N. Stuart, E. Turak, M. Walpole, and M. Wegmann. 2013. Essential Biodiversity Variables. Science 339:277–278.

Pojar, J., K. Klinka, and D. V. Meidinger. 1987. Biogeoclimatic ecosystem classification in British Columbia. Forest Ecology and Management 22:119–154.

Pôças, I., M. Cunha, and L. S. Pereira. 2011. Remote sensing based indicators of changes in a mountain rural landscape of Northeast Portugal. Applied Geography 31:871–880.

Rocchini, D., N. Balkenhol, G. A. Carter, G. M. Foody, T. W. Gillespie, K. S. He, S. Kark, N. Levin, K. Lucas, M. Luoto, H. Nagendra, J. Oldeland, C. Ricotta, J. Southworth, and M. Neteler. 2010. Remotely sensed spectral heterogeneity as a proxy of species diversity: Recent advances and open challenges. Ecological Informatics 5:318–329.

Running, S. W., R. R. Nemani, F. A. Heinsch, M. S. Zhao, M. Reeves, and H. Hashimoto. 2004. A continuous satellite-derived measure of global terrestrial primary production. Bioscience 54:547–560.

Skidmore, A. K., N. C. Coops, E. Neinavaz, A. Ali, M. E. Schaepman, M. Paganini, W. D. Kissling, P. Vihervaara, R. Darvishzadeh, H. Feilhauer, M. Fernandez, N. Fernández, N. Gorelick, I. Geijzendorffer, U. Heiden, M. Heurich, D. Hobern, S. Holzwarth, F. E. Muller-Karger, R. Van De Kerchove, A. Lausch, P. J. Leitão, M. C. Lock, C. A. Mücher, B. O’Connor, D. Rocchini, W. Turner, J. K. Vis, T. Wang, M. Wegmann, and V. Wingate. 2021. Priority list of biodiversity metrics to observe from space. Nature Ecology & Evolution.

Soverel, N. O., N. C. Coops, J. C. White, and M. A. Wulder. 2010. Characterizing the forest fragmentation of Canada’s national parks. Environmental Monitoring and Assessment 164:481–499.

Tachikawa, T., M. Kaku, A. Iwasaki, D. B. Gesch, M. J. Oimoen, Z. Zhang, J. J. Danielson, T. Krieger, B. Curtis, J. Haase, M. Abrams, and C. Carabajal. 2011. ASTER global digital elevation model version 2 - summary of validation results. Page 27.

Teucher, A., S. Hazlitt, and S. Albers. 2021. Bcmaps: Map layers and spatial utilities for british columbia.

Turner, W., C. Rondinini, N. Pettorelli, B. Mora, A. K. Leidner, Z. Szantoi, G. Buchanan, S. Dech, J. Dwyer, M. Herold, L. P. Koh, P. Leimgruber, H. Taubenboeck, M. Wegmann, M. Wikelski, and C. Woodcock. 2015. Free and open-access satellite data are key to biodiversity conservation. Biological Conservation 182:173–176.

Turner, W., S. Spector, N. Gardiner, M. Fladeland, E. Sterling, and M. Steininger. 2003. Remote sensing for biodiversity science and conservation. Trends in Ecology & Evolution 18:306–314.

Venter, O., R. A. Fuller, D. B. Segan, J. Carwardine, T. Brooks, S. H. M. Butchart, M. Di Marco, T. Iwamura, L. Joseph, D. O’Grady, H. P. Possingham, C. Rondinini, R. J. Smith, M. Venter, and J. E. M. Watson. 2014. Targeting Global Protected Area Expansion for Imperiled Biodiversity. PLoS Biology 12:e1001891.

Venter, O., A. Magrach, N. Outram, C. J. Klein, H. P. Possingham, M. Di Marco, and J. E. M. Watson. 2018. Bias in protected-area location and its effects on long-term aspirations of biodiversity conventions. Conservation Biology: The Journal of the Society for Conservation Biology 32:127–134.

Wang, T., P. Smets, C. Chourmouzis, S. N. Aitken, and D. Kolotelo. 2020. Conservation status of native tree species in British Columbia. Global Ecology and Conservation 24:e01362.

Watson, J. E. M., N. Dudley, D. B. Segan, and M. Hockings. 2014. The performance and potential of protected areas. Nature 515:67–73.

White, Joanne. C., M. A. Wulder, G. W. Hobart, J. E. Luther, T. Hermosilla, P. Griffiths, N. C. Coops, R. J. Hall, P. Hostert, A. Dyk, and L. Guindon. 2014. Pixel-Based Image Compositing for Large-Area Dense Time Series Applications and Science. Canadian Journal of Remote Sensing 40:192–212.

Woodley, S. 1993. Monitoring and Measuring Ecosystem Integrity in Canadian National Parks. Ecological Integrity and the Management of Ecosystems. Taylor & Francis.

Wulder, M. A., J. G. Masek, W. B. Cohen, T. R. Loveland, and C. E. Woodcock. 2012a. Opening the archive: How free data has enabled the science and monitoring promise of Landsat. Remote Sensing of Environment 122:2–10.

Wulder, M. A., J. C. White, R. F. Nelson, E. Næsset, H. O. Ørka, N. C. Coops, T. Hilker, C. W. Bater, and T. Gobakken. 2012b. Lidar sampling for large-area forest characterization: A review. Remote Sensing of Environment 121:196–209.

Zhang, X. Y., M. A. Friedl, C. B. Schaaf, A. H. Strahler, J. C. F. Hodges, F. Gao, B. C. Reed, and A. Huete. 2003. Monitoring vegetation phenology using MODIS. Remote Sensing of Environment 84:471–475.

# (APPENDIX) APPENDIX

# Appendix A – Unused Figures




Figure 7.1: Donut diagram of the BEC proportions in protected areas (interior), and unprotected areas (exterior) in British Columbia.

Figure 7.1 indicates…




Figure 7.2: Donut diagram of the land cover class proportions in protected areas (interior), and unprotected areas (exterior) in British Columbia.

Figure 7.2 indicates…




Figure 7.3: Density diagrams of forest structural attributes in the Coastal Douglas Fir BEC zone. Significance denoted with \*. (SIGNIFICANCE NOT CURRENTLY IMPLEMENTED).

Figure 7.3 indicates…




Figure 7.4: Scatterplots of forest (left) and wetland (right) proportions in protected areas (x-axis) and unprotected areas (y-axis).

Forests and wetlands are found at similar rates in both PAs and unprotected areas in BEC subzones (Figure 7.4). Forests are found at varying rates throughout the BEC zones. Wetlands are often small percentages of the subzones, except in some coastal western hemlock (CWH) subzones, where they make up over a quarter of both protected and unprotected areas. As a notable outlier, the coastal Douglas fir zone has a higher proportion of forest in PAs than in unprotected areas, as well as an above average proportion of wetlands in both PAs and unprotected areas.