An Automated Approach to Site Selection for Restoration in Fragmented Landscapes

2006 SIAC Student Paper Competition

Robert Roth | reroth@wisc.edu

THE UNIVERSITY *of* WISCONSIN MADISON

The Problem

- The Ecological Root:

* ***Habitat fragmentation*** – the process of dividing a discrete, homogenous habitat into smaller, isolated patches

* ***Interior Area*** – lands far enough within a patch to eliminate the edge effects of increased predation and parasitism (200m from edge)

## - It is the aim of a restoration project to decrease habitat fragmentation and increase interior area.

The Problem

The Problem

The Problem

The Problem

- The problem becomes <u>where</u> to restore in
  order to get the an optimal improvement
  of fragmentation and interior area

*complicated further by context specific requirements

- The AutoPASS method:

* *Auto*mated *P*atch *A*nalysis for *S*ite *S*election

* AutoPASS integrates domain knowledge into an
  objective, geometric analysis of the spatial
  characteristics of patches to prioritize the
  importance of selecting particular sites for
  restoration

The AutoPASS method

Compactness as a foundation

- To reduce fragmentation, the shape of the patch must be reduced in complexity

* The idea is that we want to reduce the perimeter where edge effects occur, while increasing the interior area for habitation.

- To do so, shape must be quantified

* **Compactness Ratio** – a ratio of the area of a shape to its perimeter

$$C = \frac{\sqrt{Area}}{.282 * Perimeter}$$

Where:
0 = a line
1 = a circle

The AutoPASS method

Compactness as a foundation

- However, the compactness ratio alone is not enough

Problem #1.
> *The compactness ratio is solely a summary statistic, and will only show if a change is for better or worse (never where to actually make the change)

> - Leads us to an impractical and time-consuming "trial and error" approach to selecting sites

Problem #2
> *There is no way to integrate domain knowledge into the shape analysis

The AutoPASS method

Shape prioritization using convolution

- To analyze shape locally, we developed a convolution strategy to produce a shape prioritization grid

* The patch boundaries are first rasterized and the pixels codified as follows:

0 = pixels not within the patch
1 = pixels within the patch

* A 3x3 kernel is then convoluted throughout the binary grid with the sum of the nearest neighbors placed in the center pixel

The AutoPASS method

Shape prioritization using convolution

## - There is a direct relationship of the focal sum to the compactness ratio

* Solution to problem #1

EX1. The addition of the center pixel adds two sides of perimeter by only adding one pixel of area

EX2. The addition of the center pixel adds one pixel of area, but does not add any perimeter

EX3. The addition of the center actually removes four sides of perimeter while still adding one pixel of area

The AutoPASS method

Shape prioritization using convolution

- Problem of ambiguous focal sums

* Reason a 3x3 window is preferred

EX4. The addition of the center pixel adds one pixel of area, but does not add any perimeter

EX5. The addition of the center pixel adds one pixel of area as well as four new sides of perimeter

The AutoPASS method

Shape prioritization using convolution

## - Need to have a critical value that ensures an improvement in compactness

* Focal sums of 7 or more guarantee this

* Because of such a high value, the method is iterative, allowing recommended pixels to aggregate

EX6. The addition of the center pixel removes two sides of perimeter by only adding one pixel of area

EX7. The addition of the center pixel removes two sides of perimeter by only adding one pixel of area

EX8. The addition of the center actually removes four sides of perimeter while still adding one pixel of area

The AutoPASS method

Integration of domain knowledge

- Using a raster calculator, the shape prioritization grid can then be adjusted based on quantified domain knowledge

* Solution to problem #2

* *Multiplicative Criteria* – non-shape attributes that increase the importance of selecting the site for restoration

* *Exclusionary Criteria* – non-shape attributes that decrease the importance of selecting the site for restoration

The AutoPASS method

**Integration of domain knowledge**

- The final step is to select the appropriate critical value based on the multiplicative values used

- Continue iterations to allow for pixel aggregation until:

1. The desired amount of area to be restored is reached

2. There are no longer any pixels above the critical value threshold

The Case Study

The Baraboo Hills, Wisconsin

Study Area

Sauk County

The Case Study

- Why is this natural area so important?

* One of oldest rock formations in North America

* Largest remaining forest block in Southern Wisconsin

* Home to 1,800 species of flora and fauna, many of which are not found elsewhere in the Midwest

* Rapidly deforested in the first half of the century

The Case Study

Background

- This is where the Nature Conservancy comes into the picture:

* Since the 1960s, the Conservancy has acquired 7,841 acres of land in the hills

* Early years spent slowing the deforestation, but now the focus has turned towards active reforestation in the area

The Case Study

Implementation

Rasterized Forest Distribution

1 mile

Forest Distribution

The Case Study

Implementation

Convolution of Forest

1 mile

Forest Distribution

Low Index Value

High Index Value

The Case Study

Implementation

The Cast Study

- Characteristics that exclude lands for reforestation:

1. Forest Seed Size
   * less than 160 acres

2. Distance from major roads and power lines
   * within 50 meters

3. Distance from houses and developed areas
   * within 50 meters

4. Currently forested

The Case Study

Implementation

The Case Study

- Characteristics that improve lands for reforestation:

1. Proximity to High Diversity Habitat
   * within 200 meters
   * 1.5 = High Diversity Habitat

2. Forest Seed Suitability
   * 0 = poor
   * 1 = fair
   * 1.25 = good
   * 1.5 = very good

The Case Study

**Implementation**

Multiplicative Areas

1 mile

1.00 - 1.25
1.25 - 1.5
1.5+

The Case Study

Implementation

Prioritization Index

1 mile

Low Index Value

High Index Value

The Case Study

Implementation

- Determining the Critical Value and # of Iterations:

* Stuck with the critical value of '7' to guarantee a positive improvement of the compactness ratio

* The Nature Conservancy has budgeted for 800 acres in the next ten years.

* Because nine iterations yielded under the 800 budget, we ran ten full iterations, giving us 950 pixels, each of which are equally eligible for reforestation

- Do not think of the ten iterations as ten separate years

* The Nature Conservancy can divide the final 950 acres into smaller, manageable projects as they see fit

The Case Study

Implementation

Iteration #1

N

1 mile

Forest Distribution
Added Forest

The Case Study

Implementation

The Case Study

Implementation

Iteration #3

N

1 mile

Forest Distribution
Added Forest

The Case Study

Implementation

Iteration #4

N

1 mile

Forest Distribution

Added Forest

The Case Study

Implementation

The Case Study

Implementation

The Case Study

**Implementation**

The Case Study

Implementation

The Case Study

Implementation

Iteration #9

N
1 mile

Forest Distribution
Added Forest

The Case Study

Implementation

Iteration #10

N

1 mile

Forest Distribution
Added Forest

The Case Study

1) Change in Fragmentation

- Overall Changes

1. Original Forest: 93,951,797m²
2. Updated Forest: 97,796,310m²

* a difference of 3,844,513m² (a 4% increase)

- Decrease of Fragmentation

1. Original Compactness Value: 0.08989
2. Updated Compactness Value: 0.11269

* a 25% increase

The Case Study

2) Change in Interior Area

- Overall Changes

1. Original Forest: 93,951,797m²
2. Updated Forest: 97,796,310m²

* a difference of 3,844,513m² (a 4% increase)

- Increase of Interior Area

1. Original Interior Forest: 45,271,414m² (48%)
2. Updated Interior Forest: 54,284,087m² (56%)

* a difference of 9,012,673m² (an 8% increase)

The Case Study

## 3) Economic Standpoint

- Because our addition of 3.8km² of total habitat yields
  a return of 9.0km² of interior habitat, we get a
  235% return on our restoration investment!

- Creates a savings of 57 cents on the dollar

The Case Study

Results

The Case Study

Results

Updated Interior Forest

1 mile

Updated Interior Forest

The Case Study

Results

Closing Remarks

- The AutoPASS method provides an optimal way to select sites for restoration based on shape. The resulting prioritization grid is a tool to help select sites, but should not be used blindly in resource allocation without ground evaluation.

- The method also allows the integration of domain specific knowledge. However, quantifying such knowledge is in many cases subjective and should be left to experts in the discipline.

- The choice of critical value is pivotal in the analysis. As we suggested, the value should be at least '7' to ensure improvement of shape in areas where there are no multiplicative criteria.

- The potential for creating more interior habitat per unit total area restored highlights an important economic advantage of AutoPASS analysis. The tool facilitates more appropriate allocation of restoration funding, providing literally "more bang for the buck".

Questions?

Acknowledgments: Professors A-Xing Zhu and Mark Harrower and students Eric Holbus, Jesse Papez, and Jeremy Quan

Thank you for your time,
~ Rob