

**US Army Corps** of Engineers® Engineer Research and Development Center

Engineering with Nature



## Proceedings from the US Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) and the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA)– National Ocean Service (NOS)

Ecological Habitat Modeling Workshop

Brook Herman, Todd Swannack, Jeffrey King, Paula Whitfield, Jenny Davis, Danielle Szimanski, Duncan Bryant, Joe Gailani, Matt Whitbeck, and Rebecca Golden April 2020

**Environmental Laboratory** 

**The US Army Engineer Research and Development Center (ERDC)** solves the nation's toughest engineering and environmental challenges. ERDC develops innovative solutions in civil and military engineering, geospatial sciences, water resources, and environmental sciences for the Army, the Department of Defense, civilian agencies, and our nation's public good. Find out more at <u>www.erdc.usace.army.mil</u>.

To search for other technical reports published by ERDC, visit the ERDC online library at <u>http://acwc.sdp.sirsi.net/client/default</u>.

## Proceedings from the US Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) and the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA)–National Ocean Service (NOS)

**Ecological Habitat Modeling Workshop** 

Brook Herman, Todd Swannack, and Jeffrey King

Environmental Laboratory US Army Engineer Research and Development Center 3909 Halls Ferry Road Vicksburg, MS 39180

Paula Whitfield and Jenny Davis

National Centers for Coastal Ocean Science/National Ocean Service National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration 1305 East West Highway Silver Spring, MD 20910

Danielle Szimanski

US Army Corps of Engineers, Baltimore District 2 Hopkins Plaza Baltimore, MD 21201

Duncan Bryant and Joe Gailani

Coastal Hydraulics Laboratory US Army Engineer Research and Development Center 3909 Halls Ferry Road Vicksburg, MS 39180

Matt Whitbeck

US Fish and Wildlife Service Chesapeake Bay Marshlands National Wildlife Refuge Complex 2145 Key Wallace Drive Cambridge, MD 21613

Rebecca Golden

Maryland Department of Natural Resources 580 Taylor Avenue Annapolis, MD 21401

Final report

Approved for public release; distribution is unlimited.

Prepared for US Army Corps of Engineers, 441 G Street NW, Washington, DC 20314-1000

Under Project U4368804



Proceedings from the US Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) and the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA)–National Ocean Service (NOS)

## **Ecological Habitat Modeling Workshop**



April 11-12, 2019

US Fish and Wildlife Service Blackwater National Wildlife Refuge Visitors Center 2145 Key Wallace Drive, Cambridge, MD 21613

Approved for public release; distribution is unlimited.

## ABSTRACT

This special report summarizes the activities of the Ecological Habitat Modeling Workshop held April 11–12, 2019, at the US Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) Blackwater National Wildlife Refuge Visitors Center in Cambridge, Maryland.

The workshop guided 21 participants through the process of conceptualizing, quantifying, evaluating, and communicating ecological responses to inform guidance and management decisions for ecological restoration projects. Working in interactive groups, participants used the restoration work already in progress at nearby Swan Island as the basis for their model development. Over the course of the two-day workshop, participants learned the mechanics and challenges of applying modeling processes to shape the restoration of dynamic ecosystems. Through group work and brainstorming, they identified a number of benchmarks to assess restoration success and future resilience. To accommodate the changeable and often unpredictable natural events that can shape ecosystems, workshop facilitators emphasized building iterative, fluid ecological habitat models.

Next steps include publishing this special report and scheduling a followup workshop that will include a site visit to Swan Island.

**DISCLAIMER:** The contents of this report are not to be used for advertising, publication, or promotional purposes. Citation of trade names does not constitute an official endorsement or approval of the use of such commercial products. All product names and trademarks cited are the property of their respective owners. The findings of this report are not to be construed as an official Department of the Army position unless so designated by other authorized documents.

DESTROY THIS REPORT WHEN NO LONGER NEEDED. DO NOT RETURN IT TO THE ORIGINATOR.

## Contents

ABSTRACTII
ContentsIII
Figuresv
PREFACEvi
EXECUTIVE SUMMARYvii
1 Introduction1
1.1 Background
1.2 Objective
1.3 Approach
2 Workshop Process
3 Agenda and Workshop Structure
3.1 Background and Introductions
3.2 Measuring Ecological Outcomes/Modeling Basics and Process
3.3 Modeling 1: Conceptualization
3.4 Modeling 2: Quantification
3.5 Modeling 3: Evaluation and Application15
3.6 Modeling 4: Communication, Data Management, Monitoring and Adaptive Management 15
4 Closing Session and Workshop Conclusion18
5 Workshop Products, Recommendations, and Next Steps
REFERENCES
Acronyms and Abbreviations
Appendix A: Conference Participant List
Appendix B: National Centers for Coastal Ocean Science (NCCOS) Project Proposal
Appendix C: Workshop Agenda
Appendix D: Danielle Szimanski, Swan Island Project Update, US Army Corps of Engineers- Baltimore District
Appendix E: Restoration Status of Swan Island April 2019
Appendix F: Jenny Davis, Swan Island Sampling Update, National Centers for Coastal Ocean Science
Appendix G:
a. Models: A Simple Approach to Complex Problems
b. Measuring Ecological Outcomes and Monitoring & Adaptive Management (MAMP)
Appendix H: Model Development: Conceptualization
Appendix I: Model Quantification: Gettin' Mathy With It140
Appendix J: Model Evaluation/Application: Does Your Model Make Sense & to Anyone Else? 174

Appendix K: Monitoring and Management Plan	203
Appendix L: Communicating Models: Explaining Complex Systems to Diverse Audience	213
REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE	233

## **Figures**

Figure 1. Example natural and nature-based (NNBF) found in coastal environments
Figure 2. Swan Island conceptual model11
Figure 3. Monitoring metrics (in table) that are linked to the conceptual model of Swan Island (graphic above table)
Figure 4. Refined conceptual model reflecting the three main measureable components (blue rectangles), each comprised of multiple measureable parameters (blue labeled arrows, not all included here). Note the waves component was modified to also include circulation and the measureable parameter of current velocity. The yellow ovals are nonmeasured components, and the green rounded rectangles will be inferred from the data collected

## PREFACE

This report summarizes the collaborative activities of a workshop conducted on the topic of ecological habitat modeling. It was held April 11–12, 2019, at the US Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) Blackwater National Wildlife Refuge Visitors Center in Cambridge, Maryland.

The workshop was coordinated by Ms. Paula Whitfield, research ecologist, of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Association's (NOAA) National Ocean Service (NOS)–National Centers for Coastal Ocean Science (NCCOS) in Silver Spring, Maryland and facilitated by Drs. Brook Herman, research ecologist, and Todd Swannack, research ecologist, of the Integrated Ecological Modeling Team at the US Army Engineer Research and Development Center (ERDC) in Vicksburg, Mississippi. The workshop was made possible by support offered through USACE's Engineering With Nature<sup>®</sup> (EWN<sup>®</sup>) initiative.

The organizers would like to thank Mr. Matt Whitbeck, supervisory wildlife biologist, of the USFWS and manager of the Blackwater National Wildlife Refuge, for providing the conference venue and facilitating onsite computer and facility support. Additionally, the organizers wish to thank all of the workshop participants who shared their knowledge and experience, which made it possible to advance the collaborative Swan Island Project and the ecological models that will support future monitoring and restoration efforts.

At the time of publication of this report, Dr. Ilker Adiguzel was Director of ERDC's Environmental Laboratory. COL Teresa A. Schlosser was Commander of ERDC and Dr. David W. Pittman was Director of ERDC.

This special report should be cited as follows:

Herman Brooke, Todd Swannack, Jeffrey King, Paula Whitfield, Jenny Davis, Danielle Szimanski, Duncan Bryant, and Joe Gailani. 2019. *Proceedings from the US Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) and the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA)–National Ocean Service (NOS) Ecological Habitat Modeling Workshop*. Vicksburg, MS: US Army Engineer Research and Development Center.

## **EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

This ecological modeling workshop is the result of a relationship that has grown in recent years between the US Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) and the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA). At the heart of that relationship is a mutual interest in prioritizing collaborative projects that support the Engineering With Nature (EWN) initiative. Having identified areas of mutual research interest through earlier collaborative workshops (Bridges, Banks, and King 2016, 12–20), the pursuit of a large, collaborative project was a natural next step.

In summer 2018, NOAA and USACE began the process of dedicating resources that would allow for the pre- and postconstruction monitoring of a restored island, Swan Island in the Chesapeake Bay. Swan Island, adjacent to Smith Island in Somerset County, Maryland, functions as a natural breakwater for the town of Ewell.

In fall 2018, Baltimore District began dredging and placing 61,000 cu yd<sup>1</sup> of sediment on the island as part of the restoration effort. This work culminated in late April 2019, shortly after the workshop. The Baltimore district established natural and nature-based features (NNBF), including high and low marsh and beach and dune vegetation. They completed the planting in July 2019. A joint effort between USACE Baltimore District, the USACE Engineer Research and Development Center (ERDC), NOAA–National Ocean Services' (NOS) National Centers for Coastal Ocean Science (NCCOS), the US Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS), and the Maryland Department of Natural Resources (MD DNR) will study the island for the next three years to better understand its ecological and engineering performance.

Upon completion of the initial, preconstruction sampling of the island, NOAA and ERDC investigators recognized the value of leveraging the collected data to pursue ecological modeling for future management decisions while quantitatively evaluating the long-term performance of Swan Island. USFWS and MD DNR scientists and resource managers also agreed that introducing a modeling element would help achieve the project's overall goals. Thus, the workshop arose out of the project team's desire to identify and validate the appropriate parameters for this study, establish predictive tools using ecological habitat models, define successful outcomes for the project, contribute findings and improved methodologies, and create new, innovative methodologies to address island performance.

<sup>1.</sup> For a full list of the spelled-out forms of the units of measure used in this document, please refer to *US Government Publishing Office Style Manual*, 31st ed. (Washington, DC: US Government Publishing Office, 2016), 248–52, https://www.govinfo.gov/content/pkg/GPO-STYLEMANUAL-2016/pdf/GPO-STYLEMANUAL-2016.pdf.

The workshop used Swan Island as a case study to teach participants the process of conceptualizing, quantifying, evaluating, and communicating ecological responses, with a goal of informing guidance and management decisions for ecological restoration projects. The workshop was held April 11–12, 2019, at the USFWS Blackwater National Wildlife Refuge Visitors Center in Cambridge, Maryland. There were 21 participants representing a variety of organizations, including USACE, NOAA's NCCOS and National Marine Fisheries Service, USFWS, MD DNR, the University of Pennsylvania, and the University of Toronto. Please see appendix A for a full list of conference participants and their respective organizations.

There were three primary objectives associated with the workshop:

- 1. Support modeling as a tool to drive the design, monitoring, and evaluation of ecological restoration projects using hands-on learning modules
- 2. Review sampling parameters, determine additional sample collection needs (if any), and collaboratively pursue the development of models that guide the future monitoring and evaluation of the Swan Island restoration project
- 3. Achieve consensus on the best approach for harnessing the power of ecological modeling to advance the overall project outcomes and the broader objectives of the EWN initiative

The two-day workshop began with introductions by all attendees. Next, representatives involved in the Swan Island restoration project from NOAA, ERDC, and USACE–Baltimore District presented, among other things, an overview of the project's goals, work completed on site, work that remains on site, and information about the environmental and hydrodynamic parameters being monitored and collected before project construction (completed before the workshop) and after project construction (completed after the workshop in August 2019).

Workshop facilitators presented an overview of the concepts, processes, and challenges of ecological habitat modeling. Participants then worked in small groups to create their own models for the Swan Island project.

Break-out sessions were held the afternoon of the first day and the morning of the second. During these sessions, participants identified restoration goals, anticipated likely challenges when pursuing these goals, identified important system components, and diagrammed conceptual models for the Swan Island restoration work. Participants presented and compared their draft models in the workshop's final session.<sup>2</sup> Trainers

<sup>2.</sup> Shortly after the workshop, the project team refined one of the general, linear-conceptual models, which was developed in the workshop, to produce a simplified model that specifically targeted the funded project objectives. Both models are presented in these proceedings (figures 2 and 4).

then presented the next steps in model development, including approaches for quantification, evaluation, and application. The group then discussed the usefulness of such models to inform monitoring and adaptive management plans and communicate with stakeholders and funding agencies.

The project team is currently planning a follow-up workshop, which will include a Swan Island site visit.

## **1** Introduction

#### 1.1 Background

The US Army Corps of Engineers' (USACE) Engineering with Nature (EWN) initiative began in 2010 with the goal of increasing project value using natural systems and processes, developing solutions through partnerships and collaborations, and encouraging innovation in water infrastructure development through field-scale demonstrations. Since its inception, the EWN portfolio has grown considerably, with research and development distributed across the navigation, ecosystem restoration, and flood-risk management business lines. EWN continues to produce practical tools and solutions by supporting efforts to engineer with nature.

The National Oceanic and Atmospheric Association's (NOAA) National Centers for Coastal Ocean Science (NCCOS) has a similar research and development profile in their Coastal Change Portfolio. This portfolio analyzes the ecosystem services that improve a community's resistance to the impacts of weather and changing climate conditions. NCCOS provides timely and actionable scientific assessments, information, and tools that coastal communities use to make risk management decisions.

Within USACE's EWN initiative and NCCOS's Coastal Change Portfolio exists a subset of research interests specifically focused on natural and nature-based features (NNBF). NNBF are those features that define coastal landscapes, including barrier islands, beaches and dunes, maritime forests, wetlands and seagrass beds, biogenic reefs, and more (figure 1). Using and restoring NNBF to provide ecosystem services, reduce storm risks, and enhance coastal resilience is a prime example of how engineering with nature achieves multiple benefits. NNBF include both natural features and those that are nature-based, that is, features designed and constructed to provide functions and services comparable to natural features. Please visit <u>www.engineeringwithnature.org</u> and <u>https://coastalscience.noaa.gov/category/zcoastal-change/natural-andnature-based-features/</u> for more information on efforts pertaining to NNBF.

In March 2016, researchers affiliated with USACE's EWN initiative and NCCOS's Coastal Change Priority attended a collaborative workshop on NNBF in Charleston, South Carolina (Bridges, Banks, and King 2016). This workshop developed connections between the two organizations' leaders and staff, resulting in several project ideas. Over the next two years, the scientists and engineers affiliated with these organizations continued their discussions, participated in subsequent workshops, and identified opportunities to collaborate. Ultimately, those engagements and continued interest in NNBF research contributed to the identification and funding of the Swan Island Research Project.

Through a series of communications starting in spring 2018, NCCOS and US Army Engineer Research and Development Center (ERDC) researchers engaged project managers in Baltimore District to learn more about the proposed restoration of Swan Island. In October 2018, USACE-Baltimore District began dredging the navigation channel that runs between Swan and Smith Islands near the Marvland-Virginia border and beneficially used 61,000 cu yd of the dredged sediments to restore the footprint of Swan Island (figure 2). The district completed dredging and sediment placement in April 2019, shortly after the workshop, and planting in July 2019, which included establishing NNBF such as high and low marsh and beach and dune vegetation. Planting was completed in July 2019. The creation and expansion of these habitats will have significant benefits: ecosystem service provision, increased resilience of Swan Island to future sea-level rise, and abatement of erosive losses for the town of Ewell on adjacent Smith Island. However, there is currently no mechanism in place to evaluate whether the project achieved these intended outcomes, and therefore there exists an urgent need to properly quantify and substantiate the widely held beliefs. Long-term monitoring of USACE projects, which can fill the gaps that exist within research and development, is difficult given that USACE construction, operations, and maintenance requirements often do not allow for such strategic actions. However, this project will address the previously described information gap by gathering and evaluating the ecological and physical data necessary to evaluate the outcomes of the Swan Island restoration (see appendix B for additional information specific to Swan Island and the research and development project).

Figure 1. Example natural and nature-based (NNBF) found in coastal environments (from Bridges, Todd S., Cynthia J. Banks, and Jeff K. King. 2016, 2).

#### Natural and Nature-Based Infrastructure at a Glance

GENERAL COASTAL RISK REDUCTION PERFORMANCE FACTORS: STORM INTENSITY, TRACK, AND FORWARD SPEED, AND SURROUNDING LOCAL BATHYMETRY AND TOPOGRAPHY



NCCOS researchers visited the site in late summer of 2018 to collect preconstruction data that provided the baseline information to evaluate impacts of sediment placement on the intertidal and subtidal vegetative communities and nearshore oyster populations. Likewise, ERDC engineers constructed and deployed three platforms prior to construction in an effort to better understand the hydrodynamic conditions that existed prior to restoration activities. In early 2019, the principal investigators acknowledged that the data sets generated over the course of this study would include several complex hydrodynamic parameters. Moreover, they realized that an opportunity existed to expand overall project outcomes through the use of modeling, which they could accomplish through the collection of each data set. Therefore, by leveraging the data in this way, researchers could construct, update, and improve ecological models over the project lifecycle to inform real-time decisions pertaining to adaptive management.

To that end, the principal investigators invited members of ERDC's Integrated Ecological Modeling Team to share information that would support the development of ecological models applicable to Swan Island. This initial engagement ultimately resulted in enthusiastic support for a workshop that would allow participants to learn how to conceptualize, quantify, evaluate, and communicate ecological responses to inform guidance and management decisions for restoration projects such as the Swan Island project.

The Ecological Habitat Modeling Workshop was held April 11–12, 2019, in support of the Swan Island Restoration project.

#### **1.2 Objective**

There were three primary objectives associated with the workshop:

- 1. Support modeling as a tool to drive the design, monitoring, and evaluation of ecological restoration projects using hands-on learning modules
- 2. Review sampling parameters, determine additional sample collection needs (if any), and collaboratively pursue the development of models that guide the future monitoring and evaluation of the Swan Island restoration project
- 3. Achieve consensus on the best approach for harnessing the power of ecological modeling to advance the overall project outcomes and the broader objectives of the EWN initiative

#### **1.3 Approach**

Embedded within the above objectives are targeted outcomes that support the development of a monitoring and adaptive management plan (MAMP) for the island, including a description of the model and how to quantify and evaluate it as the data become available. The overarching goal of the model is to measure and evaluate several anticipated outcomes associated with the Swan Island project including, but not limited to, the following:

- How have the restoration actions enhanced the coastal protection capacity? (for example, modeling action and no-action scenarios to quantify reductions in wave energy/attenuation provided by the island)
- What is the coastal protection capacity of Swan Island under various sea level rise projections? (that is, comparing action and no-action scenarios)
- How has the sediment deposition and vegetation planting affected the habitat benefits provided by the island? (for example, modeling vegetation, diversity, density, and species distribution as well as inundation period; vegetation period and inundation data as proxy for birds and fisheries species)

The subsequent sections of this special report provide details and outcomes from the workshop.

## 2 Workshop Process

The Ecological Modeling Workshop served as a venue for scientists and engineers to work together to develop an ecological model and learn the importance and value of codifying project-level details in an MAMP for an ecological restoration project. The Swan Island project serves as an example throughout the workshop to demonstrate the ecological model development process.

At the time the workshop was conducted, the restoration of Swan Island was already underway, with dredging of the channel and placement of the sediment completed while the workshop was taking place. Thus, attendees of the workshop needed to accomplish several tasks in order to support the overall outcomes of the three-year, monitoring and adaptive management aspect of the Swan Island restoration project. First, participants identified the ecological systems affected by the restoration. Then they defined the critical system parameters for the model. They considered parameters outside the scope of the proposed monitoring (if money and logistics were not an issue) and within the scope of the monitoring (for example, to meet the funded objectives). The participants used this exercise to develop the initial conceptual models. The facilitators then guided participants through the model conceptualization, quantification, evaluation, and application process with a series of examples and break-out group exercises relevant to the Swan Island project. Finally, workshop facilitators briefed participants on developing a MAMP and the overall use and value of such a plan, including how to use it as a communication tool between project participants and external stakeholders.

## **3 Agenda and Workshop Structure**

The full workshop agenda can be found in appendix C.

#### **3.1 Background and Introductions**

The two-day workshop began with introductions and an overview of the Swan Island restoration work, presented by Danielle Szimanski (USACE) (appendix D and E), Jenny Davis (NOAA) (appendix F), and Duncan Bryant (USACE) (verbal presentation only)—scientists involved in the project. Background presentations included a status update on the Swan Island restoration and the hydrodynamic and ecological monitoring completed to date. Again, preconstruction monitoring of the vegetation (sub/intertidal), sediment, and elevations—as well as installation of three platforms with acoustic Doppler velocimeter (ADV) sensors—was completed in August and September 2018, prior to the workshop in April 2019.

#### 3.2 Measuring Ecological Outcomes/Modeling Basics and Process

After the overview presentations about the Swan Island project, workshop facilitators Brook Herman and Todd Swannack from USACE provided an introduction to ecological modeling concepts, including the basics of developing a model, processes for measuring outcomes, practicing adaptive management, and carrying out ongoing project monitoring. Please see appendices G and H for their presentation slides.

They emphasized that, unlike an engineering model, which generally has predictable, static outcomes, developing an ecological model is an iterative process that may sometimes require best professional judgment based on expert opinion and qualitative data, because there may be unknown factors and unpredictable events (for example, storms, climate change) affecting project outcomes. This ecological modeling overview was placed within the context of the Swan Island restoration project objectives.

The general modeling process is as follows (Grant and Swannack 2008, 52):

- 1. Conceptualization: Develop conceptual model with specific cause-effect relationships between relevant parameters.
- 2. Quantification: Quantify relationships between the parameters (that is, mathematical equations) based on data collected in the field (depicted in table at bottom of figure 3).

- 3. Evaluation: Evaluate the usefulness of the model to simulate island processes under known scenarios and future scenarios. Also called model validation, at this stage in the process, if model results do not match reality, other forcing factors and processes would be included to improve model performance.
- 4. Application: Once validated, apply the model by conducting simulations to address specific project objectives and questions.

Key overview concepts include the following:

- Ecological modeling is an iterative process; model development needs fluidity.
- Each person's/group's model will be different, because of different priorities and concerns, and may change over time.
- Focus on capturing important system-level socio-ecological changes as a response to restoration, and identify important components that drive system resilience.
- Long-term, the model should help communicate the value and benefits of ecosystem restoration.

#### 3.3 Modeling 1: Conceptualization

The trainers first provided an overview presentation (appendix H) describing conceptual models, how they are used, and how to develop one. This overview included the characteristics of useful conceptual models and how to avoid pitfalls.

Development of a conceptual model is primarily about identifying the important system components and parameters, understanding the relationship between those parameters, and predicting how they will change as a result of the project restoration. Each model will be different, because each model developer has their own priorities, concerns, and objectives—all of which change over time. Thus, we should expect different conceptual models for similar systems.

After the modeling basics and overview presentations by the trainers, the workshop facilitators split the participants into two interactive working groups, each with a trainer, to develop a conceptual model for Swan Island.

The following model objectives were used as a guide:

1. Inform an MAMP for Swan Island

- 2. Capture important system-level socio-ecological and hydrodynamic changes as a response to restoration
- 3. Identify important components that drive system resilience (that is, ability to recover from disturbance)
- 4. Communicate the benefits of ecosystem restoration

Each team first determined the relevant system components and the processes (cause-effect relationships) acting on those components, keeping the overall project objectives in mind. Figure 2 below shows the primary system components and processes used in the initial conceptual model. Next, participants identified metric(s) and a unit of measurement for each component. A listed version of the components and parameters from figure 2 and a table of the links between the participants' understanding of the system, metrics for monitoring and data collection, and the initial conceptual model are illustrated in figure 3.

The first component of the model (orange rectangle at top, figure 2) indicates the stressors and drivers that affect the system but are unlikely to change as a result of restoration. That is, the system will be subjected to a host of stressors beyond what the model measures (in this example, climate, storms, sea-level rise, dredging, run-off, human activities and development, subsidence, pollution, boat wakes, ice, recreation, and herbivory). These stressors can be incorporated as stochastic events if relevant to the system. The primary components of the initial model are the hydrodynamics, geomorphology, and water quality components. These components contain parameters that influence, or will change as a result of, the restoration, and several aspects of these components can/will be measured during sampling. Hydrodynamics' parameters include infrastructure, tidal prism, water level, and current; water quality's parameters include nutrients, dissolved oxygen, turbidity and clarity, and pH; and geomorphology's parameters include the transition zone, topographic design, elevation, infrastructure, vegetative design, shoreline structure and change, and habitat complexity. Finally, the middle of the figure shown with the large blue arrows contains parameters that are the most important in terms of monitoring for ecosystem change as well as how they relate to the restoration project objectives. These parameters are waves, sediment, biomass, and habitat (including SAV, dunes, high marsh, low marsh, and oysters). The arrows indicate the direction of the cause-effect relationships between the parameters. So, for example, waves affect sediment, which affects biomass, which affects habitat, and all of these affect the component geomorphology. Of the components, hydrodynamics affects waves and sediment while water quality affects biomass. Of particular note is the way biomass affects shoreline structure and change and the way biomass also affects sediment, which together with waves affect elevation (figure 2).

Figure 3 depicts monitoring metrics (in table) that are linked to the

conceptual model of Swan Island (graphic above the table).

The table in figure 3 describes the metrics, measurements, and predicted changes over time, and the elements of that table are organized in the outline below:

- Waves
  - Metric: currents
  - Measurement: ADVs on three platforms
  - Prediction: stable (neutral)
- Waves/sediment
  - Metric: turbidity
  - Measurement: ADVs on three platforms
  - Prediction: decrease (-) on south side; stable on north side (neutral)
- Waves
  - Metric: waves
  - Measurement: pressure differential; ADVs on platforms
  - Prediction: decrease (-) on south side; stable on north side (neutral)
- Biomass/habitat
  - Metric: establishment
  - Measurement: quadrats, percent cover, density, and species along transect
  - Prediction: increase (+) followed by stable (neutral)
- Sediment/biomass/habitat
  - Metric: elevation
  - Measurement: real-time kinematic (RTK) GPS points along transect
  - Prediction: increase (+) followed by stable (neutral) as vegetation establishes
- Sediment/habitat
  - Metric: sediment characteristics
  - Measurement: sediment cores on transect
  - Prediction: dominant class; size stabilizes
- Sediment/biomass/habitat

- Metric: pH and acidification
- Measurement: porewater cores
- Prediction: unknown
- Waves/sediment/habitat
  - Metric: submerged bathymetry
  - Measurement: Light Detection and Ranging (LIDAR) and/or boat surveys
  - Prediction: habitat and hydrodynamic modeling
- Habitat
  - Metric: salinity, oxygen, pH, temperature, and chlorophyll
  - Measurement: to be determined
  - Prediction: unknown
- Waves/sediment/biomass/habitat
  - Metric: shoreline change
  - Measurement: LIDAR and/or boat surveys
  - Prediction: shoreline will accrete (+) or slow erosion once vegetation established

The workshop participants created the table in figure 3 using the Swan Island conceptual model in figure 2. The graphic headers in figure 3 (that is, hydrodynamics, water quality, and geomorphology) link to the conceptual model in figure 2, and this depiction offers the reader a method of organizing and binning a diverse set of metrics that will inform future models.

Figure 2. Swan Island conceptual model.



Figure 3. Monitoring metrics (in table) that are linked to the conceptual model of Swan Island (graphic above table).

#### Hydrodynamics

- Infrastructure (Jetties/Breakwaters)
- Tidal Prism
- Water Level
- Current

#### Water Quality

- Nutrients
  Dissolved
- Oxygen
- Turbidity/Clarity
- pH

#### Geomorphology

- Transition Zone
- Elevation
- Topo Design
- Infrastructure (Ajax)
- Veg. Design
- Shoreline
   Structure/Change
- Habitat Complexity
- Waves Sediment Biomass Habitat

F					
Parameter(s)	Metric	Measurement(s)	Prediction Overtime		
Waves	Currents	ADVs three platforms	Stable (neutral)		
Waves/Sediment	Turbidity	Acoustic; ADVs platforms	Decrease (-) on southside, no change on northside (neutral)		
Waves	Waves	Pressure Differential; ADVs platforms	Decrease (-) on southside, no change on northside (neutral)		
Biomass/Habitat	Establishment	Quadrats, percent cover, density, species along a transect	Increase (+),followed by stable (neutral)		
Sediment/Biomass/Habitat	Elevation	RTK GPS points along transects	Positive Increase (+), followed by stable (neutral) as vegetation establishes		
Sediment/Habitat	Sediment Characteristics	Sediment cores on a transect	Dominant Class, Size Stabilizes		
Sediment /Biomass/Habitat	pH/acidification	Porewater cores	Unknown		
Waves/Sediment/Habitat	submerged bathymetry	LIDAR and/or boat surveys	Habitat & hydrodynamic modeling		
Habitat	salinity	TBD	Depends on habitat		
Habitat	oxygen	TBD	Depends on habitat		
Habitat	pН	TBD	Depends on habitat		
Habitat	temperature	TBD	Depends on habitat		
Habitat	chlorophyll	TBD	Depends on habitat		
Waves/Sediment/Biomass/ Habitat	Shoreline Change	RTK GPS, LIDAR and/or boat surveys	Shoreline will accrete (+) or slow erosion once vegetation established.		

Figure 4. Refined conceptual model reflecting the three main measureable components (blue rectangles), each comprised of multiple measureable parameters (blue labeled arrows, not all included here). Note the waves component was modified to also include circulation and the measureable parameter of current velocity. The yellow ovals are nonmeasured components, and the green rounded rectangles will be inferred from the data collected.



Key Model Development Concepts

- Identify the crucial elements for consideration and monitoring in the model (for example, hydrodynamics, geomorphology, water quality, biotic components). Determine the most important components within each of these parameters (for example, impact of waves, tides, ice; important plants or fish habitat).
- Determine or estimate the relationships between the identified components connected in the system.
- Identify the external drivers that cannot be controlled but must be considered (for example, storms, climate change, sea level, pollution).

#### 3.4 Modeling 2: Quantification

During this section, the ERDC trainers provided participants with an overview of the purpose and functional forms of quantitative models (appendix I). This overview included a discussion of the type of math that may be required and decisions on time steps. In many cases, having a general understanding of the cause-effect relationship between parameters or components (*parameter* is often used interchangeably with *component*)—for example, the main parameters in the final Swan Island model in figure 4—will suffice to develop a quantitative model. The trainers emphasized that capturing critical processes is paramount, not defining a comprehensive mathematical equation for every process. The types of data used varies from quantitative (field data, literature), to qualitative (expert opinion, hypotheses), and often the model itself reveals trends and patterns. Workshop facilitators demonstrated with examples how to capture feedbacks and thresholds in the model and how to integrate multiple models. Finally, the facilitators emphasized the iterative nature of developing a quantitative model as a natural part of investigating the validity of the model relationships. Workshop participants discussed common pitfalls, including inappropriate math and choosing the wrong time step or unit of measure.

There are five basic steps to develop a quantitative model (Grant and Swannack 2008, 67–78):

- 1. Select the general quantitative structure for the model.
- 2. Choose the basic time unit for the simulations.
- 3. Identify the functional forms of the model equations.
- 4. Estimate the parameters of the model equations.
- 5. Execute the baseline simulation.

After this background on quantification, the two working groups split up to generate the quantitative process for the specific model parameters and relationships for the initial conceptual model (figure 2). (Again, the project team developed the simplified conceptual model shortly after the workshop.)

Key Model Development Concepts

- Determine an appropriate time frame for the model: how many years will data collection happen? how frequently will the model be updated? how long will the assessments run?
- Determine an appropriate measurement unit based on the growth cycle of what is being measured (for example, annually for certain species; every 25 years for a tree).
- Modeling is an iterative process; keep learning about the model and its system. Do not put a model into practice until it is well tested and rigorous.

#### 3.5 Modeling 3: Evaluation and Application

The ERDC trainers started this section by providing the background on what model evaluation is and how to do to it (appendix J). Along with presenting practical evaluation techniques, they provided advice on how to deal with uncertainty and avoid pitfalls. Evaluation is the process of rigorously assessing model components, structure, parameter values, and assumptions, but not scenario results.

There are five steps to evaluate an environmental model (Grant and Swannack 2008, 79–87):

- 1. Assess the reasonableness of model structure.
- 2. Assess functional relationships and verify code (math).
- 3. Evaluate model behavior vs. expected patterns.
- 4. Assess model correspondence to data from real system.
- 5. Document uncertainty.

The trainers emphasized model *evaluation* over model *validation*, as it is commonly called, because this step is not about validating what is true or false but rather about evaluating whether the model accomplishes its intended purpose. In addition, evaluation is an iterative process that determines the model's limits, strengths, weaknesses, and replicability. Different disciplines expect different things from model performance, which represents a challenge for model evaluation. Another challenge is the failure to document the entire evaluation process in enough detail, including the iterative approach that is inherent to the evaluation process.

The trainers also focused on the methods and challenges of building evaluation tools into their ecological models. They taught participants how to assign values (data management) to the models to measure adaptive management and enable monitoring of the model. They also discussed the importance, and challenges, of communicating about the model to both technical audiences and the general public.

## **3.6 Modeling 4: Communication, Data Management, Monitoring and Adaptive Management**

The last phase of ecological modeling development links it to monitoring and adaptive management decisions and uses it as a communication tool for various audiences, including the project team. First, the trainers emphasized the need to develop an MAMP that would serve as a living document to codify data management protocols and to link the modeling component to the adaptive management of the site. Evaluation of the conceptual model, monitoring metrics, and predictions will continue as the MAMP is developed in more detail (appendices K and L).

In the final working sessions, participants developed measurement criteria for their models, and then each group elected a spokesperson to present and explain their model to the plenary. Although the diagrams and processes the individual groups used to develop their models were different, their final models considered largely the same elements.

Next steps in model development include the following:

- 1. Review conceptual model/parameters.
- 2. Determine if monitoring metrics should be added or removed.
- 3. Review and adjust predictions as necessary.
- 4. Build an MAMP with the synthesis information.

Key Outcome Measurement Concepts

- The model must reflect what is happening in nature—not what is convenient. Determining measureable parameters (for example, current velocity, elevation) ensures accurate measurement and communicates change in the project.
- Let the model run long enough to enable accurate measurements. For example, if planting is done tomorrow, the project team cannot go back the next week to evaluate; plants need a couple of years to grow before assessment.
- When using data management software to assign values to a model, remember that not all formats lend themselves to a given problem. Statistical models can limit creative problem-solving (for example, using a linear system to assess a nonlinear model).
- The desired data will not always be available when making decisions. Be transparent and upfront about gaps in the data and information. It is acceptable to use expert opinions to parameterize equations until other data sets are available.
- Validation is not possible in an ecological model—*evaluation* captures the essence of a formal validation.
- Document the entire evaluation process. This information will be used in technical communications and with the general public—and potentially funding agencies.
- When developing a communications strategy about the project, first get an understanding of the audience's pre-existing thoughts before determining how to explain the project plan (for example, perceptions of

working waterfront communities, whose livelihoods might be impacted by a restoration).

- Develop two levels of communications about the project:
  - 1. A technical level for a scientific audience so that the model can be recreated—what assumptions were put in, what equations were used, full technical documentation
  - 2. A layperson's level for explaining the project to policy makers, citizens, and the general public; putting the project activities into narrative form will help explain it plausibly to laypeople and funding agencies.

## 4 **Closing Session and Workshop Conclusion**

The workshop uncovered some differences between the two groups and their understanding of the system; however, there was generally a wide overlap of important components and parameters. The group agreed that the conceptual models were a good start, but they needed to firm up the monitoring metrics and the interpretation of the metrics to best understand the system and make adaptive management decisions. In addition, participants wanted to practice quantifying the model using best available data to better understand this aspect of model development.

The following is a description of additional participant feedback requested by the trainers:

- Participants expressed interest in a site visit to Swan Island. There was general agreement that in the future it would be valuable to include a site visit prior to beginning work on the conceptual model.
- The two-day workshop agenda did not allow for the development of a complete model. Many said they would have liked the opportunity to develop a complete model from beginning to end (including design of the construction/sediment placement component) to use as a reference for other projects, instead of starting midproject.
- There was support for an additional group working session to develop monitoring metrics (for example, how to do the model, and from that model, how to decide which strategic monitoring parameters are needed).
- Participants suggested having material showing examples where ecological habitat modeling of this kind was applied and using the workshop to discuss results and applications.
- Holding a follow-up workshop to jointly put a model together, with monitoring criteria.
- Holding a follow-up webinar to walk people through how to put a model together.

# 5 Workshop Products, Recommendations, and Next Steps

The next step is a follow-up workshop to continue work on model quantification and evaluation. Participants will primarily include the project team and others with an interest in the geographic area.

Anticipated Workshop Products

- 1. Workshop Proceedings (this document)
- 2. Monitoring and Adaptive Management Plan (currently in development)

## REFERENCES

Bridges, Todd S., Cynthia J. Banks, and Jeff K. King. 2016. Proceedings from the US Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) and the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) Natural and Nature-Based Features Workshop. Vicksburg, MS: US Army Engineer Research and Development Center. http://hdl.handle.net/11681/20322.

Grant William E. and Todd M. Swannack. 2008. *Ecological Modeling: A Common Sense Approach to Theory and Practice*. Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing.

## **Acronyms and Abbreviations**

Term	Definition
ADV	acoustic Doppler velocimeter
ERDC	Engineer Research and Development Center
EWN	Engineering With Nature
LIDAR	light detection and ranging
MAMP	monitoring and adaptive management plan
MD DNR	Maryland Department of Natural Resources
NCCOS	National Centers for Coastal Ocean Science
NNBF	natural and nature-based features
NOAA	National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration
SAV	submerged aquatic vegetation
SLR	sea level rise
USACE	US Army Corps of Engineers
USFWS	US Fish and Wildlife Service

## **Appendix A: Conference Participant List**

	Last Name	First Name	email	Affiliation	Role
1	Balthis	Len	len.balthis@noaa.gov	NOAA/NCCOS	participant
2	Bryant	Duncan	duncan.bryant@usace.army.mil	USACE ERDC	participant
3	Burkholder	Sean	seanburk@design.upenn.edu	University of Pennsylvania	participant/landscape architect
4	Chasten	Monica	monica.a.chasten@usace.army.mil	USACE Philadelphia	participant
5	Davis	Jenny	jenny.davis@noaa.gov	NOAA NCCOS	participant
6	Garfield	Nina	nina.garfield@noaa.gov	NOAA Office for Coastal Management	participant
7	Golden	Becky	rebecca.golden@maryland.gov	MD DNR	participant
8	Herman	Brook	brook.d.herman@erdc.dren.mil	USACE ERDC	trainer
9	Holzman	Justine	justine.holzman@daniels.utoronto.ca	University of Toronto	participant/landscape architect
10	Ramsay	Laura	Iramsay@decisionpartners.co	Decision Partners	recorder
11	Roach	Andrew	andrew.a.roach@usace.army.mil	USACE Baltimore	participant
12	Seiple	Jacqueline	jacqueline.a.seiple@usace.army.mil	USACE Baltimore	participant
13	Sekoni	Tosin	tosin.a.sekoni@usace.army.mil	USACE ERDC	participant
14	Specht	Jackie	jackie.specht@maryland.gov	MD DNR	participant
15	Spires	Jason	jason.spires@noaa.gov	NOAA NCCOS	participant
16	Subramanian	Bhaskar	bhaskar.subramanian@maryland.gov	MD DNR	participant
17	Swannack	Todd	todd.m.swannack@usace.army.mil	USACE ERDC	trainer
18	Szimanski	Danielle	danielle.m.szimanski@usace.army.mil	USACE Baltimore	participant
19	Vogt	Bruce	bruce.vogt@noaa.gov	NOAA Chesapeake Bay Office	participant
20	Whitbeck	Matt	matt_whitbeck@fws.gov	USFWS	participant
21	Whitfield	Paula	paula.whitfield@noaa.gov	NOAA NCCOS	participant

## Appendix B: National Centers for Coastal Ocean Science (NCCOS) Project Proposal

(Note: For an accessible version of appendix B, please visit <u>https://ewn.el.erdc.dren.mil/projects/products\_19-15/Ecological-Habitat-Modeling-Workshop-Appendix-B.pdf</u>.)

#### Evaluating the Efficacy of Island Restoration and Enhancement for Coastal Protection: Swan Island

#### **Project Summary**

In October 2018, the Baltimore District of the US Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) will dredge the navigation channel that runs between Swan and Smith Islands near the Maryland- Virginia border and beneficially use 78,000 cubic yards of dredged sediments to restore the footprint of Swan Island (Figure 1). The restoration plan includes creation of dunes and high and low intertidal marsh (Figure 2). Planting is scheduled for spring 2019. The creation/expansion of these habitats is expected to have significant benefits in terms of ecosystem service provision, increased resilience of Swan Island to future sea level rise, and abatement of erosive losses for the town of Ewell on adjacent Smith Island. However, there is currently no mechanism in place to evaluate whether these predicted outcomes are achieved.



Figure 1. Google Earth image showing location of Swan Island in relation to the Town of Ewell, Maryland and the beneficial use placement area scheduled for October 2018 (image from: Environmental Assessment Twitch Cove and Thorofare Federal Navigation Channel Project, Dec 2015).

**Placement Areas** 

Revised - 24 September 2015



Figure 2. Google Earth image of Swan Island, with the beneficial use plan overlaid. Natural and naturebased features to be restored include low marsh, high marsh, dunes and strategic use of concrete armor units (image from: Environmental Assessment Twitch Cove and Thorofare Federal Navigation Channel Project, Dec 2015)

This project will capitalize on the imminent restoration of Swan Island, to address research gaps specific to our understanding of island system function, area of influence and ecological/engineering benefits, by gathering and evaluating the ecological and physical data necessary to evaluate the Swan Island restoration/placement. NCCOS scientists from Beaufort conducted pre-placement sampling (intertidal and subtidal vegetation, sediments and porewater and elevation profiles) of the island and MDDNR staff conducted annual SAV surveys in August 2018 to establish baseline conditions (Figure 3).

USACE will be installing up to three small platforms (Figure 4) for the attachment of an Acoustic Doppler Velocimeter (ADV) that will collect continuous wave, current and turbidity data (Figure 5). In addition, USACE proposes to conduct additional LIDAR surveys and nearshore boat surveys to provide information on dredged sediment spreading outside the construction prism. Additional surveys are proposed at 3, 6, and 9 months post construction to evaluate evolution of the island platform.


Figure 3. Satellite image of Swan Island indicating the location of the temporary benchmark and the marsh and seagrass transects surveyed in August 2018, prior to restoration of the islands natural features with the placement of dredged sediments.



Figure 4. Image of the ADV platform type to be installed by USACE staff.



Figure 5. Site locations proposed for ADV instrumentation to be installed by USACE staff.

In summary, sampling will include environmental and hydrodynamic parameters to quantify island performance (e.g. how they change over time, longevity), benefits (ecological and storm risk reduction) and the island's area of influence on surrounding features (Table 1). These data are also critical to the development/validation of sediment transport models, habitat models, guidance/tools and best practices that can be applicable beyond the Chesapeake to other regions with a similar tidal range (e.g. Gulf Coast, southeast, mid-Atlantic etc.), making island features common practice in the future.

We propose three years of post-restoration monitoring to occur annually (or more depending on the parameter) and before and after storm events for the next three years.

Table	1.	Parameters	to	be	collected	during	monitoring	efforts.
				~ -				

Parameter Category	Parameter Type	Metric- Collection method	Purpose	Agency collecting the data
Ecological Parameters	terrestrial vegetation	Quadrats, percent cover, density, species along a transect	Habitat modeling	NCCOS
	terrestrial elevations	RTK GPS points along transects	Habitat modeling	NCCOS

	sediment characteristics	Sediment cores on a transect	Habitat modeling	NCCOS
	porewater	Porewater cores	Habitat modeling	NCCOS
	underwater vegetation/benthic environment	Quadrats, percent cover, density, species at random locations	Habitat modeling	MDDNR/NCCOS
Topography/bathymetry	submerged bathymetry	LIDAR and/or boat surveys	Habitat & hydrodynamic modeling	Existing data?
ropograpny/oaurymeny	island bathymetry	LIDAR (existing or otherwise)	Habitat & hydrodynamic modeling	Existing data?
	Currents	ADVs deployed on three platforms	Hydrodynamic modeling	USACE-ERDC
Hydrodynamic parameters	Turbidity	ADVs deployed on three platforms	Hydrodynamic modeling	USACE-ERDC
	Waves	ADVs deployed on three platforms	Hydrodynamic modeling	USACE-ERDC
	salinity	TBD	Habitat modeling	
	oxygen	TBD	Habitat modeling	
Water Quality	pН	TBD	Habitat modeling	
	temperature	TBD	Habitat modeling	
	chlorophyll	TBD	Habitat modeling	

#### **ANTICIPATED PROJECT OUTCOMES:**

There are several advantages to developing a comprehensive understanding of the system where island projects occur and the benefits they provide. Research outcomes may include, but are not limited to:

1. **OUTCOME -** Quantification of island performance metrics and benefits (e.g. protection of adjacent land from erosion, breaking of offshore/storm waves, attenuation of wave energy, etc) over time will demonstrate how restoring these islands, by combining natural and engineered processes, can achieve ecological, economic and social benefits making these projects common practice in the future.

- 2. **OUTCOME** Monitoring of the island ecological benefits over time, using vegetation as a proxy, (e.g. T&E species, migratory birds, etc), including documenting changes to the shallow water habitats around and in the 'lee' of the island footprint. Documenting the latter may address the "habitat switching' debate long considered a barrier to permitting and implementation of these kinds of projects. As follow-up, we will document island ecology and develop best-practices guidance for other sites based on data from this study.
- 3. **OUTCOME** Data from this project will support new and existing hydrodynamic and ecological habitat models that will be used to evaluate island benefits and the island's influence on adjacent sites.
- 4. **OUTCOME** Guidance will be developed for applying models that are refined or developed as part of Outcome 3. Guidance documents will aide practitioners in applying models for use in determining the utility and performance of future-proposed islands. In addition, guidance will include information specific to model benefits, limitations, applications, data needs, etc.
- 5. **OUTCOME** Monitoring this island will produce data that informs future island construction projects around the nation. For example, the performance data will be integrated with other applicable data sets, and other tools and models that support future construction of island-based, natural and nature-based features (NNBF) for the purpose of storm risk reduction.

#### **PROJECT TEAM (TO-DATE):**

<u>USACE</u>

Baltimore District - Danielle Szimanski - Project Manager ERDC - Joe Gailani - Sediment Transport Processes and Modeling ERDC - Jeff King - Research Civil Engineer, EWN Deputy National Lead ERDC – Todd Swannack – Lead Habitat Modeler ERDC – Brook Herman – Habitat Modeler / Research Ecologist

NOAA

Paula Whitfield - Research Ecologist/Environmental Compliance, Jenny Davis - Research Ecologist/Coastal Restoration Specialist, Don Field - Research Biologist/Ecologist and Remote Sensing Expert Carolyn Currin – Research Ecologist/Microbiologist Jason Spires – Marine Biologist JD Dubick - Biologist USFWS – Matt Whitbeck - Blackwater Refuge Manager

MDDNR - Brooke Landry - Natural Resource Biologist; Chair, CBP SAV Workgroup

MDDNR - Becky Golden - Program Manager; Vice-chair, CBP SAV Workgroup

## **Appendix C: Workshop Agenda**

(Note: For an accessible version of appendix C, please visit <u>https://ewn.el.erdc.dren.mil/projects/products\_19-15/Ecological-Habitat-Modeling-Workshop-Appendix-C.pdf</u>.)



#### Ecological Habitat Modeling Workshop April 11 - 12, 2019 USFWS Blackwater National Wildlife Refuge Visitors Center 2145 Key Wallace Dr, Cambridge, MD 21613

#### **Overarching Objective:**

 The Ecological Habitat Modeling Workshop facilitated by the Integrated Ecological Modeling Team of the US Army Engineer Research and Development Center will allow participants to learn the process for conceptualizing, quantifying, evaluating and communicating ecological responses to inform guidance and management decisions for restoration projects such as the Swan Island Project.

#### Thursday April 11, 2019: All times listed are Eastern Time

Time	Action	Lead or Speaker
8:00	Arrive at USFWS Blackwater National Wildlife Refuge, 2145 Key Wallace Dr., Cambridge, MD 21613	
8:30-845	Welcome Remarks, Logistics, introductions	Paula Whitfield – NOAA Matt Whitbeck - USFWS
8:45 - 9:15	<ul> <li>Background –</li> <li>1. Swan Island Restoration Project Status</li> <li>2. Swan Island Parameters: before/after</li> </ul>	Danielle Szimanski - USACE Jenny Davis - NOAA Duncan Bryant - USACE
9:15 - 9:45	Measuring Ecological Outcomes/Monitoring & Adaptive Management	Brook Herman
9:45 - 10:15	Modeling Basics and Process	Todd Swannack
10:15 - 10:30	Break	
10:30-11:15	Modeling 1: Conceptualization	Todd Swannack/Brook Herman
11:15 - 12:30	Lab 1: Conceptualization	ALL

12:30 - 1:45	Lunch	ALL
1:45 - 2:30	Modeling 2: Quantification	Todd Swannack/Brook Herman
2:30 - 3:30	Lab 2: Quantification (Break as needed)	ALL
3:30-4:00	Team Report Outs	ALL
4:00 - 4:30	Daily Review: Goods and Betters	ALL
4:30	Adjourn	
4:30-5:30pm	Optional trip to BWNWR TLP Site	
	Group Dinner TBD	

## Friday April 12, 2019: All times listed are Eastern Time

Time	Action	Lead or Speaker
8:00-8:30	Coffee	
8:30-9:30	Modeling 3: Evaluation & Application	Todd Swannack/Brook Herman
9:30-9:45	Break	
9:45 – 10:30	Modeling 4: Communication/Data management/Monitoring & Adaptive Management Plan	Todd Swannack/Brook Herman
10:30 - 12:00	Lab 3: Monitoring Plan (Breaks as needed)	ALL
12:00 - 1:15	Lunch	ALL
1:15 - 2:00	Team Report Out	Todd Swannack/Brook Herman
2:00 - 4:30	Parking lot discussions	ALL
	Issues	
	Goods and Betters	
	Next steps	
4:30	Adjourn	

## Appendix D: Danielle Szimanski, Swan Island Project Update, US Army Corps of Engineers–Baltimore District

(Note: For an accessible version of appendix D, please visit <u>https://ewn.el.erdc.dren.mil/projects/products\_19-15/Ecological-Habitat-Modeling-Workshop-Appendix-D.pdf.</u>)

# SWAN ISLAND PROJECT UPDATE

Danielle Szimanski Project Manager Operations Division – Navigation Section 11 April 2019









# WHAT IS THIS PROJECT?

- 1.FY16/FY17 maintenance dredging of Smith Island federal channels (Twitch Cove, Big Thorofare)
- 2.Approximately 80,000 cubic yards of silt (65%) and fine grain sand (35%) to be removed
- 3.Island is natural breakwater for the town of Ewell on Smith Island
- 4. High marsh, low marsh, dune system created
- 5.Contained with coir logs, hay bales, armored concrete units, sand dune













# **CURRENT STATUS**



- 1. Dredging Began November 2018
- 2. Dredging completed at Swan Island end of February 2019
- 3. Approximately 55,000 cubic yards of material placed
- 4. Final grading to be completed by mid-May 2019
- 5. Planting to be completed by July 2019



## December 2018



# **SWAN ISLAND PROGRESS**







# SWAN ISLAND PROGRESS







January 2019 38



# **A-JACKS PLACEMENT**







February 2019



# **QUESTIONS?**





## Appendix E: Restoration Status of Swan Island April 2019

(Note: For an accessible version of appendix E, please visit <u>https://ewn.el.erdc.dren.mil/projects/products\_19-15/Ecological-Habitat-Modeling-Workshop-Appendix-E.pdf.</u>)

Objective	Action	Needs
Deepen federal navigation channel between Swan and Smith Islands to enable safe navigation for fishing boats and Smith Island residents who rely on boats to get to mainland	Dredging of Smith Island federal channel completed April 12, 2019	<ul> <li>Monitoring and maintenance plan for channel</li> <li>Expectation that dredging will need to be repeated in 10 years</li> </ul>
Beneficially used 61,000 cubic yards of dredged sediment to restore the footprint of Swan Island, create dunes and high and low intertidal marsh	<ul> <li>Pre-construction consultation conducted with F&amp;WS to determine restoration needs for each part of the island: (high marsh, low marsh, dunes, protect Heron rookery).</li> <li>Island surveyed; elevations marked to establish benchmarks</li> <li>Took pre-construction sediment/vegetation samples to assess baseline conditions, and determine the optimal growth elevation for <i>Spartina alterniflora</i>.</li> <li>Developed metrics for successful restoration of marshes, dunes to create optimal conditions; help predict resilience to long-range rise in sea level</li> <li>Placement, grading of dredged material completed May 2019</li> <li>Planting of 200,000 plugs of various species of site-appropriate plants (eg; low/high marsh plants; switch grass in dunes, etc.) to be completed in July 2019.</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Determine accretion benchmarks</li> <li>Monitor for 3 years post- construction to evaluate and compare:         <ul> <li>elevation</li> <li>shoreline erosion</li> <li>vegetative success</li> <li>SAV abundance and distribution</li> <li>sediment characteristics</li> <li>fish access using habitat complexity, inundation as a proxy.</li> <li>oyster population</li> <li>Need for funds to develop a plan for long-term monitoring. Funds secured for up to three years only.</li> <li>Funds/strategy for communicating with Island residents, funding agencies about the restoration</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
Improve/Maintain habitat value of intertidal areas for fish	<ol> <li>Part of the unvegetated subtidal bight will be converted to low intertidal marsh. This represents a balance between increasing resilience of the island to SLR (by adding elevation) and maintaining access for fish</li> </ol>	<ul> <li>Re-evaluate in 3 years to determine if habitat complexity and inundation are sufficient to support fish accessibility.</li> <li>Other monitoring metrics to use: Species diversity, vegetation and inundation as a proxy for habitat value to fisheries species.</li> </ul>

Erosion/storm protection to increase resilience for the town of Ewell on nearby Smith Island	<ol> <li>Three monitoring platforms installed around the Island to record, currents, sea levels, wave heights etc</li> <li>Construction of breakwater using concrete 'A-Jack' armor units for underwater support</li> <li>Planting of dunes and high and low marsh, and successful establishment of these vegetative communities will facilitate elevation gain (through sediment trapping and production of belowground biomass) in response to future SLR</li> </ol>	<ul> <li>5. Monitoring plan is in development (by partners) but initial funding was for design, construction (USACE Operations and Maintenance).</li> <li>(1) Hay bales placed on top of breakwall will eventually break down.</li> <li>(2) Dredging will likely have to be done again in 10 years – may revisit this then</li> <li>(3) Establish a mechanism to evaluate predicted outcomes</li> </ul>
Monitor hydrodynamics	Three monitoring platforms installed around the Island to record, currents, sea levels, wave heights etc.	<ol> <li>Ice storms, ice accumulation, extreme weather events may affect monitoring stations</li> </ol>
Monitor oyster colonies	<ul> <li>Pre-reconstruction survey found an intact oyster population around the Island with multi-year classes (generations) of oysters.</li> <li>No oysters were found in the channel</li> </ul>	<ol> <li>Re-assess oyster population in 3 years</li> </ol>
Funding for monitoring, future restoration, impact of climate change (sea level rise; ice storms)	<ol> <li>Funding secured for up to three years for hydrodynamic, ecological and topographic monitoring</li> </ol>	<ol> <li>Develop communications and outreach strategy as part of the monitoring and adaptive management plan</li> </ol>

## Appendix F: Jenny Davis, Swan Island Sampling Update, National Centers for Coastal Ocean Science

(Note: For an accessible version of appendix F, please visit <u>https://ewn.el.erdc.dren.mil/projects/products 19-15/Ecological-Habitat-Modeling-Workshop-Appendix-F.pdf</u>.)





#### Elevation Benchmark (0.95m NAVD88)

Transect surveys to establish full elevation range occupied by *S. alterniflora* 





#### Intertidal Marsh - Pre-placement conditions

S. alterniflora grows over a ~60 cm elevation range

Sediment characteristics and porewater sulfide concentrations widely variable

SAV – percent cover, stem height, plot elevation





#### Oyster presence/absence/ size range



Intact intertidal oyster community

- multiple year classes
- no oysters found in channel



What we envision doing

- elevation
- shoreline position
- vegetative success intertidal and SAV
- sediment characteristics (grain size/carbon)
- accretion?
- oysters
- inundation of intertidal areas (fish access)



NATIONAL CENTERS FOR **COASTAL OCEAN SCIENCE** National Ocean Service

## **Appendix G:**

#### a. Models: A Simple Approach to Complex Problems

(Note: For an accessible version of appendix Ga, please visit <u>https://ewn.el.erdc.dren.mil/projects/products 19-15/Ecological-Habitat-Modeling-Workshop-Appendix-Ga.pdf</u>.)

# models

A simple approach to complex problems

## Overview

- Intro to systems thinking
- What is a "model"?
- General notes on modeling
- Types of models
- Overview of the "modeling process







#### 2

### Systems

A system consists of a particular set of objects that interact in space and time. Systems are organized collections of interrelated physical components characterized by a boundary and functional unity.

System behavior is intrinsically difficult to model due to the dependencies, competitions, feedback loops, indirect/direct relationships, or other interactions

*Ecosystem: Complex of ecological communities and their environment, forming a functional whole in nature (Patten & Jørgensen, 1995)* 

3

4



More



# Definition of models

#### You are a modeler.

- Commonly used in the nerd world: "abstractions of reality"
- Model certification definition (EC-1105-2-412):
  - "a representation of a system for a purpose"
  - "a way to represent a system for the purposes of reproducing, simplifying, analyzing, or understanding it"
- How would your tell your family what a model is?

# Definition of model for this class

Conceptual and numerical representation of environmental and ecological system

SIDE NOTE: **not** software applicable to any situation



# **Ecological modeling**

# Ecosystems are inherently complex,

vironment based on point of view of model builders

- Ecosystems are inherently complex interdependent systems
- Ecology is a question-driven discipline
- Models are developed ad-hoc (project-by-project) with little reuse
  - Each system reacts differently to stimuli
  - Multiple approaches for a single problem
  - Trade-offs: detail, scale, expense
- Models for monitoring **must be** adaptable

# **Ecological Modeling Approaches**

Ecological Question	Example Modeling Approaches
Where might species <i>X</i> be found after 5 years?	Habitat suitability index (HSI), GIS-based regression
How will climate change affect system X?	Individual (agent) , HSI modeling
Will species <i>X</i> persist in region <i>Y</i> with habitat fragmentation?	GIS, Metapopulation, Agent-based
How rapidly will species X invade area Y?	Agent-based ,GIS, System dynamics
How will disease X spread through species Y?	Demographic, Agent-based, GIS
How will pollutant <i>M</i> affect species <i>X</i> ?	Biochemical model, statistical analysis of experimental data
How much timber can be harvested	Forest growth model
How can we control pest species X?	HSI, Agent-based, System dynamics

# **Engineering v. Ecological Models (Part 1)**

	<b>Engineering Models</b>	Ecological Models
Primary Basis	Physics Chemistry (water quality)	Physics Chemistry Biology INTERACTIONS THEREOF
First principles?	Sometimes (e.g., Laws of Motion)	Rare / Never (Often do not exist)
Knowledge of dynamics	High	Low
Model Confidence	High	Low
Science/Art	90/10	25/75

# **Engineering v. Ecological Models (Part 2)**

Engineering Models	Ecological Models
Models are well developed and reusable	Most models are single-use
New application uses old models	New application uses new models
A small set of models is sufficient	A toolbox containing a dozen modeling approaches is required
The model components are well understood	Most ecological systems are poorly understood
Models are used for prediction	Models are used for exploration and education
Models are heavily science-based	Models rely on local expertise



# Why do we develop models?

#### Models!

To increase understanding

To organize thinking

To forecast future conditions

To inform decision-making

Provide a platform for critical thinking
## Models are never

#### Answers or Decisions People make decisions. Models inform people.

#### Reality

Inherently a model is an abstraction of reality.



#### A few thoughts to consider at 10,000 feet before beginning...

Think About	Ask Yourself
Purpose / Objectives	Why are you developing a model (understanding, forecasting, informing, etc.)? What are you trying to accomplish with a model? What question is being asked of the model? What is the model simulating?
Fidelity	What level of accuracy is required (exact v. relative comparison)?
Space	Where is the model targeting? What spatial resolution is of interest (none, order of magnitude)?
Time	Is the model simulating time? How long and detailed (order of magnitude)?
The Big Picture	Are the prior four categories commensurate?

## When are models (in)appropriate?

Models might help	Don't waste your time
•I don't understand my system!	•I want to predict EXACTLY what is going to happen
<ul> <li>Examining future trends</li> </ul>	
Deving out congrise	•I want "the answer"
•Playing out scenarios	•Determining value judgments
<ul> <li>Quantifying trade-offs between</li> </ul>	
alternatives	<ul> <li>Replacing critical thinking</li> </ul>
•Communicating with stakeholder or decision-makers	

#### **Common misconceptions**

#### A model cannot be built with incomplete understanding.

Managers make decisions with incomplete information all the time! This should be an added incentive for model-building as a statement of current best understanding.

#### A model must be as detailed and realistic as possible.

If models are constructed as 'purposeful representations of reality', then design the leanest model possible. Identify the variables that make the system behave and join them in the most simple of formal structures. **Parsimony is key (i.e., Einstein's aphorism...as simple as possible, but no simpler)**!

Starfield et al. (1997)

# **Types of Models**

#### Table 1. Description of model types often used for modeling environmental benefits.

Model	General Use	Example
Analytical	Systems where solution to closed form equations represent system	Population growth, Lotka- Volterra models
Conceptual	Diagramming relationships among components, organizing information, determining data needs	CEMCAT (see Fischenich 2008, for more examples)
Index	Determining habitat quality across a landscape, relates species presence to environmental variables	HSI, HGM
Simulation	Modeling dynamics of complex systems that have multiple factors interacting across scales, often have spatial components	Agent-based models, ADH- CASM, ELAM, ICM, system dynamic models
Statistical	Analysis of datasets to determine distributional properties of the data	ANOVA, goodness-of-fit, regression, t-test,
Spatial	Projects where particular spatial attributes are important can be incorporated into simulation models	GIS, EDYS

#### **Analytical Models**

Solution of closed form equations representing the system



$$\begin{bmatrix} n_0 \\ n_1 \\ \vdots \\ n_{\omega-1} \end{bmatrix}_{t+1} = \begin{bmatrix} f_0 & f_1 & f_2 & f_3 & \dots & f_{\omega-1} \\ s_0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \dots & 0 \\ 0 & s_1 & 0 & 0 & \dots & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & s_2 & 0 & \dots & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \ddots & \dots & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \dots & s_{\omega-2} & 0 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} n_0 \\ n_1 \\ \vdots \\ n_{\omega-1} \end{bmatrix}_t$$



#### **Conceptual Models**

Diagramming relationships among components, organizing information, determining data needs, framework for critical thinking



#### **Index models**

Determining ecosystem quality relative to environmental variables

Quantity \* Quality

Quality for what? Species – HSI Community – HSI Function – HGM







## **Simulation models**

### **Statistical Models**

#### Analysis of datasets to determine distributional properties of the data

Model	-2 Log  L	K	$\Delta AIC_c$	$W_I$
Phi(Maximum 10-day summer discharge), p(Discharge during sampling, species) f(Median summer discharge lag 2)	4574.1	8	0.000	0.071
Plai(Maximum 10-day summer discharge), p(Discharge during sampling, species) f(Maximum 10 day summer discharge lag 2)	4574.1	8	0.007	0.070
Plai(Maximum 10-day summer discharge), p(Discharge during sampling, species) f(Minimum 10-day spring discharge lag 2)	4574.1	8	0.056	0.069
Phi(Maximum 10-day summer discharge), p(Discharge during sampling, species) f(Minimum 10-day summer discharge lag 2)	4574.1	8	0.065	0.068
Phi(Maximum 10-day summer discharge), p(Discharge during sampling, species) f(Median spring discharge lag 2)	4574.2	8	0.120	0.067
Plii(Maximum 10-day summer discharge), p(Discharge during sampling, species) f(Maximum 10-day spring discharge lag 2)	4574.3	8	0.204	0.064
Plii(Median summer discharge), p(Discharge during sampling, species) f(Median spring discharge lag 2)	4574.9	8	0.848	0.046
Plai(Median summer discharge), p(Discharge during sampling, species) f(Maximum 10-day spring discharge lag 2)	4575.0	8	0.896	0.045
Plai(Median summer discharge), p(Discharge during sampling, species) f(Minimum 10-day spring discharge lag 2)	4575.0	8	0.897	0.045
Plai(Median summer discharge), p(Discharge during sampling, species) f(Maximum 10 day summer discharge lag 2)	4575.0	8	0.988	0.043











## **Spatial Models**

Combination of spatial attributes often coupled with simulation



## **Integrated Modeling**











Figure 2. Distance between foraging areas and heronry sites modifies SI values.



# **The Modeling Process**

#### **Ecological Model Development**



#### Key attributes for model development teams

Creativity Flexibility Quiet Determination Humility Constructive criticism Listening to local experts!



Dr. Kyle McKay, modeling

Develop, refine, collaborate, iterate!

#### Covered throughout this course, but worth emphasizing

#### Developing good modeling practices is the key

Don't rely on good models; be a good modeler Communication and documentation are underemphasized, but overly important

The value of a "strawman" or alpha-version

Key warnings:

Beware of plots without data points...

Beware of anyone claiming their ecological model is predicting exactly what the future will look like

Beware of an ecological model that is "well-behaved" (ecosystems are noisy, stochastic systems, not linear trajectories)

#### **Take-away Points**:

- Models cannot cure all that ails you.
- Models can serve as useful tools.
- Many types (and combinations) of models exist.
- Model development is iterative, but these loops can be rapid!
  Iteration helps avoid the pitfalls.

29

#### **References for Further Reading**

Grant W.E. and Swannack T.M. 2008. Ecological modeling: A common-sense approach to theory and practice. Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing.

Schmolke A., Thorbek P., DeAngelis D.L., and Grimm V. 2010. Ecological models supporting environmental decision making: A strategy for the future. Trends in Ecology and Evolution, 25: 479-486.

Swannack T.M., Fischenich J.C., and Tazik D.J. 2012. Ecological Modeling Guide for Ecosystem Restoration and Management. ERDC/EL TR-12-18, U.S. Army Engineer Research and Development Center, Vicksburg, MS.

McKay S.K. and Pruitt B.A. 2012. An Approach for Developing Regional Environmental Benefits Models. EMRRP-EBA-14, U.S. Army Engineer Research and Development Center, Vicksburg, MS.

30

# **Model Certification**

#### **Policy and Guidance**

Present – EC 1105-2-412

PB 2013-02 – Continued EC 1105-2-412

PGN Update to include model certification and process New guidance to align with principles of SMART Planning

#### Model Cert SOP

Includes details of the certification process

Also being updated in near future

5-	CECW-CP	DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY U.S. Amy Corps of Engineers Washington, D.C. 20314-1000	EC 1105-2-412
	Circular No. 1105-2-412		31 March 2011
	ASSI	EXPIRES 31 March 2013 Planning JRING QUALITY OF PLANNING MODEI	.s
	1. <u>Purpose</u> . This circular e planning models.	stablishes the propess and the requirements fo	or assuring the quality of
	<ol> <li><u>Applicability</u>. This circu (MSCs), and district comma planning models as defined</li> </ol>	lar applies to all USACE elements, Major Su nds having Civil Works responsibility. This in Paragraph 5 of this Circular.	bordinate Commands guidance applies to
	3. <u>References</u> .		
	a. The Information Qu	ality Act, Public Law No. 106-554.	
	b. Engineer Regulation	1105-2-100, Planning Guidance Notebook,	April 2000.
	c. Engineering and Cor Engineering Software in Pl	nstruction Bulletin 2007-6: Model Certification anning Studies.	on Issues for
	d. U.S. Army Corps of September 2003.	Engineers, Report of the Planning Models In	nprovement Task Force,
on	e. Office of Manageme Federal Register Vol. 70, N	nt and Budget, Final Information Quality Bu Io. 10, January 14, 2005, pp 2664-2677.	lletin for Peer Review,
	4. Background.		
re	a. The Corps of Engine in 2003 to assess the state or assure that high quality met investments in the Nation's objective of the PMIP is to and models for U.S. Army O	ers Planning Models Improvement Program ( f planning models in the Corps and to make r nods and tools are available to enable inform water resources infrastructure and natural en rarry out "a process to review, improve and y corps of Engineers (USACE) Civil Works bu	PMIP) was established ecommendations to ed decisions on vironment. The main alidate analytical tools simess programs." In

and modes for U.S. Amy Corps of Engineers (USACE) USN works ousness programs. In carrying out his initiative, a PMIP Task Force was established to examine planning model issues, assess the state of planning models in the Corps, and develop recommendations on improvements to planning models and related analytical tools. The PMIP Task Force collected the views of Corps leaders and recognized technical experts, and conducted investigations and



33

#### **Policy and Guidance**

- Continuing Authorities Program Planning Process Memo Jan 2011 Approval of planning models not required MSC responsible for assuring quality of models
  - ATR used to ensure models and analyses are:
    - Compliant with Corps policy
    - Theoretically sound
    - Computationally accurate
    - Transparent
    - Described to address limitations and use Documented appropriately





JAN 1 9 2011

DIRECTOR OF CIVIL WORKS' POLICY MEMORANDUM #1 SUBJECT: Continuing Authority Program Planning Process Improvements

 The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) seeks to be more flexible and agie in the execution of the Continuing Authority Program (CAP). The goal is to finnd and execute the projects that can move forward and remove funds from projects that cannot be executed. District and Major Subordinate Commands (MSC) must make these decisions more quickly so we do not any stage struncedimate Commande (MSC) must make these decisions more quickly so we do not have, iteratily, handles of millicos of oblican assigned to projects that are not proceeding. This memoraham modifies existing apulance with the guid of implementing improvements to the theory of the structure of the structure of the structure of the structure of the with the MSC. Inspections will be conducted to ensure that the program is being securited in accord with guidance.

2. The individual authorities known collectively as the CAP are:

a. Section 14, Flood Control Act of 1946 (PL 79-526), as amended, for emergency stream and shoreline erosion protection for public facilities and services;

b. Section 103, River and Harbor Act of 1962 (PL 87-874), as amended, amends PL 727, an Act approved August 13, 1946 which authorized Federal participation in the cost of protecting the shores of publicly owned property from hurricane and storm damage;

c. Section 107, River and Harbor Act of 1960 (PL 86-645), as amended, for navigation;

d. Section 111, River and Harbor Act of 1968 (PL 90-483), as amended, for mitigation of shoreline erosion damage caused by Federal navigation projects;

e. Section 204, Water Resources Development Act of 1992 (PL 102-580), as amended, for beneficial uses of dredeed material:

f. Section 205, Flood Control Act of 1948 (PL 80-858), as amended, for flood control;

g. Section 206, Water Resources Development Act of 1996 (PL 104-303), as amended, for aquatic ecosystem restoration;

34

#### Definitions

What is "model certification"?

"... a corporate approval that the model is sound and functional."

What is a planning model?

Models and analytical tools that planners use to define water resources management problems and opportunities, formulate potential alternatives, evaluate potential effects of alternatives, and support decision-making.

Includes all models used for planning, regardless of their scope or source

What is a "certified" planning model?

"... A planning model reviewed and certified by the appropriate Planning Center of Expertise (PCX) in accordance with the criteria and procedures specified in EC 1105-2-412."

#### **Certification Criteria**

What criteria used by the PCX as basis for certification? Technical Quality – Contemporary theory, consistent with design objectives, documented, tested

System Quality – Computational integrity, appropriately programmed, verified or stress-tested

Usability – Ease of use, availability of input, transparency, error potential, education of user

36

#### **Easier Model Approval**

Develop and use Conceptual Models Excellent tool to communicate stressors and drivers Inform level of detail Selection of model

### EARLY, EARLY, EARLY Communication with ECO-PCX

During identification of problems and opportunities

Selecting models and level of detail necessary

Selection and review should be in-progress or complete by the Alternatives Milestone

Preparation of plan for review, testing, and documentation (i.e., Model Review Plan)

In advance of any kind of internal, external, formal, or informal review

37

## **Easier Model Approval**

Complete model documentation Address model certification criteria including application to planning Documentation of prior model review and testing Reviewers' qualifications, Review charge Comments and responses, Proposed revisions to the model

Early identification of model review needs facilitates: Review process setup Concurrent review with model development

# Easier Model Approval

Already reviewed model?

Provide review documentation including:

reviewers' qualifications,

Review charge

comments and responses,

proposed revisions to the model.

Don't overlook Quality Control of your spreadsheets to ensure computational correctness and usability.

Early identification of model review needs facilitates:

Review process setup

Concurrent review with model development

38

38

#### b. Measuring Ecological Outcomes and Monitoring & Adaptive Management (MAMP)

(Note: For an accessible version of appendix Gb, please visit <a href="https://ewn.el.erdc.dren.mil/projects/products19-15/Ecological-Habitat-Modeling-Workshop-Appendix-Gb.pdf">https://ewn.el.erdc.dren.mil/projects/products19-15/Ecological-Habitat-Modeling-Workshop-Appendix-Gb.pdf</a>.)

MEASURING ECOLOGICAL OUTCOMES AND MONITORING & ADAPTIVE MANAGEMENT (MAMP)

Brook D. Herman and Todd M. Swannack U.S. Army Corps of Engineers Engineer Research and Development Center –

Environmental Laboratory

Swan Island Workshop

April 11, 2019

#### Workshop

- Presentation/Labs (Group Participation)
- Modeling Basics
- Conceptualization + (Lab 1)
- Quantification + (Lab 2)
- Evaluation/Application
- Communication/Monitoring Plan + (Lab 3)
- ► Presentation
  - ► Ecological Restoration
  - Measuring Ecological Outcomes

# <complex-block>

## OVERVIEW

**Ecosystem Restoration**: the assisted recovery of ecosystem structure, function or process that had been degraded, damaged or destroyed

Monitoring and Adaptive Management: deliberate collection of data in order to understand impact of actions (restoration) to system of interest, to make informed management decisions and to apply understanding to future projects.

## SWAN ISLAND ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION





## MONITORING REQUIRES UNDERSTANDING OF SYSTEM DYNAMICS

An ecosystem is greater than the sum of its parts. -Eugene P. Odum

# ECOLOGICAL SYSTEMS



**Structure**: "refers to both the composition of the ecosystem (i.e., its various parts) and the physical and biological organization defining how those parts are organized"

**Function/Process:** "describes a process that takes place in an ecosystem as a result of the interactions of plants, animals, and other organisms in the ecosystem with each other or their environment"

> Comprised of numerous ongoing processes

## ECOSYSTEM STRUCTURE AND FUNCTION/PROCESS



Component	Description	Examples
Hydrogeomorphology	<b>Physical processes</b> governing geologic setting, climate, hydrologic cycling, and watershed land use with implications for channel morphology, sediment regimes, channel hydraulics, and hydrologic connectivity	Sediment Transport
Biogeochemistry	<b>Chemical processes</b> driving the concentration, fate, and transport of nutrients, contaminants, and other constituents	Salinity
Biological Systems	<b>Reproduction, survival, and movement</b> of living components of an ecosystem	Vegetation
Socio-economics	Instrumental value of ecosystems to humans	Storm Protection
Cultural-personal values	Intrinsic value of ecosystems to humans and resulting influence of humans on ecosystems	Loss of Bay Islands

## COMPONENTS OF ECOSYSTEMS

# What natural disturbances govern ecosystem structure and function?

- <u>Pulses</u>: discrete events (e.g., Storms)
- <u>Presses</u>: slowly escalating events (e.g., **Boat Wake**, **Recreation**)
- <u>Ramps</u>: slowly changing conditions (e.g., Sea Level Rise)

#### What is the disturbance regime?

i.e., magnitude, frequency, duration, timing, and rate of change (sensu, Poff et al. 1997)

Is the system "stationary"? Are disturbance regimes changing?

## TEMPORAL VARIABILITY






- Ecosystems are complex, self-organizing, interacting systems
- Modeling provides mechanism to capture current knowledge of the system, identify important process/interactions, facilitate communication, and increase transparency

#### WHY MODELS?



- Communicate the "process"
- Synthesize understanding of system function
- Understand and diagnose underlying stressors
- > Develop a common "mental picture"
- Identify metrics for project planning, monitoring, and adaptive management
- Guide numerical model development
- Guide and plan restoration alternatives
- Identify R&D needs

HOW ARE CONCEPTUAL MODELS USED IN ENVIRONMENTAL MONITORING?



- 2. Identify important components/drivers/stressors of the system
- 3. Determine measurable metrics to collect data
- Forecast/predict change in metrics over time

### MEASURING ECOLOGICAL OUTCOMES



#### Example

- Delignment of the second secon
- 2. System Components: substrate, hydrology, herbivory, storms, stem density
- 3. Metrics:
  - a) stem density: number of stems per plot
  - 2. b) depth: average depth of plot at low tide
- 4. Predictions:
  - Stem density will increase over time (Years 1-5) to reach a maximum of 50 stems (over predefined area)
  - 2. Depth will be maintained at an average of 0.05 meters after sediment placement (Years 1-5)



### MEASURING ECOLOGICAL OUTCOMES

Monitoring Ecosystem Restoration Considerations:

- What is restoration "success"?
- 2. Compare monitoring results to reference conditions?
- 3. Will you use monitoring data to determine when success has been met?



Conceptual model used as template for quantitative model development, which better identifies metrics for monitoring (i.e., don't collect unnecessary data)



### MEASURING ECOLOGICAL OUTCOMES

- Environmental restoration projects are complex and identifying metrics for monitoring benefits is crucial
- Ecological modeling provides tool to conceptualize system in an adaptive framework
- Models are developed for a specific purpose. Consider how monitoring data will be used before collecting it.
- Clearly documenting each step of the process increases transparency, and scientific defensibility

#### TAKE HOME POINTS

#### Appendix H: Model Development: Conceptualization

(Note: For an accessible version of appendix H, please visit <u>https://ewn.el.erdc.dren.mil/projects/products\_19-15/Ecological-Habitat-Modeling-Workshop-Appendix-H.pdf</u>.)

## Model Development: Conceptualization

Brook Herman 601-634-3248 brook.d.herman@usace.army.mil

Modeling Workshop Swan Island Ecosystem Restoration April 11, 2019



US Army Corps of Engineers.



Engineer Research and Development Center



## **Lecture Overview**

- What are conceptual models?
- Development of conceptual models
- Characteristics of useful conceptual models
- Pitfalls and good practices
- Documentation

Much (i.e., most) of the content in this lecture was graciously provided by Drs. Craig Fischenich, Tomma Barnes, Kyle McKay and Todd Swannack (See references at end of lecture).





**BUILDING STRONG®** 

A conceptual model is a tentative description of a system or sub-system that serves as a basis for intellectual organization.



Conceptual models describe general functional relationships among essential ecosystem components. They tell the story of "how the system works."



## How are conceptual models used in ecosystem restoration?

- Communicate the restoration "process"
- Synthesize understanding of system function
- Understand and diagnose underlying stressors
- Develop a common "mental picture"
- Identify metrics for project planning, monitoring, and adaptive management
- Guide numerical model development
- Guide and plan restoration alternatives
- Identify R&D needs





**BUILDING STRONG** 

## A few stipulations...

- The same system can have many potential conceptual models
- CMs reflects our personal understanding and viewpoint

#### Conceptual models are <u>NOT</u>:

- The truth they are simplified depictions of reality
- Comprehensive they focus only upon those parts of an ecosystem deemed relevant while ignoring other important (but not immediately germane) elements
- Final they provide a flexible framework that evolves as understanding of the ecosystem increases



## How are conceptual models used in ecological model development?

- Team building
- Communication and general understanding
- Sometimes two models are helpful to describe:
  - A team's complex thinking via a descriptive model
  - A simplified model as a basis for quantification
- BUT for model development a conceptual model must translate into quantifiable processes



BUILDING STRONG<sub>®</sub>

## **Types of Conceptual Models**

Type of model	Description	Strengths	Drawbacks		
Narrative	Use word descriptions, mathematical or symbolic formula	Summarizes literature, information rich	No visual presentation of important linkages		
Tabular	Table or two-dimensional array	Conveys the most information	May be difficult to comprehend amount of information		
Picture models	Depict ecosystem function with plots, diagrams, or drawings	Good for portraying broad-scale patterns	Difficult to model complex ecosystems or interactions		
Box and arrow (Stressor model)	Reduce ecosystems to key components and relationships	Intuitively simple, one-way flow, clear link between stressor and vital signs	No feedback, few or no mechanisms, not quantitative		
Input/output matrix (Control model)	Box and arrow with flow (mass, energy, nutrients, etc.) between components	Quantitative, most realistic, feedback and interactions	Complicated, hard to communicate, state dynamics may not be apparent		



BUILDING STRONG<sub>®</sub> Table: Gucciardo et al. (2004), Fischenich (2008)

## **Example: Currituck Sound Estuary Restoration**





Figure: Orth et al. (2006), Kemp et al. (2004)

# Development of conceptual models





**BUILDING STRONG**<sub>®</sub>

## **Conceptual Model Development**

- State the model objectives.
- Bound the system of interest.
- Identify critical model components within the system of interest.
- Articulate the relationships among the components of interest.
- Represent the conceptual model.
- Describe the expected pattern of model behavior.
- Test, review, and revise as needed.



**BUILDING STRONG** 



## **Craft Matters**

Help readers by grouping related elements, aligning elements, and minimizing crossed lines.

#### These are the same!



## **Presentation Tips**

- Combine graphical and narrative descriptions
- Align boxes, both horizontally and vertically
- Maximize 'content: eg. use line types or weights, shapes, and colors to show important information
- Avoid shaded boxes that photocopy poorly
- Limit complexity

**BUILDING STRONG** 

- Aggregate lines when possible
- Adapt to target audience and presentation medium



## Conceptual model development example: Marsh Vegetation





**BUILDING STRONG®** 

## State the model objectives

- Marsh restoration has become a major source of investment throughout the region for habitat, storm protection and fisheries.
- A comprehensive framework accounting for the benefits of these efforts has not been developed.
- Our objective is to develop a model for assessing the benefits of marsh vegetation restoration in the bay.





**BUILDING STRONG®** 

## **Bound the system**

- Chesapeake Bay
- Current and potential tidal marsh areas



### **Identify model components**

- Applied a driver-stressor framework
- Focused on ecosystem benefits and service oriented outcomes

Social Context	Public opinion Regulations Resource Usage Management actions	Attitudes Legal constraints Quality of life Construction	Funding Political jurisdiction Demand / supply Restoration	Population growth Policies Conservation
Drivers Stressors	Urban Land Use Agriculture Land Use Resource Extraction Ecosystem engineers Infrastructure Climate Change	Impoundments Land Use Type/Intensity Channel Alteration/Piping Wastewater Non-Point Runoff Silviculture Timber Beavers Transportation Temperature	Road Crossings Riparian Land Use Bank treatment Industrial discharge Septic/sewer discharge Crop Mines Invasive species Dams Precipitation	Bridges / Culverts Temporary Land Uses Power generation Animals Sand and Gravel Withdrawals
State Sub-State	Channel Form Flow Regime Water Quality Connectivity	CEM-I CEM-IV Minimally Impacted Damped Minimally Impacted Physio-Chemical Impact Upstream & Downstream Downstream Only	CEM-II CEM-V Flashy Damped with Peaking Nutrient Enrichment Chemical Contamination Upstream Only Isolated	CEM-III Engineered
Services	Existence Value Heritage / Future Use Cultural Value Recreation Flow Regime Water Quality Resource extraction Air quality Public Health	Aesthetics Educational Boating Wildlife Observation Flood attenuation Municipal Withdrawal Treatment Cost Sand and gravel Micro-climate regulation Disease regulation	Spiritual Ecotourism Fishing Water Contact Flood Conveyance Industrial Use Waste Assimilation Timber Carbon sequestration Vector control	Historical Social cohesion Hunting Hydropower Agricultural Withdrawal

BUILDING STRONG®

## Identify relationships between components

- Literature and data resources cataloged (e.g., effects of urban land use on flow regime and resulting effects on recreational fishing)
- Model maintained in a very flexible format
  - Future versions of the model will eliminate some model components.
  - At this juncture, physical, chemical, and biological processes linking drivers, states, and services are not fully explained.





**BUILDING STRONG®** 

### **Develop representations of the model**



## Describe expected patterns of model behavior



### Test, review, document, and revise

- Generalized model was beta tested for a few key processes
- Model documented in reports and peer-reviewed at an external conference and internal outlet
- Model undergoing revision as part of a research program on urban streams

An Approach for Developing **Regional Environmental Benefits** Models by S. Kyle McKay' and Bruce A. Pr

Abstract, Under rapid land use change, high deman-

n freshwater ecosystem services, and a growing apprecia-ion for the value of functioning ecosystems, the Appalaout has developed a multi-mi FROC TNJEMPRO-FRA-1/

OVERVIEW: Ecosystem restoration projects in a given region often have similar driver stressors, state conditions, and ecosystem services. Moreover, objectives and accompanyin etrics may be similar enough to encourage regional model development. Regional appro environmental benefits analysis offer opportunities to streamline project evaluation by developin environmental ordentis anarysis oles objectuatines to suedaniale project evaluations of vieresiping consistent understanding, metrics, and models. This technical node proposes a framework for developing regionally applicable environmental benefits models. The proposed framework is demonstrated for streams in the Applachatina Predmont. This approach could serve as a basis for developing consistent restoration outputs that can be combined and compared at regional scales

INTRODUCTION: Owing to the complexity and variability of natural systems, accounting for th benefits of ecosystem restoration, management, and mitigation efforts with scientifically based repeatable, and transparent techniques can be challenging (Fischenich et al, in preparation). To overcome these obstacles, models of environmental effects have been developed in regions with similar hydrologic, geomorphic, and ecological processes (e.g., ecoregions or physiographi provinces). Some commonly applied regional models of environmental benefit and impact includ minices of boott integrity (Rar 1991, Sunogor and Angemmeier 2001, Georgia Department of Natural Resources ((GA-DNR) 2005), wetland assessments with hydrogeomorphic methods (Brinson 1995), Smith et al. 1995, Brinson and Kheinhard 11996), and regional sevironmental flow standards (Poff et al. 2010, Snelder et al. 2011). Herein, these regional approaches are augment with standard methods for conceptual and numerical model development. The result of th combined approach is a framework for developing regionally applicable models of environmer benefits. Although regional models have been developed for varying purposes (e.g., imp assessment, mitigation requirements), the focus of this technical note is on the regional approach a

it pertains to the evaluation of proposed ecosystem restoration projects. The regional modelin approach outlined here may help USACE planners develop scientifically based models of environmental benefits and construct model documentation capable of addressing rigorous quality assurance standards typically highlighted during various internal and external pee processes

WHY DEVELOP A REGIONAL MODEL? Prior to examining the framework for regiona model development, it is constructive to review strengths and weaknesses of regional models. Th primary advantages of developing a regional model include

<sup>1</sup>U.S. Army Engineer Research and Development Center (ERDC), Environm Phone: 601-415-7160, Fax: 601-634-3912, <u>Kyla McKay/duasea army mil</u> <sup>3</sup> ERDC-EL, Athens, GA, Phone: 706-201-8678, <u>Bruce Prait/duasea.army n</u> antal Laboratory (FL) Athans GA

Pigdmont strasms have been adve and use practices spanning nearly two centuries, al cotton farming practices of the 1800s and sa aduced simuficant erosion such that, in muc induced significant erosion such that, in much Piedmont, the original topsoil has eroded away o red clay sub-toils (Jackson et al. 2005, Trimble 20



**BUILDING STRONG** 

Innovative solutions for a safer, better world

ERDC



CONSTRUCTING A CONCEPTUAL MODEL LINKING DRIVERS AND ECOSYSTEM SERVICES IN PERMONT STREAMS S. Kyle McKay<sup>1</sup>, Bruce A. Fruitt<sup>1</sup>, Christopher J. Anderson<sup>2</sup>, Joanna Curran<sup>3</sup>, Ana Del Arco Ochos Mary C. Freeman<sup>3</sup>, Brends Rashleigh<sup>4</sup>, and E. Dean Trawick<sup>7</sup>

127

## Characteristics of useful conceptual models



ERDC

**BUILDING STRONG®** 

## Characteristics of useful conceptual models

- Relevant to the problem
- Directed at the appropriate spatial and temporal scales
- Strike an appropriate balance between over-simplification and over-sophistication.
- Underpinned by sound scientific knowledge



**BUILDING STRONG** 



## Good conceptual ecological models should include:

- Most important components (e.g., drivers, both internal (e.g., flow rates) and external (e.g., climate)), that reflect the model objectives and help us answer questions about the system (how agencies can effect change).
- Critical thresholds of ecological processes and environmental conditions
- Discussion of assumptions and gaps in the state of knowledge, especially those that limit the predictability of restoration outcomes.
- Identification of current characteristics of the system that may limit the achievement of management outcomes.
- Adequate references to substantiate the model.





**BUILDING STRONG®** 

## **Reviewing conceptual models**

- Does it appropriately identify the assumptions, limitations, areas of disagreement, and gaps in the state of knowledge?
- Will the model's functionality shift through time (e.g., will processes change with land use or climate)?
- Does it sufficiently account for long-term environmental variability and disturbance (e.g., drought, hurricanes)?



# Pitfalls and good practices (Grant and Swannack 2008)





**BUILDING STRONG®**
## **Pitfalls: Scope**

- Inadequate definition of model purpose
  - ▶ "To understand..." is dangerous
- Implicit criteria for model evaluation
  - ► What are the criteria that make this model useful?
- No description of model context
  - ► How will the model be applied in the "real-world"?





**BUILDING STRONG®** 

## **Pitfalls: Bounding the System**

- Casual choice of scale for the system-of-interest
   What is the spatio-temporal scale of decision making?
- Inclusion of too many components
  - ► It is easy to get lost in the weeds
- Careless categorization of system components
  - Categorize relative to model (not ecological) function
- Inclusion of excessive detail







## **Pitfalls: Logic Traps**

- Inclusion of circular logic
  - Ecological processes often rely on feedback loops, but don't let your whole model be a feedback loop
- Lack of precision in conceptual model diagram
  - Modeling definitions are useful, so learning the language and process is time well-spent
- Reluctance to make initial hypotheses about system behavior
  - Write down some initial ideas. Does the model perform as expected?





BUILDING STRONG®

### Take-away Points:

- Conceptual models come in all shapes and sizes.
- We're focused on developing conceptual models that are transitioned into QUANTITATIVE TOOLS.
- Conceptual model development can be facilitated by iterative application of the steps summarized here.

### Up Next:

Step 2 of the Modeling process – Quantification

### Later Today:

Lab Exercise – Develop a Conceptual Model



## **References for Further Reading**

- Fischenich J.C. 2008. The application of conceptual models to ecosystem restoration. ERDC/EBA TN-08-01.
- Grant W.E. and Swannack T.M. 2008. Ecological modeling: A common-sense approach to theory and practice. Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing.
- Casper A.F., Efroymson R.A., Davis S.M., Steyer G., and Zettle B. 2010. Improving conceptual model development: Avoiding underperformance due to project uncertainties. ERDC-TN-EMRRP-EBA-5.
- Henderson J.E. and O'Neil L.J. 2007. Template for conceptual model construction: Model review and Corps applications. ERDC TN-SWWRP-07-4.
- Henderson J.E. and O'Neil L.J. 2007. Template for conceptual model construction: Model components and application of the template. ERDC TN-SWWRP-07-7.



**BUILDING STRONG** 



## **Conceptual Modeling Tools**

- Quiet + Pencil + Paper (or maybe Powerpoint)
- Conceptual Ecological Model Construction Assistance Tool (CEMCAT)
- EPA's Causal Analysis/Diagnosis Decision Information System (CADDIS, <u>http://www.epa.gov/caddis/</u>)
- Integration and Application Network (IAN, <u>http://ian.umces.edu/</u>)





**Narrative**: A heart-shaped watershed with 30 miles of habitat and 2 small mill dams





### **Appendix I: Model Quantification: Gettin' Mathy** With It

(Note: For an accessible version of appendix I, please visit <u>https://ewn.el.erdc.dren.mil/projects/products\_19-15/Ecological-Habitat-Modeling-Workshop-Appendix-I.pdf</u>.)

# Model Quantification

GETTIN' MATHY WITH IT.

### Outline

Why quantify?

What type of math?

What's the time step?

**Functional forms** 

**Parameter estimates** 

Quick, dirty, yet scientifically defensible tricks to generate patterns Pitfalls

## Don't have to be good at math!

Biologists and ecologists have deep understanding of their systems, but generally aren't exposed to advanced mathematical techniques

Elegant mathematical solutions are neat, but they're not the only approach

If you have an understanding of your system, you can model it

## Quantification

Quantifying models provides ability to understand numerical consequences of ideas, scenarios, system dynamics, etc..

### Conceptual Model should be used a template

- Equations should be tightly coupled with conceptual model
- Helps with communication and transparency
- Don't hide behind the math/code



# Choosing appropriate mathematics & software

### In Theory:

- Results should not depend on software or advanced math
- What is important is that the critical processes are captured

### In Practice:

- Software/Mathematics affect efficiency and computation time
- Need to identify up-front how model will be quantified
- Mechanistic (process-based) models aren't developed that often for USACE planning
  - Statistical equations (correlations) used as proxies

## How do you choose the approach?

Experience	$N_{t+1}$	= 1	$V_t +$	(bi	irth	s - a	dea	ths]	)	$\frac{\mathrm{d}N}{\mathrm{d}r} = rN$	$\left(1-\frac{N}{K}\right)$	
Comfort-level		[ <b>F</b> .	F.	F.		F	Fl	Г	- <b>N</b> ₀ 1	dt		
Deadlines	M <sub>A</sub> =	P <sub>0</sub> 0 0 :	0 P <sub>1</sub> 0 : 0	0 0 P <sub>2</sub> : 0	  	0 0 0 : P <sub>m-1</sub>	0 0 0 : 0	n <sub>A</sub> =	$ \begin{array}{c} \mathbf{N}_{0}\\ \mathbf{N}_{1}\\ \mathbf{N}_{2}\\ \vdots\\ \mathbf{N}_{m-1}\\ \mathbf{N}_{m} \end{array} $			7
Question being asked												, <b>•</b> •

Simpler is better – Don't make it too complicated!

## Choosing the time step

## Have to choose how often the model is updated, and how long to run it.

- We plan for 50 yr horizon, but how often do you need to calculate changes in order to get an accurate idea?
  - What processes are you interested in? How often do they occur?
  - Time step needs to reflect what's happening in nature, not what's convenient
  - Don't have to choose familiar units
  - Can use 12 seconds, 3 days, 14 months, 50 yrs, etc...

## Time step, con't.

Can have nested time-steps within a model

What level of precision is necessary?

## **Functional Forms of Equations**

### How should relationships be quantified?



## What if functional forms are unknown?

### Use verbal descriptions and graphical functions

- Try to explain the relationship in a minute, then draw a picture
- Graphical representations provide an intermediate step between verbal and mathematical representations.



#### Linear functions:

simplest relationship; the general relationship between two variables is understood (e.g., variable A increases when variable B decreases), but the exact form is not



## Types of data and parameterizations

#### **Quantitative Data**

- Field work
- Remotely sensed
- Other models
- Literature
- Theory

#### **Qualitative data**

- Expert opinion
- Hypotheses

### The model itself

Experimenting with model can reveal trends and patterns





## Capturing feedbacks and thresholds

## All environmental systems have feedback (positive/negative) and thresholds

- E.g., crowding in populations is a negative feedback
- Species viability changes under different environmental conditions

## These effects are often difficult to determine precisely in nature

## **Integrated Models**

### Using Hydrodynamic Models

- Integrated Models are models composed of multiple models
- USACE modeling generally combines hydrodynamic and ecological models



CH3D temperature, salinity, used as inputs for Oyster Restoration model



Oyster metapopulation used ADH velocity, flow, and WQ data



SWAT (watershed model) calculated flow, and velocity to determine Zebra mussel larval mortality

# Quantifying inputs from hydrodynamic models

### Important considerations

 What time scale is important to the ecological components of the system?

- Hydrodynamic models can run at small time steps that might not be link well with ecological processes.
  - Cumulative effects are more important (E.g., does seagrass care what happens every 30 seconds, or are exposures over weeks or months more important?

• Requires aggregation of Hydro model data to reasonable scales

# Quantifying inputs from hydrodynamic models

• Are you interested in historical patterns or future patterns?

- Does the hydro data contain a range of values that can show wide range of ecological response? If not, inference from eco model limited.
- Critical to organize with Hydro modeling team to ensure data will be delivered in appropriate format/scales
  - Costly and time-consuming to redo simulations

## **Quantifying Thresholds**

### Quickest way is with step-functions or if-then statements

• Equations are almost never reported



**Typical HSI Representation** 

$\begin{array}{ll} MSSS \leq 5 \mbox{ or } MSSS > 40 & OSI_{MSSS} = 0 \\ 5 < MSSS \leq 10 & OSI_{MSSS} = -0.3 + (0.06 * MSSS) \\ 10 < MSSS \leq 15 & OSI_{MSSS} = -0.4 + (0.07 * MSSS) \\ 15 < MSSS < 18 & OSI_{MSSS} = -1.1 + (0.1167 * MSSS) \\ 18 \leq MSSS \leq 22 & OSI_{MSSS} = 1 \\ 22 < MSSS \leq 30 & OSI_{MSSS} = 2.925 - (0.0875 * MSSS) \\ 30 < MSSS \leq 35 & OSI_{MSSS} = 1.5 - (0.04 * MSSS) \\ 35 < MSSS \leq 40 & OSI_{MSSS} = 0.8 - (0.02 * MSSS) \end{array}$		
$\begin{array}{ll} 5 < MSSS \leq 10 & OSI_{MSSS} = -0.3 + (0.06 * MSSS) \\ 10 < MSSS \leq 15 & OSI_{MSSS} = -0.4 + (0.07 * MSSS) \\ 15 < MSSS < 18 & OSI_{MSSS} = -1.1 + (0.1167 * MSSS) \\ 18 \leq MSSS \leq 22 & OSI_{MSSS} = 1 \\ 22 < MSSS \leq 30 & OSI_{MSSS} = 2.925 - (0.0875 * MSSS) \\ 30 < MSSS \leq 35 & OSI_{MSSS} = 1.5 - (0.04 * MSSS) \\ 35 < MSSS \leq 40 & OSI_{MSSS} = 0.8 - (0.02 * MSSS) \end{array}$	$MSSS \le 5 \text{ or } MSSS > 40$	$OSI_{MSSS} = 0$
$ \begin{array}{ll} 10 < MSSS \leq 15 & OSI_{MSSS} = -0.4 + (0.07 * MSSS) \\ 15 < MSSS < 18 & OSI_{MSSS} = -1.1 + (0.1167 * MSSS) \\ 18 \leq MSSS \leq 22 & OSI_{MSSS} = 1 \\ 22 < MSSS \leq 30 & OSI_{MSSS} = 2.925 - (0.0875 * MSSS) \\ 30 < MSSS \leq 35 & OSI_{MSSS} = 1.5 - (0.04 * MSSS) \\ 35 < MSSS \leq 40 & OSI_{MSSS} = 0.8 - (0.02 * MSSS) \\ \end{array} $	$5 < MSSS \le 10$	$OSI_{MSSS} = -0.3 + (0.06 * MSSS)$
$15 < MSSS < 18$ $OSI_{MSSS} = -1.1 + (0.1167 * MSSS)$ $18 \le MSSS \le 22$ $OSI_{MSSS} = 1$ $22 < MSSS \le 30$ $OSI_{MSSS} = 2.925 - (0.0875 * MSSS)$ $30 < MSSS \le 35$ $OSI_{MSSS} = 1.5 - (0.04 * MSSS)$ $35 < MSSS \le 40$ $OSI_{MSSS} = 0.8 - (0.02 * MSSS)$	$10 < MSSS \le 15$	$OSI_{MSSS} = -0.4 + (0.07 * MSSS)$
$18 \le MSSS \le 22$ $OSI_{MSSS} = 1$ $22 \le MSSS \le 30$ $OSI_{MSSS} = 2.925 - (0.0875 * MSSS)$ $30 \le MSSS \le 35$ $OSI_{MSSS} = 1.5 - (0.04 * MSSS)$ $35 \le MSSS \le 40$ $OSI_{MSSS} = 0.8 - (0.02 * MSSS)$	15 < MSSS < 18	$OSI_{MSSS} = -1.1 + (0.1167 * MSSS)$
$\begin{array}{ll} 22 < MSSS \leq 30 & OSI_{MSSS} = 2.925 - (0.0875 * MSSS) \\ 30 < MSSS \leq 35 & OSI_{MSSS} = 1.5 - (0.04 * MSSS) \\ 35 < MSSS \leq 40 & OSI_{MSSS} = 0.8 - (0.02 * MSSS) \end{array}$	$18 \le MSSS \le 22$	$OSI_{MSSS} = 1$
$30 < MSSS \le 35$ $OSI_{MSSS} = 1.5 - (0.04 * MSSS)$ $35 < MSSS \le 40$ $OSI_{MSSS} = 0.8 - (0.02 * MSSS)$	$22 < MSSS \le 30$	$OSI_{MSSS} = 2.925 - (0.0875 * MSSS)$
$35 < MSSS \le 40$ $OSI_{MSSS} = 0.8 - (0.02 * MSSS)$	$30 < MSSS \le 35$	$OSI_{MSSS} = 1.5 - (0.04 * MSSS)$
	$35 < MSSS \le 40$	$OSI_{MSSS} = 0.8 - (0.02 * MSSS)$

Take advantage of the math! (equations look smarter)

### Seagrass quantification (Yaquina Bay, OR)



## Re-quantifying model for new area





In first application (Yaquina Bayt), depth worked well. In second (Puget Sound), *Depth* relationship didn't capture the relationship as well. Have to re-quantify, or re-conceptualize functional form based on data.

## Quantification for Kelp and Seagrass

#### Ideal conditions:

- clear water (light availability)
- nutrient-rich waters
- moderate water movement
- 20 C (68 F) temperatures
- typical depth range 25 90 feet

#### Ideal conditions:

- Z. marina near-shore, estuarine areas- clear water (low turbidity and high PAR light)
- calmer waters
- optimal temperature 50-68 F
- typically 0-8 foot depths, max 20 feet
- 4 97% sand composition
- salinity 10-30 ppt

## Missing data

### There are often relationships that aren't defined quantitatively

- Have to rely on expert opinion
- Literature
- Interpolations

## This is not less rigorous than quantitative data analysis, just less precise

Qualitative data requires increased attention in the documentation

## Will make bigger mistake leaving out important relationships than hypothesizing about relationships

Increased need for transparency

## Quantifying feedbacks w/o data





Tell the story! In this case, negative feedback causes incremental decrease in growth Quick way to generate patterns

## Quantifying expert opinion: Habitat



## Modeling without data

Decisions will need to be made, regardless of data availability

**Need for transparency** 

Simple functions can help identify magnitude and general trends in absence of data

Expert opinion can be used to parameterize equations until other datasets are available

## **Considering Scale**

System properties emerge as scale changes

**O**GoTeamEcoMod

## **Spatial Modeling**

Incorporating topographic, geomorphic, and/or land use patterns into models to understand how changes in spatial configurations affect ecological dynamics

### **Space matters**

 Configuration and composition of landscapes can affect ecological structure and function

http://www.slideshare.net/gceyre/what-is-gis-9719692

## **Considering Space**



## Working with spatial models

### **Considerations:**

- Location-based differences across the project area
- What spatial scale is relevant?
  - Link ecological processes to a spatial scale (i.e., the grid/DEM/etc)


### interactive Toolkit for Applied Modeling (TAM)

Platform developed for rapid model development

**Quantifies threshold-based datasets** 

**Certified for USACE** 



### **Choosing inappropriate mathematics & software**

- Not all formats lend themselves to a given problem
- Can get trapped by constraints of approach

### Not choosing appropriate time step

- Too long: violate assumption that change is system is constant b/w time steps
- Too short: lose interpretability, longer simulation time

### **Relying on automated parameterization techniques**

 Processes that test every possible combination of parameter values can quickly turn the model into a black box

### Using overly sophisticated equations

 It's easy to rely on fancy stats, but make sure they are appropriate for the objective of the model

# Uninterpretable functional relationships/coefficients without meaning

• Functional relationships should make sense (within your discipline)

Coefficients should reflect magnitude of process occurring in nature

### Not paying attention to units of measure

Can violate assumptions and create nonsensical results

### No clear verbal description

- If you can't explain it clearly, you can't math it correctly
- Try to explain it in one minute where you get hung up can help identify problem areas

### Don't consider graphical relationships

- Intermediate step b/w verbal and mathematical model
- Can serve as proxy for formalized equations

### **Reluctance to use qualitative information**

• Specific numbers can be difficult to find. Stories aren't.

### Removing functional relationships due to lack of data

### Appendix J: Model Evaluation/Application: Does Your Model Make Sense & to Anyone Else?

(Note: For an accessible version of appendix J, please visit <u>https://ewn.el.erdc.dren.mil/projects/products\_19-15/Ecological-Habitat-Modeling-Workshop-Appendix-J.pdf.</u>)

# MODEL EVALUATION/ APPLICATION

### DOES YOUR MODEL MAKE SENSE & TO SOMEONE ELSE?

### **OVERVIEW**

What is evaluation?

Why is it useful?

How do you evaluate environmental models?

**Dealing with uncertainty.** 

**Practical Evaluation Techniques** 

Pitfalls

### **EVALUATION**

- Process of rigorously assessing model components, structure, parameter values, assumptions, but not scenario results
- Commonly called model validation
  - Models represent a point of view of a system.
    Validation probably not the best term b/c it indicates a model can be true. Are opinions true?
  - Evaluation captures the essence of validation without connoting that the model is true
- Process needs to ensure scientific defensibility and transparency

### **EVALUATION CON'T.**

Ę

- Is the model useful for its intended purpose?
  - Given the assumptions, structure, and assumptions, can the model be used for what the developers intended.

### • What are its limits and weaknesses?

- Under what conditions does the model break?
- Should you try to break it?
- Is it re-creatable?

## **EVALUATION IS OFTEN NOT RIGOROUS**

### **Detailed evaluation is rare**

- Overly rely on software
- Don't have time
- Aren't concerned with recreatability
- Discipline hasn't required it
  - Small field & modeling was esoteric
  - But most agencies rely on models now
  - Increased need for scientifically-defensible and detailed documentation
  - TRACE (Transparent and comprehensive model evaluation)

### **PROBLEMS WITH EVALUATION**

### Different disciplines have different expectations of model performance

	Hydrological Modeling	<b>Ecological Modeling</b>
Main Focus	Water	Persistence of species
Sub focus	Chemistry of water	Dynamic relationships
Environmental Hierarchy Target	Landscape	Molecular (Genetics) Organ systems / tissues Individuals Populations Landscape Ecosystem Biome
First principles?	Sometimes	Never %
Model confidence	High	Low
Science/Art	99/1	25/75
Knowledge of dynamics	High	Low





10

## **PROBLEMS WITH EVALUATION**

### **Biggest issue is failure to document entire evaluation process**

- Iterative approach
- Evaluation occurs throughout the modeling process, but is rarely documented thoroughly. Need to document each cycle.



## **STEPS IN EVALUATING ENVIRONMENTAL MODELS**

- 1) Assess reasonableness of model structure
- 2) Assess functional relationships & verify code
- 3) Evaluate model behavior vs expected patterns
- 4) Does model correspond well to data from real system?
- 5) Document uncertainty

## ASSESS REASONABLENESS OF MODEL STRUCTURE

- Does the structure make sense?
  - Absolutely required for explanatory models (most environmental models), but not really for correlative models, which are less focused on capturing relationships b/w variables

### Somewhat subjective

- Requires a priori hypotheses to test functional relationships
- There are always simpler and more complex models

## **DO THE FUNCTIONAL FORMS MAKE SENSE?**

Ę

- Do the functional forms of the equations generate reasonable output given the other components in the model?
- Equations may not stand up after they're coupled with other model components



### **EVALUATING FUNCTIONS**

Each function must be evaluated separately, then again when coupled to other components. Document each step!



## DOES MODEL ACT LIKE YOU THOUGHT IT WOULD?

# A priori expectations are critical for thorough evaluation

- Without documenting expected patterns of behavior, it becomes difficult to ascertain whether the model is producing the correct values
- Evaluate code and each function to make sure everything is being calculated correctly
- Practice iterative evaluation



### SEAGRASS EXAMPLE

 In general, environmental models are used to project system dynamics, so some understanding of how output compares to real data can be useful.



 Model does a good job of predicting presence of Z. japonica, as well as predicting its absence.

## **MODEL SENSITIVITY**

# Determines degree of response of model behavior to changes in various components.

- Provides indication of relative accuracy of each parameter
- Run model over range of values
  representing degree of uncertainty
- Indicates level of confidence we have with model's ability to address question

### WHAT ABOUT MODELS WITH HIGH UNCERTAINTY/MISSING DATA?

# Pattern-oriented modeling

- Parameterize different versions of model that represent range of uncertainty
- Compare results to observed or hypothesized patterns
- Discard models that don't match multiple patterns





Sex Ratio

## PATTERN ORIENTED MODELING, CON'T.

Carry the analysis forward with models that weren't removed



## PATTERN ORIENTED MODELING



#### 9 Patterns analyzed

- Infestation rates
- Bird densities in shade
- Foraging patterns (3)
- Vegetation characteristics & bird densities
- Bird movement patterns
- Bird consumption of beetles



How land use and habitat diversity affect migratory bird populations and their ability to suppress an insect pest on Jamaican coffee farms

## DISCOVERING THE MODEL'S LIMITS

# How does the model perform under extreme circumstances?

• Run model across wide range of values outside of range

### **Break the model!**

Critical for understanding how model functions across a wide range of conditions.

### **SEAGRASS EXAMPLE**

# Developed model for *Zostera japonica* (invasive seagrass in PNW)

 Used sensitivity analysis and contingency tables to evaluate model equations



### Failure to iteratively evaluate and document each step



$$\Delta W = W_s P - W(R_m + M) \tag{1}$$

$$R_m = r_{20} * Q_{10}^{((T-20)/10)}$$
(2)

$$P = P_{max} * \frac{I}{I+H_{I}} * \frac{S*T^{pt}}{T^{pt}+H_{T}^{pt}} * \frac{H_{D}}{D+H_{D}}$$
(3)

$$I_{z,t} = I_0 * e^{-K_d - K_p * b_z} \tag{4}$$

$$I_{z,t} = I_0 * e^{-K_d}$$
(5)



# Underestimating importance of qualitative components of model

• Does it look right?

# Accepting conceptually flawed functional relationships

Immediately places you in position to defend

### Acceptance of surprising model results

- "Hmmm...that seems weird. Oh well."
- Need to figure it out and document it!
  - Could be coding issue, flawed conceptualization, quantification, etc..

# Interpreting initial results without letting model burn-in

- Initial behavior might not represent model patterns
- Resulting from initial conditions and parameter values

=

# Over-reliance on automated evaluation techniques

 Canned software cannot provide level of rigor needed for complex models

### **Over-reliance on statistics**

 Statistical and practical significance aren't always the same thing

23

### Believing data from real system are correct

- Field data were collected over a specific period of time, under a particular set of environmental conditions.
- May not necessarily correlate with model projections



### **Careless design of sensitivity analysis**

 What parameters actually make sense for a sensitivity analysis?

# Tendency to equate model sensitivity with model failure



Iterative process...

Keep learning about your model and about your system.

Be patient with yourself and the process.

26

### EXAMPLE OF MODEL STRUCTURE

### SLOSH: the does water run uphill model



### HOW DOES THE MODEL OUTPUT COMPARE TO REAL DATA?

 In general, environmental models are used to project system dynamics, so some understanding of how output compares to real data can be useful.



### **Appendix K: Monitoring and Management Plan**

(Note: For an accessible version of appendix K, please visit <u>https://ewn.el.erdc.dren.mil/projects/products 19-15/Ecological-Habitat-Modeling-Workshop-Appendix-K.pdf</u>.)



# Monitoring and Adaptive Management (MAMP)

April 12, 2019 Swan Island Model Workshop


Monitoring
Objectives

- Determine Success
- Adaptive Management Decisions
- Advance the Science Pool and Compare Results
- Refine Restoration Techniques
- Reduce Restoration Costs
- Communication to Agencies/Public





### Monitoring Challenges

- Time/Budget
- Site Specifics (All Projects are Different)
- None/Few Standard Protocols
- Personal Biases
- Differences Spatial/Temporal scales





### Monitoring and Adaptive Management Plan -Living Document

#### TABLE of CONTENTS

- Project Objectives/Monitoring Objectives
- System Model
- Metrics
- Data collection protocols
- Data interpretation (evaluate/assess project/system model)
- Reporting
- Data management
- Roles and Responsibilities

#### Northerly Island Section 506 Great Lakes Fishery & Ecosystem Restoration

Appendix E - Monitoring & Adaptive Management Plan







1

What do you want out of the monitoring data?

Set Monitoring Objectives.



### Protocols:

- Detailed enough that someone could pick up plan and collect data for project (personnel turnover)
- Seasonality (timing) and Frequency (1x yr)

		51 7417 11
Information	Notes	July 2717 Ilam
Date	day, month, year	Orland Orrassland
		Most Driand Inact Drossland
		Bibannie Bairie
	Even though it may be your notebook, and you will	DIFERMIN
	know who recorded the data, the person that takes	Orland Hark, I/
	over for you once you leave or retire from the	ramsect : Northside mourage
Name(s) of Monitor	position may need to know this information.	Start: 41°35,13251187512(23)
Site	Project name.	End & 41°35, 1355'N RTº 51.6240
	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	30 plots, mm phillin, not hitad
	Specific type of vegetation or unique management	, it is a compare of the
Management Unit or Locale	unit name.	1 Budhic 15 Downt Doulunt
		Solart 20 Color
		Dhamu ID 3 CALMU
	Unique name or label of transect, start location of	Pala 22 The Alle
	the transect (GPS coordinates), how far the start is	Mathin 29 Lizant
	from the edge of management unit, compass	travir 20 agrain 1
	bearing/direction toward end, length of transect,	toela 10 fesela +
Transect Number and	location of end (GPS coordinates), rules of plot	tappa 5 /ysnum
Description	placement, etc.	Zizaur 15 paper
		Solaia 1 4 Bubace 7
	Expected number of plots to be sampled from	applat 5 solalt
No. of Plots	transect	PLANTIN DI ANA

### Data Records

Data Management/

Roles & Responsibilities

- Electronic Files (e.g., Excel spreadsheet)
- Manage Folders/Files
- A. Orland Tract Grassland sect 206
  - a. Monitoring
    - i. 2010
      - 1. Wet Prairie
        - a. Transects
          - i. Orland\_WetPraire\_2010\_T2.exl
  - Data collection, per parameter
  - Data management/storage
  - Reporting factsheets, rare data, journal articles

#### Marsh Vegetation Restoration <u>Project</u>

- a)To track establishment of marsh vegetation b)To test the role of sediment marsh vegetation establishment
  - Critical Drivers: biomass, sediment transport
- 3. Metrics:

Interpret

the

Data

- 1. a) <u>stem density</u>: number of stems per plot
- 2. b) <u>depth</u>: average depth of plot at low tide
- 4. Predictions:
  - Stem density will increase over time (Years 1-5) to reach a maximum of 50 stems (over predefined area)
  - 2. Depth will be maintained at an average of 0.05 meters after sediment placement (Years 1-5)

Placement Areas Nervised – 24 September 2015 Nervised – 24 Septe

### Appendix L: Communicating Models: Explaining Complex Systems to Diverse Audience

(Note: For an accessible version of appendix L, please visit <u>https://ewn.el.erdc.dren.mil/projects/products\_19-15/Ecological-Habitat-Modeling-Workshop-Appendix-L.pdf</u>.)

## Communicating Models

Explaining complex systems to diverse audience



## This model is a Black Box

## All models are wrong, but some are useful



**Communicating Models** 

### ○ Two levels required

- Technical documentation
  - Each stage of model development should be thoroughly documented, including equations and assumptions
- Communicating to non-technical audiences
  - How do we communicate to non-modelers, stakeholders, general public, etc...



- Most ignored aspect of modeling
- Confusionover the meaning of model"
- Preexisting notionsprevent audiencefrom understanding objective
  - Very rarely do we Analyze audience Anticipatepotential obstacles

## Three Common Obstacles in Communicating Models



1. Audience fails to understand meaning & use of a key concept or term

2. Audience struggles to represent mentally some phenomenon, structure, or process

3. Audience may have a preexisting understanding preventing them from believing (therefore understanding) the model

## 1. Audience fails to understand meaning of a key concept

### **Elucidating Explanation:**

- Lists a concept's critical features
- Provide an array of varied examples
- Provides opportunities to practice distinguishing examples fromnonexamplesby looking for critical features



## 2. Audience struggles to represent mentally some phenomenon, structure, or process

### AGeneral Impression of the System

- Oevelop a summary image identifying critical components
- Structure-suggestingtitles & organizing analogies
- Strong main points & connections
- Easily discernible pointswith clear connections between them that create a narrative form
  - Clear conceptual models can really help with this

# 3. Audience's preexisting notions prevent understanding

### Transformative Explanation

- States existing lay or "implicit" description of the system
- O Acknowledge the apparent plausibility
- Usingexamples familiar to the audiencepoint out where existing description fallsshort
- Present analternative explanation
- Oemonstratehow alternative more effectively
  - represents the system

**Model Communication 2.0** Case study: Oyster modeling in Chesapeake Bay

Oyster abundance at all time low

Federal and state agencies disagree on how to bes manage species (fishery vs. environmental benefits)

O Developed an integrated hydrodynamiecological model to address management questions

Multi-disciplinary team developed hydrodynamic, particle tracking, and agentbased models

### Communication challenge How to make this understandable & meaninoful?





### Federal & State stakeholders

- Planners, project managers, fisheries managers, oyster biologists
- No engineers or modelers in stakeholder group, but they had general understanding of models

• We decided on a mediated-modeling approach

- <u>Audience Analysis</u>: Series of meetings prior to, during, and after model development
  - Preliminary meeting: discussion of modeling approach
    - identified background knowledge and experience of stakeholders

Second meeting: we convened with stakeholders to evaluate model and develop scenarios

## **Obstacle 2: Understanding big picture**

(0)

0

0)\_\_\_



### Drilling down to points of interest

Metamorphosis Growth Management Aging Survival Reproduction from ADH from PTM Temp., Salinity, TSS, DO Input Recruitment Survival Growth Reproduction Temp Temp Temp Salinity Salinity Salinity Processes Individual aging Metamorphosis TSS TSS TSS DO DO DO Larval production Size/age harvested Biomass Outputs Dead Bushels of market oysters to IBOPM Oyster density Age structure . ... 0 

Population Dynamics Submodel

.

### **Obstacle 2 confirmed**

O Audience was interested in bigicture of oyster dynamicsand not underlyinghydrodynamic & particle tracking models

• For example:



## Additional Model Communication Pitfalls Observed

### Eachteam memberwants to talk about how cool their stuff is

 Audienceanalysis defines interests (i.e., what to talk about, what to omit)





### **Potential Pitfalls**

 Discussing, rather than just documenting, uncertainty is crucial

Without describing limitations, it hurts modeler's credibility<sup>6</sup>



## **Novel Visualizations**

### Visualexploration takes advantage of the capacity of the human eye to rapidly detect anplatterns







REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE					Form Approved			
Dublic reporting burden for this	stad to overage 1 hour per response	a including the time for row	iowing instructions	OMB No. 0704-0188				
the data needed, and completing and reviewing this collection of information. Send comments regarding the burden estimate or any other aspect of this collection of information, including suggestions for reducing this burden to Department of Defense, Washington Headquarters Services, Directorate for Information Operations and Reports (0704-0188), 1215 Jefferson Davis Highway, Suite 1204, Arlington, VA 22202-4302. Respondents should be aware that notwithstanding any other provision of law, no person shall be subject to any penalty for failing to comply with a collection of information if it does not display a currently valid OMB control number. <b>PLEASE DO NOT RETURN YOUR FORM TO THE ABOVE ADDRESS</b> .								
1. REPORT DATE (DD April 2020	- <i>MM</i> -YYYY) 2. F	<b>REPORT TYPE</b> Final Report		3. [	DATES COVERED (From - To) FY19-FY20			
4. TITLE AND SUBTIT	LE	5a.	5a. CONTRACT NUMBER					
Proceedings from the and Atmospheric Ad	Engineers (USACE) an –National Ocean Servi	d the National Oce ce (NOS): Ecolog	eanic 5b. ical	ic 5b. GRANT NUMBER				
Habitat Modeling Workshop				5c. PROGRAM ELEMENT NUMBER				
6. AUTHOR(S)					5d. PROJECT NUMBER U4368804			
Brook Herman, Todd Swannack, Jeffrey King, Paula Whitfield, Jenny Davis, Danie Szimanski, Duncan Bryant, Joe Gailani, Matt Whitbeck, and Rebecca Golden				elle <b>5e</b> .	5e. TASK NUMBER 089500			
					5f. WORK UNIT NUMBER			
7. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES)					3. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION REPORT NUMBER			
EL, ERDC, 3909 Halls Ferry Road, Vicksburg, MS 39180				]	ERDC/EL SR-20-1			
9. SPONSORING / MONITORING AGENCY NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES)			<b>ES)</b>	10.	10. SPONSOR/MONITOR'S ACRONYM(S)			
US Army Corps of Engineers, 441 G Street NW, Washington, DC 20314-1000				11.	SPONSOR/MONITOR'S REPORT			
			NUMBER(S)					
12. DISTRIBUTION / A	VAILABILITY STATEM	ENT		I				
Approved for public release; distribution is unlimited.								
13. SUPPLEMENTAR	NOTES							
14. ABSTRACT	ummorizes the activiti	es of the Ecological H	bitat Madaling W	orkshop held	April 11, 12, 2010, at the US Fish			
and Wildlife Service	(USFWS) Blackwate	r National Wildlife Re	fuge Visitors Cent	er in Cambridg	ge, Maryland. The workshop guided			
21 participants through the process of conceptualizing, quantifying, evaluating, and communicating ecological responses to inform								
guidance and management decisions for ecological restoration projects. Working in interactive groups, participants used the								
restoration work already in progress at nearby Swan Island as the basis for their model development. Over the course of the two-day								
workshop, participants learned the mechanics and challenges of applying modeling processes to shape the restoration of dynamic								
cosystems. Through group work and orallistorning, they identified a number of benchmarks to assess restoration success and future resilience. To accommodate the changeable and often unpredictable natural events that can shape ecosystems, workshop facilitators								
emphasized building iterative, fluid ecological habitat models. Next steps include publishing this special report and scheduling a								
follow-up workshop that will include a site visit to Swan Island.								
15. SUBJECT TERMSHabitat (Ecology)Mathematical models;Restoration ecology; EnvironmentalEnvironmental management; Sustainable								
EcologyMathemati	engineering;	47 1 11 11 17 1	engin	eering				
16. SECURITY CLASS	IFICATION OF:		17. LIMITATION OF ABSTRACT	18. NUMBER OF PAGES	PERSON Jeffrey K. King			
a. REPORT	b. ABSTRACT	c. THIS PAGE			19b. TELEPHONE NUMBER (include			
Unclassified	Unclassified	Unclassified		245	area code) +1 (202) 761-0752			
			I	l	Standard Form 298 (Rev. 8-98)			

Prescribed by ANSI Std. 239.18