Geographic Citizen Science in Marine Management

A spatial analysis case study | Jervis Bay, NSW



Dr Eleanor Bruce School of Geosciences Sydney SpaceNet







VGI and Citizen Science Projects

 Graffiti project – defining the identity of urban environments



- Bushfire preparation foster community engagement and building disaster resilience
 - PhD Billy Haworth

www.billyhaworth.com









- Climate Change Adaptation in Post-Disaster Recovery Processes
- Geospatial Information for Assessing Environmental Livelihood Security: South Pacific







Geographic Citizen Science

Spatial patterns and uncertainty

- Broad scale distributions patterns requires extensive monitoring data
- Challenged by logistical constraints
- Citizen Science engaging non-specialist volunteers in collection of data for scientific enquiry (Bhattacharjee, 2005; Silverton, 2009)
- Achieves geographical reach needed to address spatial ecological questions at scales relevant to species migration patterns





Matthew Maury's – Whale chart





- Geographical citizen science is used to refer to projects in which the collection of locational information is integral to the study (Haklay, 2013; Elwood et al., 2012)
- VGI phenomenon involves the acquisition and dissemination of geographic information through the voluntary activity of individuals or groups (Elwood et al., 2012)





Elements of the Web's Next Generation

THE UNIVERSITY OF SYDNEY





> Web 2.0

- Increase in user generated content (UGC) disseminated via the internet
- Proliferation of locationalacquisition devices
- Facilitate large-scale citizen science initiatives but also challenges traditional scientific practices...



Levels of engagement

Haklay (2013) – knowledge building through engagement



[Haklay, M., 2013, Citizen Science and Volunteered Geographic Information – overview and typology of participation.]



SPOT. LOG. MAP.





WESTERN AUSTRALIA





vers 🔹 Park

Latest sighting: Eastern rock lobster Spotted by Danny Lee



VICTORIA

Redmap (Range Extension Database & Mapping p invites the Australian community to spot, log and ma marine species that are uncommon in Australia, or a particular parts of our coast.

> FIND OUT Map data ©20

Explore the Seafloor

Home

About

The Science

FAQ
Join Now
Login

You could win an underwater camera,

Volunteer as a citizen scientist on two important marine research projects.

You don't need to go anywhere! Simply look at seafloor photos online and tag what you see - we'll help with tutorials and information. The competition winners have been announced and the urchin images are all completed - but we still need help with kelp photos.

> 309693 photos identified

> > Start

now

Help with Kelp

Kelp beds along Australia's east and west

coasts are an important marine habitat.

oceans?

How are they being affected by warming

9495

citizen scientists

Spot Sea Urchins



In a fantastic effort by citizen scientists all the sea urchin photos have been identified. We still need more help with the kelp images though!



Persuasive technologies to useful research collaborations...



THE UNIVERSITY OF

[Source: http://mucru.org/our-research/research-projects/citizen-sciencecoastal-walkabout/]





[Source: Hal Mayforth, http://sciencecareers.sciencemag.org/career_magazine]



Challenges...

- Acceptance dependent on recognition of inherent bias
 - Robustness of volunteer-collected data
 - Lack of standardised collection procedures
 - Inadequate evaluation of the validity of these data for the intended study
- Surveillance rather than targeted monitoring
- Opportunistic sampling methods often adopted in volunteer-tourism based marine surveys





Case study: Distribution patterns of migrating humpback whales









Near extinction









East Australian Humpback Whale



Mother-calf pair, Jervis Bay

- High levels of maternally directed philopatry
- Mother-calf pairs show a significant preference for warm, shallow water and sheltered embayments relative to other group types
- Calf's experience may influence subsequent habitat choices
- Need to identify critical resting sites along migration path
- Interconnectivity of coastal areas has implications for reserve design



> To establish spatial clusters of mother-calf observations within Jervis Bay relative to other whale groups during mid to late austral spring.





Geographic citizen science data

Volunteer collected data – commercial whale-watch platform





- > What are the constraints?
- Standardisation of sampling effort difficult particularly if survey design requires flexibility
- Spatial sampling bias
- Observer error

)

Positional offset

- TR A
- Different spatial configurations of errors may result in either the underestimation or overestimation of a cluster

Spatial cluster analysis





Proportion of days in which each whale group composition was sighted per month between 2007 and 2010.

- Moran's I and G_i^* statistics
- > Lag distance d = 2000 m
- > False discovery rate (FDR)

 Randomisation tests in which sample data was randomly rearranged to examine impact of potential bias on spatial cluster detection

Mother-calf groups

Non mother-calf groups

Jervis Bay Marine Park
 pod sighting
 Gi* z-score
 Cold Spot - 99% Confidence
 Cold Spot - 95% Confidence

Cold Spot - 90% Confidence Not Significant Hot Spot - 90% Confidence Hot Spot - 95% Confidence Hot Spot - 95% Confidence

Table 2. Comparative global Moran's *I* results for mother-calf pod and non-calf pod sightings using data randomly adjusted for spatial sampling, positional offset and pod composition observation error (100 random samples).

	Nor	n-calf grou	ıps	Mother-cal			
	Moran's I	STD	p value	Moran's I	STD	p value	
Unadjusted	0.1793		<0.001	0.1401		<0.001	
Adjusted for spatial sampling effort	0.1797	0.0012	<0.001	0.1148	0.0029	<0.001	
Offset distance							
50 m	0.1787	0.0028	<0.001	0.1376	0.0029	<0.001	
100 m	0.1740	0.0049	< 0.001	0.1399	0.0028	<0.001	
150 m	0.1712	0.0062	< 0.001	0.1400	0.0033	<0.001	
200 m	0.1682	0.0049	<0.001	0.1387	0.0043	<0.001	
250 m	0.1651	0.0058	<0.001	0.1364	0.0052	<0.001	
300 m	0.1636	0.0061	<0.001	0.1380	0.0046	<0.001	
Observation error							
2%	0.1732	0.0034	<0.001	0.1350	0.030	< 0.001	
5%	0.1654	0.0058	<0.001	0.1286	0.040	< 0.001	
10%	0.1503	0.0071	<0.001	0.1168	0.062	< 0.001	
15%	0.1377	0.0083	<0.001	0.1072	0.0057	<0.001	
20%	0.1264	0.0084	<0.001	0.0983	0.0061	<0.001	
25%	0.1146	0.0095	<0.001	0.0928	0.0065	<0.001	

Table 3. Testing of the G_i^* statistic with sample data adjusted for potential bias in sampling effort, observer error and positional offset (100 random samples).

Pod	Unadjusted (%)	Adjusted for sampling	Observer Error (%)					Positional Offset (%)						
		effort (%)												
			2%	5%	10%	15%	20%	25%	50 m	100 m	150 m	200 m	250 m	300 m
Mother-calf (N = 3548)														
G_i^*														
Accept null	25.6	27.3	23.9	25.1	27.0	28.4	29.5	30.0	25.7	25.4	25.4	25.5	25.8	25.6
Reject null	74.4	72.7	76.1	74.9	73.0	71.6	70.5	70.0	74.3	74.6	74.6	74.5	74.2	74.4
Positive cluster - 99% CL	23.0	22.7	23.9	23.5	23.0	22.6	22.3	22.2	23.0	23.1	23.0	23.0	22.7	22.9
Positive cluster - 95% CL	3.3	3.6	2.9	3.0	3.0	3.2	3.4	3.7	3.2	3.2	3.2	3.2	3.3	3.2
Positive cluster - 90% CL	1.4	1.4	1.2	1.5	1.7	1.9	2.0	2.1	1.4	1.4	1.4	1.3	1.4	1.4
Negative cluster - 99% CL	25.0	17.7	31.5	30.1	27.5	25.7	23.4	22.4	24.5	25.8	25.4	24.9	23.5	24.0
Negative cluster - 95% CL	18.7	23.1	12.4	12.6	13.1	13.3	14.4	14.4	18.9	17.8	18.3	18.7	19.9	19.6
Negative cluster - 90% CL	3.0	4.2	4.1	4.3	4.6	4.8	5.1	5.2	3.3	3.3	3.3	3.3	3.3	3.3
Non-calf (N = 3548)														
G_i^*														
Accept null	21.1	21.0	23.6	26.5	32.4	36.9	40.7	42.5	21.7	22.4	22.7	23.0	23.5	23.7
Reject null	78.9	79.0	76.4	73.5	67.6	63.1	59.3	57.5	78.3	77.6	77.3	77.0	76.5	76.3
Positive cluster - 99% CL	19.4	19.4	19.0	18.5	17.7	17.0	16.3	15.8	19.1	18.9	18.7	18.6	18.6	18.5
Positive cluster - 95% CL	2.1	2.2	2.3	2.4	2.5	2.5	2.6	3.0	2.3	2.4	2.6	2.5	2.5	2.5
Positive cluster - 90% CL	1.0	1.1	1.0	1.0	1.1	1.3	1.6	2.0	0.9	0.9	1.0	1.1	1.1	1.1
Negative cluster - 99% CL	10.6	10.6	6.2	4.3	2.6	2.1	1.6	1.3	8.4	6.0	5.3	4.3	3.6	3.2
Negative cluster - 95% CL	35.0	36.6	36.4	34.0	28.2	24.6	22.6	21.4	36.6	36.8	36.0	35.3	35.2	35.2
Negative cluster - 90% CL	10.8	9.2	11.6	13.2	15.5	15.7	14.7	14.1	10.9	12.6	13.6	15.2	15.6	15.8

Positional error within 300 m had minimal impact on the Global Moran's I and G_i^* statistics

Potential for under or over representation

Relative sampling effort

Proportion of randomly adjusted samples whose test values exceeded the original test value (G_i^* statistic)

Depth and exposure preference

Response curves showing the relationship between probability of calf-pod occurrence and depth (A) and exposure (B), and non-calf pod and depth (C) and exposure (D). The shape of the curve shows change in logistic prediction for each variable while the other variable is kept at the mean sample value.

1. The fishing vessel surrounds a school of fish 2. Floats 3. Weights 4. The bottom of the net is brought together and then hauled on-board

[Source: Goodfishbadfish Sustainable Seafood, 2013]

THE UNIVERSITY OF

Legend

group sighting

Zone Plan

Zone

General Use Zone

Habitat Protection Zone

Habitat Protection Zone (Purse Seining & Lift Netting)

Habitat Protection Zone (Seasonal Anchoring Zone)

Habitat Protection Zone (Spearfishing Prohibited)

Sanctuary Zone

Sanctuary Zone (Designated Anchoring Area)

Special Purpose Zone

- Local indicators of spatial clustering were more susceptible to both observational errors and spatial sampling bias.
- Cluster confirmed despite introduced observer bias
- With increased populations range has begun to expand beyond traditional migratory routes, 'spill over' particularly important to mother-calf groups
- Changing habitat usage trends have implications for Marine Protected Area management – citizen engagement with policy decisions

- Longitudinal studies over wide geographic regions
- Observer bias can be reduced through in-field training and observer experience
- Open Tools mechanism s for determining and communicating uncertainty
- Participant involvement beyond passive sensors to cognitive engagement in scientific problem

- Bruce, E., Albright, L., Sheehan, S. and Blewitt, M. (2014) Distribution patterns of migrating humpback whales (*Megaptera novaengliae*) in Jervis Bay, Australia: A spatial analysis using geographical citizen science data, *Applied Geography*, 54: 83-95. doi:10.1016/j.apgeog.2014.06.014
- Haworth, B. and Bruce, E. (2015). A Review of Volunteered Geographic Information for Disaster Management, *Geography Compass*, 9(5): 237-250, DOI: 10.1111/gec3.12213.
- Biggs EM, Bruce E, Boruff B, Duncan JMA, Duce S, Haworth BJ, Horsley J, Curnow J, Neef A, McNeill K, Pauli N, Van Ogtrop F, Imanari Y, (2015).
 Sustainable development and the water-energy-food nexus: a perspective on livelihoods. *Environmental Science and Policy* doi:10.1016/j.envsci.2015.08.002
- Climate Change Adaptation in Post-Disaster Recovery Processes
- <u>http://www.climatechangeplus.net/</u>

