SPECIES & ECOSYSTEMS AT RISK & CULTURALLY SIGNIFICANT ECOSYSTEMS MAPPING

BREAK OUT SESSION:

What are some ways to enhance/improve species at risk mapping for the region (map attached), to make it more useful for local government and First Nations planning?

INSTRUCTIONS:
- Have your group brainstorm thoughts and ideas on this topic,
- Briefly consider **some or all of** the prompts below (depending on group members' knowledge/ experience/ interest*).*
- For each, consider **opportunities for collaborating and pooling resources** between projects and organizations, and **who could be involved** (e.g. as part of a working group)?
- *Please capture the breadth of ideas in the group – **consensus is not required.***
- For consideration:
  - **Challenges** raised in interviews, (see attached)
  - **Recommendations & comments made** in questionnaire (see attached).

PROMPTS:

1. Pros and cons of using **predictive mapping** (e.g. species range maps, TEM, species habitat models, etc.) to flag the potential for species at risk occurring in an area

2. How can reporting and mapping of **species at risk observations** be enhanced (e.g. crowdsourcing, citizen science, Biohub, mandatory reporting for QEPs).

3. Ideas and opportunities for using **new methods and technologies** (e.g. lidar, high resolution satellite imagery, modelling) to expand/improve mapping of ecological communities at risk.

4. Is there a need for new, updated or **improved standards and best practice guidance for identifying and mapping small ecological features on the ground?** If so, what is needed and who should be involved?

5. **Standards, best practices &** for mapping SEAR at site level (are existing ones adequate? New ones needed?)

6. **Guidance on how to apply SEAR mapping for QEPs (put eg in)**

7. Any other ways to make SEAR mapping **more useful for local government and First Nations** in meeting their objectives around important ecosystems and biodiversity[1]?

---

[1] e.g. in referrals, climate change adaptation planning, carbon targets, OCPs, EDPAs, Green Infrastructure Networks, Biodiversity Strateg, etc.

SPECIES & ECOSYSTEMS AT RISK MAPPING
CHALLENGES
(Summarized from interviews)

1. **Flagging Level**
   a. CDC element occurrence mapping is heavily skewed (to areas and species which have been most intensively surveyed),
   b. Many at-risk ecological communities are not picked up in Conservation Data Centre (CDC) mapping.
   c. Habitats of Species at-Risk (SAR) are not well mapped (only as good as models and their data)
   d. Lack of predictive mapping for species and ecosystems at risk
   e. No clear link between ecological communities at risk and TEM site series.

2. **Observations & Site level mapping:**
   a. Ecological communities at-risk are often not picked up in site level assessments by QEPs (e.g. at risk forest ecosystems, small wetlands).
   b. No clear guidance on when forested ecosystems meet criteria for being at risk; therefore most QEPs only categorize 250+ year old forest which has never been logged as being at risk, excluding almost all remaining CDF and CWHxm forests.
   c. Reporting and submitting data on species and ecological communities at risk is complicated, and reporting methods and interfaces are not use friendly.
   d. QEPs are not required to submit reports on observed and mapped species and ecological communities at risk

3. **Culturally significant at risk ecosystems**
   a. No formal recognition or flagging of ecological communities that are of high value to First Nations
   b. Extent of culturally significant & at risk ecosystems has shrunk with cessation of indigenous management practice
   c. Mapping Garry Oak patches is difficult due to forest infilling.
   d. Data on culturally significant ecosystems is a big gap; strict protocols for consent and confidentiality are required.