

RESOURCE SELECTION BY
WHITE-TAILED DEER, MULE DEER, AND ELK
IN NEBRASKA

By

David M. Baasch

A DISSERTATION

Presented to the Faculty of
The Graduate College at the University of Nebraska
In Partial Fulfillment of Requirements
For the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy

Major: Natural Resource Sciences

Under the Supervision of Professor Scott E. Hygnstrom

Lincoln, Nebraska

August, 2008

UMI Number: 3315313

INFORMATION TO USERS

The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted. Broken or indistinct print, colored or poor quality illustrations and photographs, print bleed-through, substandard margins, and improper alignment can adversely affect reproduction.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if unauthorized copyright material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.



UMI Microform 3315313
Copyright 2008 by ProQuest LLC
All rights reserved. This microform edition is protected against
unauthorized copying under Title 17, United States Code.

ProQuest LLC
789 East Eisenhower Parkway
P.O. Box 1346
Ann Arbor, MI 48106-1346

RESOURCE SELECTION BY
WHITE-TAILED DEER, MULE DEER, AND ELK
IN NEBRASKA

David M. Baasch, Ph.D.

University of Nebraska, 2008

Advisor: Scott E. Hygnstrom

Management of cervids in Nebraska is a growing concern due to population eruptions and declines, potential for inter-specific transmission of disease, and habitat depredation. We used resource selection functions to relate cervids to resources and develop locally adaptive plans for managing white-tailed deer (*Odocoileus virginianus*), mule deer (*O. hemionus*), and elk (*Cervus elaphus*) in Nebraska. We use simulation techniques to determine if discrete-choice, logistic-regression, and MAXENT-modeling could recover a known probability distribution. We evaluated influence of numbers of use and random locations and levels of selection and availability used in analyses of resource selection. Discrete-choice modeling consistently provided precise and accurate estimates of the known probability distribution when appropriate levels of selection and availability were chosen. Based on our results, we used discrete-choice modeling to assess influence of landscape characteristics on resource selection by white-tailed deer,

mule deer, and elk in Nebraska. Selection of resources by white-tailed deer at the DeSoto National Wildlife Refuge changed in response to conversions of cropland to grasslands. The conversion had the largest impact on cropland and wooded areas on the refuge. However, we could not consistently predict impacts of converting 5% of landcover from cropland to grassland, which indicated changes in selection of resources by white-tailed deer was nonlinear. White-tailed deer and mule deer in Morrill County selected agricultural crops juxtaposed with wooded cover, but mule deer selected resources at lower specificity. We determined >30% of landcover in Morrill County was selected by white-tailed deer and mule deer indicating an overlap in space-use. Selection of resources by female elk in the Pine Ridge was influenced by slope, aspect, and distance to road and forest edge. We used results to identify a potential elk redistribution area within the Pine Ridge to help managers minimize depredation complaints by landowners. My dissertation is an important contribution to resource selection modeling and cervid ecology in Nebraska. Our results will be used to direct management decisions and develop models for predicting the spread of infectious diseases.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would first like to thank my major advisor Dr. Scott E. Hygnstrom for all his efforts during my graduate program. He has been supportive in all my endeavors, yet provided me with freedom to develop my own style as a professional biologist. Scott has fought many battles on my behalf, from securing extra funding, obtaining data for my research, or protecting my time while I completed my degree. Scott has provided me valuable insight on what it means to be a professional biologist as well as advice on writing, conducting research, and securing funding for research. His willingness to allow me to branch out and work with other biologists on various projects, while conducting my dissertation research, has been invaluable and is something that I greatly appreciate.

Working with the members of my graduate committee, Drs. Scott E. Hygnstrom, Andrew J. Tyre, Kurt C. VerCauteren, Jerry D. Volesky, Joshua J. Millspaugh, and Kent M. Eskridge, has been one of the high points of my graduate program. Each member, at some point during my tenure at the University of Nebraska, has provided me with valuable insight on research, writing, or life in general. I truly could not have made it this far without their assistance.

Dr. Andrew Tyre deserves special recognition. Drew has made numerous sacrifices on my behalf including devoting extra time arranging a distance-learning course to inviting me into his home for 1-on-1 counseling and advising. Though we have not always agreed on terminology and concepts, we always found a way to get past our disagreements and progress in a professional manner. I truly respect and value Drew's

statistical and ecological knowledge and look forward to continuing our professional relationship.

Dr. Jerry Volesky also deserves special recognition. From the minute I began working for Jerry in North Platte, he provided me with multiple opportunities to improve my professional career, whether it was attending workshops, allowing me to leave work for months at a time to attend classes, or conducting field research. Jerry consistently pushed me forward, and was as much a friend as he was a supervisor. We have become excellent colleagues and I hope to continue our productive scientific relationship.

Many others have assisted me in various ways throughout my program. Kurt VerCauteren has been a tremendous help throughout my time at UNL. I have gained a great respect for Kurt, and he has been a tremendous help in the pursuit of my degree and life-long career. Other people who have been a positive influence and have assisted me in various tasks include Dr. Larkin Powell, Dr. Erin Blankenship, Greg and Mindy Clements, Jason Gilsdorf, Chuck Frost, Travis Kinsell, Mike Cover, Bruce Stillings, Justin Fischer, Ty Matthews, Max Post van der Berg, Naikoa Aguilar-Amuchastegui, David Walter, Justin Boner, and Russ Otto. A special thanks to the School of Natural Resources, Nebraska Game and Parks Commission, and National Wildlife Research Center for providing graduate funding for me.

Finally, I would like to thank my wife Julie and son Trace. They have had to endure quite a bit throughout my graduate program including low pay, time spent in the office, fieldwork, conferences, and moving. They have met these hardships with tremendous understanding and have held me together during this period and for that, I am forever thankful!

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	i
TABLE OF CONTENTS	iii
LIST OF TABLES.....	vi
LIST OF FIGURES.....	xi
CHAPTER 1	
An Evaluation of Three Resource Selection Modeling Techniques Using Simulated Presence-Absence Data	
ABSTRACT.....	1
INTRODUCTION.....	3
METHODS.....	9
RESULTS.....	16
DISCUSSION.....	20
CONCLUSION.....	27
LITERATURE CITED.....	28
CHAPTER 2	
Resource Selection by White-tailed Deer: Affects of Conversion of Landcover	
ABSTRACT.....	44
INTRODUCTION.....	45

	iv
METHODS.....	49
RESULTS.....	57
DISCUSSION.....	60
MANAGEMENT IMPLICATIONS.....	64
LITERATURE CITED.....	66

CHAPTER 3

Predicting Resource Selection by White-tailed Deer: An Assessment of Impact

Associated with Conversions of Landcover

ABSTRACT.....	76
INTRODUCTION.....	78
METHODS.....	83
RESULTS.....	90
DISCUSSION.....	94
MANAGEMENT IMPLICATIONS.....	101
LITERATURE CITED.....	103

CHAPTER 4

Resource Selection of Sympatric White-tailed Deer and Mule Deer in Western Nebraska

ABSTRACT.....	112
INTRODUCTION.....	113
METHODS.....	117
RESULTS.....	125
DISCUSSION.....	132

	v
MANAGEMENT IMPLICATIONS.....	138
LITERATURE CITED.....	139

CHAPTER 5

Resource Selection by Elk in the Pine Ridge of Northwestern Nebraska

ABSTRACT.....	158
INTRODUCTION.....	160
METHODS.....	165
RESULTS.....	174
DISCUSSION.....	177
MANAGEMENT IMPLICATIONS.....	182
LITERATURE CITED.....	184

LIST OF TABLES

Table 2.1	Twelve <i>a priori</i> models used in discrete-choice analyses of resource selection by female white-tailed deer at DeSoto National Wildlife Refuge in Iowa and Nebraska, 1991 – 2006.....	71
Table 2.2	Top 4 discrete-choice models used to estimate relative probability of female white-tailed deer selecting a 30-m x 30-m resource unit, number of parameters in model (K), BIC, Δ BIC, and BIC-weights during 4 seasons of 3 periods at DeSoto National Wildlife Refuge in Iowa and Nebraska, 1991 – 2006. DNWR converted approximately 5% of the total habitat (160 ha) from agricultural cropland to native vegetation (cool- or warm-season grassland or wooded cover) during each period.....	72
Table 2.3	Coefficients and standard errors (in parentheses) of discrete-choice models used to estimate the probability of female white-tailed deer selecting 30-m x 30-m resource units in DeSoto National Wildlife Refuge (DNWR), during 3 periods (1991 – 1997, 1999 – 2003, and 2004 – 2006) and 4 seasons including: pre-parturition (1 Jan – 30 Apr), parturition (1 May – 20 Jun), post-parturition (21 Jun – 30 Sep), and breeding (1 Oct – 31 Dec). DNWR converted approximately 5% (160 ha) of the total habitat from agricultural cropland to native vegetation (cool- or warm-season grassland or wooded cover) during each period.....	73
Table 2.4	Selection ratios and confidence limits (Lower and Upper, $P < 0.05$) for variables from period and season-specific model averaged discrete-choice models used to estimate probability of female white-tailed deer selecting	

30-m×30-m resource units at DeSoto National Wildlife Refuge.

Seasons included: pre-parturition, parturition, post-parturition, and breeding. Years in each period were 1991 – 1997, 1999 – 2003, and 2004 – 2006. During each period, 5% (160 ha) of the total habitat was converted from agricultural cropland to native vegetation (cool- or warm-season grassland or wooded area).....74

Table 3.1	Percent of landcover available and proportion of estimated probabilities of female white-tailed deer selecting 30-m x 30-m resource units in 7 classes of landcover (% Use) at DeSoto National Wildlife Refuge during 4 seasons and 3 periods (1991 – 1997, 1999 – 2003, and 2004 – 2006). Approximately 5% (160 ha) of the total landcover was converted from agricultural cropland to native vegetation (predominantly cool- or warm-season grassland) during each period. We used discrete-choice models to estimate resource selection distributions.....	108
-----------	---	-----

Table 3.2	Season-specific indices of predicted and observed impact based on change in estimated probabilities of resource selection by female white-tailed deer at DeSoto National Wildlife Refuge (DNWR) during 4 seasons of 3 periods (1991 – 1997, 1999 – 2003, and 2004 – 2006). Approximately 5% (160 ha) of the total landcover was converted from agricultural cropland to native vegetation (predominately cool- or warm-season grassland) during each period. We used discrete-choice models to estimate resource selection distributions. Based on our methods and definition, negative or	
-----------	--	--

	positive values indicate negative impact or benefit to deer, respectively.....	109
Table 3.3	Landcover specific mean difference and associated standard error (in parenthesis) between observed and predicted probabilities of selection of resource units (30-m x 30-m parcel of land) by female white-tailed deer at DeSoto National Wildlife Refuge during 4 seasons and 3 periods (1991–1997, 1999–2003, and 2004–2006). Negative values indicate observed selection was > predicted selection and * indicates confidence interval did not contain 0.0 ($CI = \bar{X} \pm 1.96 \times SE$). Approximately 5% (160 ha) of the landcover was converted from agricultural cropland to cool- or warm-season grassland during each period. We used discrete-choice models to estimate observed and predicted resource selection distributions.....	110
Table 4.1	Thirteen <i>a priori</i> models used in discrete-choice analyses of resource selection by male and female white-tailed deer and mule deer living sympatrically in Morrill County, Nebraska, 2004 – 2007.....	146
Table 4.2	Top 4 discrete-choice models used to estimate relative probability of selecting a 30-m×30-m resource unit, number of parameters in model (K), BIC, ΔBIC, and BIC-weights during 4 seasons for male white-tailed deer in Morrill County Nebraska, 2004 – 2007.....	147
Table 4.3	Top 4 discrete-choice models used to estimate relative probability of selecting a 30-m×30-m resource unit, number of parameters in model (K), BIC, ΔBIC, and BIC-weights during 4 seasons for female white-tailed deer in Morrill County Nebraska, 2004 – 2007.....	148

Table 4.4	Coefficients and standard errors (in parentheses) of discrete-choice models used to estimate the probability of male or female white-tailed deer selecting a 30-m×30-m resource unit within Morrill County, Nebraska during 4 seasons, 2004 – 2007.....	149
Table 4.5	Top 4 discrete-choice models used to estimate relative probability of selecting a 30-m×30-m resource unit, number of parameters in model (K), BIC, ΔBIC, and BIC-weights during 4 seasons for male mule deer in Morrill County Nebraska, 2004 – 2007.....	150
Table 4.6	Top 4 discrete-choice models used to estimate relative probability of selecting a 30-m×30-m resource unit, number of parameters in model (K), BIC, ΔBIC, and BIC-weights during 4 seasons for female mule deer in Morrill County Nebraska, 2004 – 2007.....	151
Table 4.7	Coefficients and standard errors (in parentheses) of discrete-choice models used to estimate the probability of male or female mule deer selecting a 30-m×30-m resource unit within Morrill County, Nebraska during 4 seasons, 2004 – 2007.....	152
Table 4.8	Percent of resource units (30-m×30-m parcels of land) with a probability of use greater than what would be observed if selection of resources by male, female, or either sex of white-tailed deer or mule deer was random within Morrill County, Nebraska, USA, 2004 –2007 (1/4,842,079). Seasonal probability distributions were estimated with discrete-choice models.....	153

Table 4.9	Percent of resource units (30-m×30-m parcels of land) with a joint probability of use greater than what would be observed if selection of resources by male, female, or either sex of white-tailed deer or mule deer was random within Morrill County, Nebraska, USA (1/4,842,079 ²), 2004 – 2007. We estimated probability distributions with season, species, and sex-specific discrete-choice RSF.....	154
Table 5.1	Thirty-one <i>a priori</i> models used in discrete-choice analyses of resource selection by female elk in the Pine Ridge region of northwestern Nebraska, 1995 – 1997.....	191
Table 5.2	Top 5 discrete-choice models (ranked by BIC) used to estimate probability of female elk selecting 30-m x 30-m resource units, including the number of parameters in each model (K), BIC, ΔBIC, and BIC-weights during 5 seasons in the Pine Ridge region of northwestern Nebraska, 1995 – 1997.....	192
Table 5.3	Coefficients of discrete-choice models used to estimate the probability of female elk selecting 30-m x 30-m resource units within the Pine Ridge region of northwestern Nebraska during 5 seasons, 1995 – 1997. Standard error appears below associated coefficient.....	193

LIST OF FIGURES

- Figure 1.1 Coefficients of linear regression models with known coefficients predicted by estimated coefficients of landcover variable in discrete-choice models with 250, 500, 1,000, or 2,000 use locations (top to bottom), level of selection of use locations defined at 4 levels [300 m, 600 m, 1,200 m, and DNWR (left to right blocks of 4 plots)], and 5 random locations per use location selected at 4 levels of availability [300 m, 600 m, 1,200 m, and DNWR (left to right in each block)]. Error bars represent approximate confidence intervals ($\pm 1.96 \times SE$).....33
- Figure 1.2 Coefficients of linear regression models with known coefficients predicted by estimated coefficients of landcover variable in logistic-regression models with 250, 500, 1,000, or 2,000 use locations (top to bottom), level of selection of use locations defined at 4 levels [300 m, 600 m, 1,200 m, and DNWR (left to right blocks of 4 plots)], and 5 random locations per use location selected at 4 levels of availability [300 m, 600 m, 1,200 m, and DNWR (left to right in each block)]. Error bars represent approximate confidence intervals ($\pm 1.96 \times SE$).....34
- Figure 1.3 Coefficients of linear regression models with known coefficients predicted by estimated coefficients of landcover variable in MAXENT models with 250, 500, 1,000, or 2,000 use locations (top to bottom), level of selection

of use locations defined at 4 levels [300 m, 600 m, 1,200 m, and DNWR (left to right blocks of 4 plots)], and 5 random locations per use location selected at 4 levels of availability [300 m, 600 m, 1,200 m, and DNWR (left to right in each block)]. Error bars represent approximate confidence intervals ($\pm 1.96 \times SE$).....35

Figure 1.4 Coefficients of linear regression models with known coefficients predicted by estimated coefficients of landcover variable in MAXENT models with 250, 500, 1,000, or 2,000 use locations (top to bottom), level of selection of use locations defined at 4 levels [300 m, 600 m, 1,200 m, and DNWR (left to right blocks of 4 plots)], and 10,000 random locations selected at 4 levels of availability [300 m, 600 m, 1,200 m, and DNWR (left to right in each block)]. Error bars represent approximate confidence intervals ($\pm 1.96 \times SE$)..... 36

Figure 1.5 Coefficients of linear regression models with known probabilities predicted by estimated probabilities of resource use and approximate confidence intervals ($\pm 1.96 \times SE$) for discrete-choice models with 250, 500, 1,000, or 2,000 use locations (top to bottom), level of selection of use locations defined at 4 levels [300 m, 600 m, 1,200 m, and DNWR (left to right blocks of 4 plots)], and 5 random locations per use location selected at 4 levels of availability [300 m, 600 m, 1,200 m, and DNWR (left to right in each block)].....37

Figure 1.6	Coefficients of linear regression models with known probabilities predicted by estimated probabilities of resource use and approximate confidence intervals ($\pm 1.96 \times \text{SE}$) for discrete-choice models with 250, 500, 1,000, or 2,000 use locations (top to bottom), level of selection of use locations defined at 4 levels [300 m, 600 m, 1,200 m, and DNWR (left to right blocks of 4 plots)], and 10,000 random locations selected at 4 levels of availability [300 m, 600 m, 1,200 m, and DNWR (left to right in each block)].....	38
------------	---	----

Figure 1.7	Coefficients of linear regression models with known probabilities predicted by estimated probabilities of resource use and approximate confidence intervals ($\pm 1.96 \times \text{SE}$) for logistic-regression models with 250, 500, 1,000, or 2,000 use locations (top to bottom), level of selection of use locations defined at 4 levels [300 m, 600 m, 1,200 m, and DNWR (left to right blocks of 4 plots)], and 5 random locations per use location selected at 4 levels of availability [300 m, 600 m, 1,200 m, and DNWR (left to right in each block)].....	39
------------	---	----

Figure 1.8	Coefficients of linear regression models with known probabilities predicted by estimated probabilities of resource use and approximate confidence intervals ($\pm 1.96 \times \text{SE}$) for logistic-regression models with 250, 500, 1,000, or 2,000 use locations (top to bottom), level of selection of use	
------------	--	--

locations defined at 4 levels [300 m, 600 m, 1,200 m, and DNWR (left to right blocks of 4 plots)], and 10,000 random locations selected at 4 levels of availability [300 m, 600 m, 1,200 m, and DNWR (left to right in each block)].....40

Figure 1.9 Coefficients of linear regression models with known probabilities predicted by estimated probabilities of resource use and approximate confidence intervals ($\pm 1.96 \times \text{SE}$) for MAXENT models with 250, 500, 1,000, or 2,000 use locations (top to bottom), level of selection of use locations defined at 4 levels [300 m, 600 m, 1,200 m, and DNWR (left to right blocks of 4 plots)], and 5 random locations per use location selected at 4 levels of availability [300 m, 600 m, 1,200 m, and DNWR (left to right in each block)].....41

Figure 1.10 Coefficients of linear regression models with known probabilities predicted by estimated probabilities of resource use and approximate confidence intervals ($\pm 1.96 \times \text{SE}$) for MAXENT models with 250, 500, 1,000, or 2,000 use locations (top to bottom), level of selection of use locations defined at 4 levels [300 m, 600 m, 1,200 m, and DNWR (left to right blocks of 4 plots)], and 10,000 random locations selected at 4 levels of availability [300 m, 600 m, 1,200 m, and DNWR (left to right in each block)].....42

Figure 1.11	Test data AUC scores for discrete choice regression, logistic regression, and MAXENT models with 250 or 2,000 use locations (top or bottom row, respectively), level of selection of use locations defined at 300 m (left) or DNWR (right), and 5 random locations per use location selected at 4 levels of availability [300 m, 600 m, 1,200 m, and DNWR (left to right in each plot)]......	43
Figure 2.1	Goodness-of-fit regressions predicting observed selection with predictive RSF models generated for white-tailed deer at DNWR during 4 seasons of 3 periods. Plots include observed versus predicted proportions of resource selection (points), a regression of proportions (solid line), X=Y-line (dashed line), and slope of regression line with standard error in parenthesis. A slope of 1 indicates a 1-to-1 relationship between observed and predicted proportions of resource selection (i.e., good fit of RSF to locations of female white-tailed deer at DNWR).....	75
Figure 4.1	Overlap in relative use of space (ORUS) based on 16 season-, species-, and sex-specific discrete-choice models for white-tailed deer and mule deer in Morrill County, Nebraska, USA, 2004 – 2007.....	155
Figure 4.2	Goodness-of-fit regressions predicting observed selection with predictive RSF models generated for female and male white-tailed deer during 4 seasons, 2004 – 2006. Plots include observed versus predicted proportions	

of resource selection (points), a regression of proportions (solid line), X=Y-line (dashed line), and slope of regression line with standard error in parenthesis. A slope of 1.0 indicates a one-to-one relationship between observed and predicted proportions of resource selection (i.e., good fit of RSF to locations of female or male white-tailed deer in Morrill County, Nebraska, USA)..... 156

Figure 4.3 Goodness-of-fit regressions predicting observed selection with predictive RSF models generated for female and male mule deer during 4 seasons, 2004 – 2006. Plots include observed versus predicted proportions of resource selection (points), a regression of proportions (solid line), X=Y-line (dashed line), and slope of regression line with standard error in parenthesis. A slope of 1.0 indicates a one-to-one relationship between observed and predicted proportions of resource selection (i.e., good fit of RSF to locations of female or male mule deer in Morrill County, Nebraska, USA).....157

Figure 5.1 Pine Ridge study area in northwestern Nebraska with land ownership classification, herd areas, and use locations.....194

Figure 5.2 Goodness-of-fit regressions predicting observed selection with predictive RSF models generated for female elk in the Pine Ridge region of northwestern Nebraska, USA during 4 seasons, 1995 – 1997. Plots

include observed versus predicted proportions of resource selection (points), a regression of proportions (solid line), X=Y-line (dashed line), and slope of regression line with standard error in parenthesis. A slope of 1 indicates a one-to-one relationship between observed and predicted proportions of resource selection (i.e., good fit of RSF to locations of female elk)..... 195

Figure 5.3 Distribution of classes of probabilities of resource-selection for female elk in the Pine Ridge region of Northwestern Nebraska based upon seasonal discrete-choice models. Classes included: High (>90th percentile), Moderately High (>random and <90th percentile), and Low (<random). We also identified a potential elk redistribution area (PERA) based on resources with high probabilities of selection and a high proportion of publicly owned land..... 196

CHAPTER 1

An Evaluation of Three Resource Selection Modeling Techniques Using Simulated Presence-Absence Data

DAVID M. BAASCH, *University of Nebraska, School of Natural Resources*, 135 Hardin Hall, 3310 Holdrege Street, Lincoln, NE 68583, USA.

ANDREW J. TYRE, *University of Nebraska, School of Natural Resources*, 414 Hardin Hall, 3310 Holdrege Street, Lincoln, NE 68583, USA.

SCOTT E. HYGSTROM, *University of Nebraska, School of Natural Resources*, 415 Hardin Hall, 3310 Holdrege Street, Lincoln, NE 68583, USA.

JOSHUA J. MILLSPAUGH, *University of Missouri, Department of Fisheries and Wildlife Sciences*, 302 Natural Resources Building, Columbia, MO 65211, USA.

KENT M. ESKRIDGE, *University of Nebraska, School of Natural Resources*, 340 Hardin Hall, 3310 Holdrege Street, Lincoln, NE 68583, USA.

KURT C. VERCAUTEREN, *USDA/APHIS/WS/National Wildlife Research Center*, 4101 Laporte Avenue, Fort Collins, CO 80521, USA.

ABSTRACT The performance of statistical methods for modeling resource selection is difficult to evaluate using field data because the true selection distribution is unknown. Simulated data based on a known probability distribution can be used as the “truth” to evaluate the performance of statistical methods. Models should be able to recover the true selection distribution if they are to be useful in analyzing field data. We used simulation techniques to evaluate the effectiveness of 3 statistical methods to recover a known probability distribution. We generated use locations at 4 sample sizes (250, 500,

1,000, and 2,000) and 4 levels of selection according to a known probability distribution across DeSoto National Wildlife Refuge (DNWR). We generated either 5 random locations per use location or 10,000 random locations (total) within a predetermined area around use locations to determine the influence of number of random locations on results. We analyzed simulated data with 2 popular methods for evaluating data for resource selection (discrete-choice and logistic regression) and compare the results with a maximum entropy method (MAXENT). We compared estimated coefficients of models to coefficients of the model used to develop the underlying probability distribution, compared estimated probability distributions to the known probability distribution, and used area under receiver operator characteristic curves (AUC) to evaluate performance of methods. Number of use and random locations use in analyses, level at which selection of resources occurred, and area considered available affected each statistical method differently. Discrete-choice produced more precise and accurate estimates of the true probability distribution when the area in which we selected use locations was larger than the area in which we selected random locations. Logistic regression produced good estimates of the true probability distribution when selection of use and random locations occurred at the study area level. All models were better than random in receiver operating characteristic (ROC) indicating better discrimination of selection than random chance. Results from ROC analyses however, often contradicted other methods used to evaluate model performance and we encourage caution when using AUC as a measure of performance for resource selection models. Discrete-choice modeling was best able to recover the known selection distribution in our study area, but we recommend further studies using simulated data over different landscapes to confirm our results.

Key words: AUC, discrete-choice, logistic regression, MAXENT, resource selection, ROC, simulated data.

Ecological Modeling: 00(0): 000–000, 200X

INTRODUCTION

Resource selection is a valuable field of study in animal ecology. Conclusions drawn from resource selection studies have important implications because they serve as guidelines for habitat management plans and habitat suitability indices (Garshelis 2000). Effective management and conservation of species requires an understanding of habitat requirements, well-guided techniques for collecting data (use and random data), and an accurate method for analyzing data. Occasionally data on both use- and nonuse-locations are available for the development of resource selection models, for which general-purpose statistical methods can be used (i.e., at the population level: Design I in the terminology of Manly et al. 2002, MacKenzie 2006). However, in many cases absence data are not available. In particular, radio-telemetry studies only document where the animal was; this type of data is extremely common (Cooper and Millspaugh 1999, MacKenzie 2006).

Resource selection analysis usually involves the generation of random locations. Typically, random locations are generated by sampling cells within a region defined as available to the animal or by selecting a set number of points within each habitat class or region in the study area. A recurring problem that exists with presence-absence analyses is the determination of what is defined to be “available” to the animal. Several definitions of availability exist in literature, most of which are associated with the geographic range of the species, study area, home range, or localized areas around each