Wildlife Biology

WLB-00697

Phoebus, I., Boulanger, J., Eiken, H. G., Fløystad, I., Graham, K., Hagen, S. B., Sorensen, A. and Stenhouse, G. 2020. Comparison of grizzly bear hair-snag and scat sampling along roads to inform wildlife population monitoring. – Wildlife Biology 2020: wlb.00697

Appendix 1

Supplementary results

Table A1.1. Number of scat samples, grizzly bear (GB) scat samples, kilometers of roads driven, total kilometers of roads, kilometers of gravel and other roads, percentage driven of total roads and of gravel roads, and number of samples and GB scat samples collected per kilometer of road driven per cell in the scat road surveys of the 2018 DNA inventory in Alberta, Canada.

| | Scat samples | GB scat samples | Driven | Roads (km) | | | % Driven | Scat | GB scat |
|------|-----------------|-----------------|--------|------------|-------|-------|----------|-------------|-------------|
| Cell | | | | Gravel | Other | Total | of total | samples per | samples per |
| 220 | 10 | 0 | 1.7 | 1.7 | (7 | 00 | 10205 | | |
| 320 | 12 | 0 | 15 | 15 | 6/ | 82 | 18 | 0.80 | 0 |
| 321 | 6 | 1 | 78 | 95 | 9 | 104 | 76 | 0.08 | 0.01 |
| 322 | 1 | 1 | 59 | 46 | 60 | 105 | 56 | 0.02 | 0.02 |
| 323 | 0 | 0 | 60 | 41 | 140 | 181 | 33 | 0 | 0 |
| 324 | 0 | 0 | 79 | 86 | 83 | 170 | 46 | 0 | 0 |
| 325 | 0 | 0 | 97 | 87 | 107 | 194 | 50 | 0 | 0 |
| 348 | 0 | 0 | 42 | 31 | 54 | 86 | 49 | 0 | 0 |
| 349 | 0 | 0 | 37 | 80 | 55 | 135 | 27 | 0 | 0 |
| 350 | 3 | 3 | 95 | 99 | 73 | 172 | 55 | 0.03 | 0.03 |
| 351 | 20 | 20 | 39 | 38 | 142 | 179 | 22 | 0.51 | 0.51 |
| 352 | 0 | 0 | 48 | 36 | 52 | 88 | 55 | 0 | 0 |
| 353 | 0 | 0 | 11 | 10 | 43 | 53 | 20 | 0 | 0 |
| 376 | 8 | 0 | 69 | 45 | 91 | 135 | 51 | 0.12 | 0 |
| 377 | 20 | 17 | 44 | 31 | 96 | 127 | 35 | 0.45 | 0.39 |
| 378 | 0 | 0 | 29 | 23 | 58 | 82 | 36 | 0 | 0 |
| 379 | 3 | 2 | 92 | 102 | 85 | 187 | 49 | 0.03 | 0.02 |
| 380 | 0 | 0 | 32 | 31 | 98 | 129 | 25 | 0 | 0 |
| 381 | 1 | 0 | 34 | 31 | 78 | 109 | 31 | 0.03 | 0 |
| 382 | 0 | 0 | 90 | 75 | 125 | 199 | 45 | 0 | 0 |
| 383 | 2 | 1 | 66 | 26 | 114 | 140 | 47 | 0.03 | 0.02 |
| 384 | 0 | 0 | 52 | 37 | 35 | 72 | 72 | 0 | 0 |
| 385 | 0 | 0 | 39 | 31 | 84 | 114 | 34 | 0 | 0 |

| 405 | 2 | 1 | 23 | 36 | 17 | 53 | 44 | 0.09 | 0.04 |
|----------|-----|-----|------|------|------|------|----|------|------|
| 406 | 3 | 2 | 94 | 89 | 15 | 104 | 90 | 0.03 | 0.02 |
| 407 | 5 | 5 | 79 | 61 | 52 | 112 | 70 | 0.06 | 0.06 |
| 408 | 6 | 6 | 84 | 53 | 74 | 128 | 66 | 0.07 | 0.07 |
| 409 | 2 | 1 | 81 | 80 | 118 | 198 | 41 | 0.03 | 0.01 |
| 410 | 1 | 0 | 39 | 38 | 94 | 132 | 30 | 0.03 | 0 |
| 411 | 0 | 0 | 53 | 45 | 47 | 92 | 58 | 0 | 0 |
| 412 | 1 | 1 | 36 | 29 | 28 | 57 | 63 | 0.03 | 0.03 |
| 413 | 1 | 1 | 56 | 29 | 110 | 139 | 40 | 0.02 | 0.02 |
| 434 | 2 | 2 | 7 | 6 | 26 | 32 | 22 | 0.29 | 0.29 |
| 435 | 14 | 14 | 85 | 45 | 48 | 92 | 92 | 0.17 | 0.17 |
| 436 | 16 | 14 | 129 | 69 | 92 | 161 | 80 | 0.12 | 0.11 |
| 437 | 2 | 1 | 143 | 86 | 124 | 210 | 68 | 0.01 | 0.01 |
| 438 | 0 | 0 | 47 | 30 | 112 | 142 | 33 | 0 | 0 |
| 439 | 1 | 0 | 54 | 5 | 158 | 163 | 33 | 0.02 | 0 |
| 440 | 0 | 0 | 11 | 0 | 102 | 102 | 11 | 0 | 0 |
| 463 | 2 | 2 | 23 | 39 | 7 | 47 | 50 | 0.09 | 0.09 |
| 464 | 4 | 4 | 98 | 84 | 64 | 148 | 66 | 0.04 | 0.04 |
| 465 | 9 | 8 | 82 | 39 | 215 | 254 | 32 | 0.11 | 0.10 |
| 466 | 6 | 6 | 166 | 127 | 168 | 294 | 57 | 0.04 | 0.04 |
| 467 | 3 | 3 | 93 | 68 | 136 | 204 | 46 | 0.03 | 0.03 |
| 468 | 3 | 2 | 19 | 0 | 23 | 23 | 83 | 0.16 | 0.11 |
| 491 | 8 | 8 | 47 | 40 | 19 | 59 | 81 | 0.17 | 0.17 |
| 492 | 3 | 3 | 42 | 52 | 30 | 82 | 52 | 0.07 | 0.07 |
| 493 | 0 | 0 | 43 | 33 | 124 | 157 | 27 | 0 | 0 |
| 494 | 1 | 0 | 77 | 32 | 121 | 155 | 50 | 0.01 | 0 |
| 495 | 10 | 10 | 123 | 97 | 70 | 179 | 69 | 0.07 | 0.08 |
| 496 | 4 | 3 | 24 | 7 | 181 | 192 | 13 | 0.16 | 0.12 |
| Averages | 4 | 3 | 61 | 48 | 82 | 131 | 48 | 0.08 | 0.05 |
| Totals | 185 | 142 | 3065 | 6552 | 2412 | 4121 | | | |

| | | Hair samp | ling technique | Scat sampling technique | | |
|---------|------------|---------------|----------------|-------------------------|------------|--|
| Session | Date | GB Individual | | GB | Individual | |
| | | samples | bears | samples | bears | |
| 1 | 5–13 June | 1 | 1 | 56 | 5 | |
| 2 | 19–27 June | 12 | 7 | 49 | 2 | |
| 3 | 3–11 July | 7 | 6 | 22 | 2 | |
| 4 | 17–25 July | 8 | 4 | 15 | 1 | |

Table A1.2. Counts of grizzly bear (GB) samples and individual bears identified per session for hair and scat sampling during the 2018 DNA inventory in Alberta, Canada.

Table A1.3. Summary statistics for hair-snag sampling, scat sampling, and hair+scat sampling for the spatially explicit capture-recapture (SECR) analysis in the 2018 DNA inventory in Alberta, Canada.

| Statistic | Session | | | | |
|------------------------------------|---------|-----|-----|-----|-------|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | Total |
| Hair-snag sampling (7×7 km cells) | | | | | |
| Detections | 1 | 7 | 6 | 4 | 18 |
| Unmarked bears | 1 | 7 | 4 | 2 | 14 |
| Cumulative individual bears marked | 1 | 8 | 12 | 14 | 14 |
| Detection frequencies | 10 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total site visits | 1 | 7 | 7 | 4 | 19 |
| Detectors visited | 1 | 6 | 6 | 4 | 17 |
| Detectors available | 50 | 50 | 50 | 50 | 200 |
| Scat sampling (3.5×3.5 km cells) | | | | | |
| Detections | 5 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 10 |
| Unmarked bears | 5 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 8 |
| Cumulative individual bears marked | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 8 |
| Detection frequencies | 6 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total site visits | 9 | 4 | 3 | 1 | 17 |
| Detectors visited | 8 | 4 | 3 | 1 | 16 |
| Detectors available | 153 | 153 | 153 | 153 | 612 |
| Hair+scat sampling | | | | | |
| Detections | 5 | 8 | 8 | 5 | 26 |
| Unmarked bears | 5 | 6 | 5 | 2 | 18 |
| Cumulative individual bears marked | 5 | 11 | 16 | 18 | 18 |
| Detection frequencies | 11 | 6 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| Total site visits | 10 | 11 | 10 | 5 | 36 |
| Detectors visited | 9 | 10 | 9 | 5 | 33 |
| Detectors available | 203 | 203 | 203 | 203 | 812 |

| Bear ID | Sex | 2018 Age | Sampling technique |
|-----------|-----|----------|--------------------|
| G151 | М | 11 | hair and scat |
| G152 | Μ | 9 | hair and scat |
| G153 | F | 9 | scat |
| G166 | Μ | 13 | hair |
| G172 | Μ | 5 | hair and scat |
| G175 | Μ | 7 | scat |
| G182 | Μ | 3 | hair |
| AB_6196 | F | adult | hair |
| Cuar120 | F | unknown | scat |
| DNA_8557 | F | subadult | scat |
| SAR2868 | Μ | adult | hair |
| 323D-1B-4 | F | unknown | hair |
| 408D-1A-3 | F | unknown | hair |
| 410-1A-1 | F | >5 | hair and scat |
| 437D-3M-2 | F | unknown | hair |
| 492B-1A-3 | Μ | unknown | hair |
| 492B-1C-3 | F | unknown | hair |
| 548B-4B-1 | F | >4 | hair |

Table A1.4. Details of individual grizzly bears identified through hair and scat sampling techniques including bear ID, sex and age during the 2018 DNA inventory in Alberta, Canada. Previously collared research bears are indicated by the G-number bear IDs.

Figure A1.1. Detection function plots for male and female bears for hair+scat sampling (model HS1; Table 2) during the 2018 DNA inventory in Alberta, Canada.



Appendix 2

Sampling approach cost comparison

We estimated the cost to conduct a hair-snag DNA inventory using a 50-cell grid system with full road access at \$93 000, while the cost of a scat-based inventory was reduced by 30% to \$68 000 (Table A2.1). In order to compare DNA inventory budgets between sampling designs in our project specific context, we estimated budgets based on the costs and samples collected in 2018.

Our scat-based DNA inventory occurred along roads and therefore, only within areas accessible by road, while other study areas may require remote helicopter access. The lack of helicopter costs here helps maintain comparability between methods. All-terrain vehicle (ATV) access costs are included in the hair sampling budget because while all cells are accessible by truck, getting to the hair snag sites can require ATV use depending on location and road conditions.

The staffing costs required for each method include the salary of one project leader (also serving here as a crew member). Hair sampling requires an additional crew member to conduct field work, while scat sampling needs only one person to drive roads and collect samples.

The costs are estimated for two office shifts (one for field preparation and one for wrap-up) and six field shifts (a training session, set-up session, and four sampling sessions). We estimate the hair crew would work ten hours per day for nine-day shifts, and the scat crew eight hours per day for six-day shifts, while office days would be seven and a half hours per day for both crews. In addition, overtime hours (e.g. ten hours per person) are expected for the hair crew due to high workloads required in site set-up and take down during the last sampling session.

The hair sampling method requires more field equipment (e.g. wire, bait, and sampling gear) and field preparation (e.g. site selection and bait preparation, including fermentation time), training prior to field work, data entry and wrap-up work post field work. Prior to field work, the scat crew only needs to assemble scat kits and prepare road survey maps. In the cost estimates, these differences are shown with the hair crew requiring two crew members for nine office days prior to field work, nine days of training, and nine office days post fieldwork for field work, six days for training, and six office days post field work.

In the field, truck costs would be higher per day for the scat crew due to mileage and gas. However, there would be fewer field days required for the scat crew which reduces the overall truck cost.

Laboratory analysis costs depend on the number of samples collected, the sub-selection criteria used, the total number of samples sent to the lab, and which tests are run on each sample (e.g. species or individual identity). Costs in this budget comparison are estimated based on samples collected and prices in 2018: 94 hair samples and 183 scat samples at an average cost of \$65 per hair sample and \$110 per scat sample in addition to lab set-up fees.

The statistical analyses and final report costs differ between sampling techniques, especially depending on the extent of the report and the type of report (e.g. single DNA inventory versus monitoring report). In this budget comparison we have included report costs for DNA inventories, where both methods require the same amount of time for statistics and report assembly.

| Item | Details | Hair sampling costs | Scat sampling costs |
|------------------------|---|---------------------------|---------------------------|
| Project leader | 1 person (45 field and 27 office days for hair crew and 30 field and 18 offices for scat crew) | \$14 700 | \$8300 |
| Additional crew salary | 1 person for hair crew (45 field and 27 office days) | \$13 400 | \$0 |
| Training | Safety courses (project leader and crew members) | \$300 | \$200 |
| Accommodation | Crew accommodation (field and office days) | \$12 500 | \$4200 |
| Food | Crew meals (field and office days) | \$8400 | \$2800 |
| Trucks | Rental, maintenance, damage, insurance, mileage | \$5600 | \$6000 |
| Gas | Gas for trucks (more driving for scat but few field days) | \$5000 | \$5300 |
| Other access costs | All-terrain vehicle use (1 for hair crew) and gas | \$4900 | \$0 |
| Field equipment | Crew and truck gear (e.g. communications, safety and sampling gear) | \$7300 | \$5,000 |
| Lab analysis | Hair or scat sample analysis (depends on number of samples, e.g. 100 hair and 200 scat samples) | \$7000 | \$22 500 |
| Statistical analysis | Statistician (depends on extent of report, inventory versus monitoring, e.g. 13 days) | \$9800 | \$9800 |
| Report | Project supervisor (depends on extent of report, inventory versus monitoring, e.g. 20 days) | \$4500 | \$4500 |
| | Total costs | \$93 400 | \$68 600 |

Table A2.1. Comparison of project costs in Canadian dollars using a hair sampling versus scat sampling approach to conduct a grizzly bear population inventory with spatially explicit capture-recapture (SECR) in a 50-cell grid sampling system.