A Checklist for Proposing Changes to the
California Wildlife Habitat Relationships System

Users are encouraged to propose changes to data in the CWHR system which will improve the reliability of the model predictions. Please complete the form below to propose corrections, additions or deletions to information in the CWHR database based upon the output of a query. Thank you for your input.

****

Name:_____Date:_____

Title:_____Agency/Company:_____

Suggested change:
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____

****

Version of CWHR used: _____

Query parameters:
      Habitat types and stages_____
      Habitat suitability levels_____
      Elements excluded from query_____
      Exclusion level for elements_____

Were habitat parameters field-verified?_____

Did you consider the following model assumptions?

_____   Habitat suitability ratings for a species in a habitat are statewide rather than bioregional. Suitability of a given habitat for a given species may vary throughout the state, but only one overall statewide rating is assigned. This is likely to represent the average of a range of suitability values.

_____   Habitats for species that require juxtaposition of two or more habitats are individually rated as if the other habitats are available in the proper mix.

_____   Ratings are developed assuming all special habitat elements are present in adequate amounts if they are typical components of the habitat.

_____   Habitats are rated assuming that adequate habitat amounts and patch size exist.

_____   The model does not account for species interactions (e.g. competition, predation) within a habitat.

Did you consider the basic logic governing the query process? (This topic is covered in detail in the CWHR training course.)

_____   Species presence/absence for location and habitat are calculated with and logic rather than made directly. For example, to determine if the Northern Goshawk is predicted to occur in Blue Oak Woodland habitat in El Dorado County, the program will search first for the species in the habitat and next for the species in the location. If the answer is yes to both questions, the species will be predicted to occur there. No prediction is made directly for that species in that habitat in that location.

_____   There is no connection between the elements databases and the databases for habitat and locations. Excluding elements considered essential for a given life requisite will drop a species off a list regardless of its presence in a given habitat or location.

What is the source of the proposed change? Please attach documentation.

_____ Expert opinion/Field observation. Observation should be documented with field notes including observer name, date, location, and CWHR habitat type for suggested commission/omission errors. For proposed changes to habitat suitability levels, CWHR habitat type, size and cover class should also be included.

_____ Published information/Validation study. Copy of article or pertinent parts with full citation should be attached.

****

If you are proposing an original validation study, please consult with CWHR program staff in the course of designing the study. The following references may also be helpful:

For an example of a well-designed validation study, see Hejl, S.J. and Verner, J. (1988) Evaluating avian-habitat relationships in red fir forests of the Sierra Nevada. 1988 Transactions of the Western Section of the Wildlife Society 24: 121-134.

For a discussion on the problems associated with making changes based on validation study findings, see Sterner, D. (1995) Guidelines for making changes to the CWHR model. Unpublished report. California Department of Fish and Game.

****
CWHR Program Use Only

Are changes necessary?_____yes _____no

Justification:_____
_____
_____

Initials_____   Date:_____

****