

2016 Ecological Communities

Conservation Status Rank Review and Changes Summary

- One ecological community was removed from the list due to insufficient data
- Community Summary dynamic reports:
 - One ecological community had revisions to the Biogeoclimatic (BGC) distribution based on element occurrences
 - Non-BGC distribution data (Forest District, Ecosection, MOE Region, Regional District and Municipality) was revised for 617 ecological communities, to be consistent with the Biogeoclimatic Ecosystem Classification (BEC) Map Version 9
- Conservation Status dynamic reports:
 - Improvement to the reports! Range Extent Estimate is now displayed in its own field (when the value exists in the data) instead of in the Range Extent Comments.
 - Range Extent Estimates were re-calculated and Range Extent Comments revised for 617 ecological communities, to be consistent with BEC Map Version 9
- Conservation Status Ranks:
 - Provincial Conservation Status Ranks were reviewed for 23 existing ecological communities. New data were available and included in all assessments and current status ranking criteria were used for the first time for 20 of the 23 ecosystems. Of these, status ranks changed for 15 ecological communities and remained unchanged for 8 others. Of those that changed:
 - 10 are now less at risk
 - 3 are more at risk
 - 2 have higher uncertainty
 - BC List Status (Red/Blue/Yellow) also changed for 10 ecological communities
- Names of four ecological communities were changed to be consistent with botanical taxonomic and name updates, and classification:
 - 2 Scientific names (1 botanical, 1 typo)
 - 2 English names
- Element occurrence mapping: 626 element occurrences were published for 31 ecological communities