The Importance of Scale: Assessing and Predicting Brook Trout Status in its Southern Native Range

Mark Hudy¹

U.S. Forest Service, Fish and Aquatic Ecology Unit, James Madison University, Harrisonburg, Virginia 22807

Keith Nislow

U.S. Forest Service, Northern Research Station, University of Massachusetts, Amherst, Massachusetts, 1003

Eric P. Smith

Virginia Tech, Department of Statistics, Blacksburg, Virginia 24061

Arthur R. Cooper and Dana M. Infante Michigan State University, Department of Fisheries and Wildlife, Lansing Michigan, 48824

¹ Current address: U.S. Geological Survey, 12201 Sunrise Valley Drive, Reston, Virginia 20192

Abstract. -- Occupancy models are of increasing interest to managers and natural resource decision makers. Assessment of status and trends, as well as the specific drivers influencing occupancy, both may change as a function of scale, and analyses conducted at multiple scales can help identify important mechanisms leading to changes in distributions. We analyzed extensive fine-scale occupancy data across the southern historic range of the brook trout, Salvelinus fontinalis to determine which landscape metrics and thresholds were useful in predicting brook trout presence across three relevant spatial scales and how brook trout occupancy varied by scale. Percentage occupancy declined markedly with increased spatial resolution, as 52% of watersheds (HUC10) but only 32% of subwatersheds (HUC12) and 14% of catchments (HUC14) were occupied. Across all three scales, habitats which were exclusively occupied by native brook trout (without non-native trout) were rare (<10%). CART models using GIS-derived landscape predictor variables were developed for three classification cases: Case 1:(brook trout; no brook trout), Case 2 (brook trout; non-native trout only; no trout), and Case 3 (brook trout only; brook and non-native trout; non-native trout only and no trout). Model results were sensitive to both scale and the number of classification categories with respect to classification accuracy, variable selection and variable threshold values. Classification accuracy tended to be lowest at the finest (catchment) scale potentially reflecting stochastic population processes and barriers to movement. Classification rates for the overall models were: Case 1: Watershed (80.19%); Subwatershed (85.06%); Catchment (71.13%); Case 2: Watershed (69.31%); Subwatershed (68.72%); Catchment (57.38%); Case 3: Watershed (58.91%); Subwatershed (59.83%); Catchment (47.59%). Our multiscale approach revealed soil permeability (positive) and atmospheric pollution (negative) to be important predictors. The predicted occupancy and observed status of brook trout appear to be influenced by the scale the data are collected and reported.

Introduction

Maintaining sustainable and resilient wild trout populations depends on the availability of a distinct set of habitat conditions that are threatened by a wide range of anthropogenic factors operating at multiple spatial and temporal scales. These concerns, along with apparent declines in distribution and abundance in some systems, have led to calls for systematic analysis of status and trends, particularly at large landscape scales (Rieman et al. 1997; Thurow et al. 1997; Hudy et al. 2008). In addition, given likely changes in habitat suitability in the near- and longer-term, managers need tools, which will help them identify, conserve, and restore priority populations and habitats. Occupancy models, which identify habitat and landscape variables that are associated with occurrence, can be useful for these purposes, and are increasingly used in the context of wild trout conservation (Wagner et al. 2013).

Brook trout, Salvelinus fontinalis, provide an excellent example of these issues. Native populations, particularly in the southern portion of their range, are under threat from landscape change (deforestation and development), non-native species (particularly naturalized rainbow trout and brown trout), atmospheric pollution, and most recently, regional climate warming. These concerns have led to the creation of the Eastern Brook Trout Joint Venture (EBTJV) (EBTJV 2006) a multiagency effort to document status and trends over the entire historic range. Previous work accomplished under the EBTJV produced an initial status assessment (Hudy et al. 2008). This assessment was conducted at relatively coarse resolution (subwatershed (HUC12)) and confirmed that populations appeared to be at risk and declining, and that an initial predictive model identified forest cover as an important determinant of brook trout occurrence. However, the determination of status and the identification of critical habitat factors are highly dependent on the spatial scale of analysis. For brook trout, these issues are particularly relevant. Many populations exist in small isolated, headwater patches and brook trout presence in some subwatersheds may only be represented by one or a few of these small populations, which are potentially highly vulnerable to extirpation. Similarly, at these fine spatial scales, the factors that best account for brook trout presence may change, with consequent implications for management actions. To address these issues, in this study we used fine-scale (catchment HUC14) occupancy data, along with an expanded list of GIS-based landscape variables, to assess status of both native and nonnative trout and the factors contributing to presence or absence of these species over the southern historic range of the brook trout. Our goal was to refine our assessment of status, and to increase our ability to identify priority habitats and effective management strategies.

Methods

Study area, assessment scale and classifications of reproducing trout

Through over 100 years of sampling efforts, an extensive and fine scale database of cold-water habitats supporting naturally reproducing trout has been developed within the southern historic range of the brook trout (Pennsylvania, New Jersey, Maryland, West Virginia, Virginia, North Carolina, Tennessee, Georgia, South Carolina)(Hudy et al. 2008). These states are unique within the EBTJV in that they have a census of the downstream extant of reproducing trout. Detection probabilities are unknown for the majority of the datasets but ranged from 89 to 99 % in Pennsylvania streams (Wagner et al. 2013).

We created a 50-km buffer zone around a 1969 map of the species' native distribution in the study area (developed from fish collections and personal communications with fisheries experts; MacCrimmon and Campbell 1969; Hudy et al. 2008) and classified all 808 watersheds (HUC10); 3,804 subwatersheds (HUC12) and 132,321 catchments (HUC14) that were situated wholly or partially within the region and buffer zone according to occupancy of reproducing populations of native brook trout, and non-native rainbow trout *Oncorhynchus mykiss* and brown trout *Salmo trutta*. A total of 107 sub-basins (HUC 8) were within the study area but we did not include these in this analysis because of the small sample sizes in some of the wild trout classes we were trying to predict.

There were 8 possible classifications (Table 1). We grouped these classifications and developed models to predict wild trout status for 3 different cases of interest to biologists participating in the EBTJV. Case 1 models predicted two categories either brook trout (defined as watershed units classified as 1, 2, 3 or 4) or no brook trout (defined as watershed units classified as 5,6,7,or 8). Case 2 models predicted three categories; brook trout (defined as watershed units classified as 1, 2, 3 or 4), non-native trout (defined as watershed units classified as 1, 2, 3 or 4), non-native trout (defined as watershed units classified as 1, 2, 3 or 4), non-native trout (defined as watershed units classified as 5, 6, or 7) and no trout (defined as watershed units classified as 8). Case 3 models predicted 4 categories; allopatric brook trout (defined as watershed units classified as 1), sympatric brook trout (defined as watershed units classified as 2, 3 or 4), non-native trout (defined as watershed units classified as 5, 6, or 7) and no trout (defined as watershed units classified as 1), sympatric brook trout (defined as watershed units classified as 2, 3 or 4), non-native trout (defined as watershed units classified as 5, 6, or 7) and no trout (defined as watershed units classified as 8). Models were developed for all three cases for all three-watershed scales for a total of 9 models.

Candidate metrics, metric screening, metric calculations

We calculated and evaluated 85 candidate landscape metrics (Thieling 2006; Esselman 2011) and these metrics were used instead of site-specific variables (Moyle and Randall 1998) (Table 2). Each metric was summarized by the relevant watershed (HUC10); subwatershed (HUC12) or 4 catchment (HUC14) categories (LC= local catchment; NC= network catchment (sum of all upstream catchments); LB = local catchment buffer (sum of 100 m buffer around NHD+ stream layer in the local catchment) and NB= network buffer (sum of 100 m buffer of all upstream NHD+ streams). Landscape metrics can provide an indicator of watershed health when many anthropogenic factors potentially contribute to a problem, and such metrics can assist in identification of key limiting factors (Marschall 1996; McCormick et al. 2001).

Model development

The data were analyzed using CART version 7.0 (<u>http://www.salford-systems.com</u>., Brieman et al., 1984) using classification trees. Classification trees are popular as they are relative easy to understand and are nonparametric methods. A classification tree is a series of binary splits that results in nodes and branches that produces a prediction model for a class variable. At each node a split of the data is made based on a threshold value for one of the independent variables. Each series of nodes leads to a terminal node, provides a classification rule and is associated with independent variables and associated thresholds. The decision as to what variable is used and the threshold is based on a measure of change in a classification metric. For this analysis, the Gini measure of "purity" of the classification was used. A tree grows until no improvements may be made and often results in overfitting of a model. Part of the goal is to produce a simple tree. To do this we used ten-fold crossvalidation and used a one-standard error rule. With crossvalidation, the data are split ten times into a group consisting of 90% of

the data and 10% of the data. The model is fit using the 90% group and evaluated using the 10% group. The process is repeated 10 times using a different subset each time. A "cost" or classification function is used to measure the overall quality of the tree, and crossvalidation results in an estimate of the variance of the measure. A simple tree is one that has a cost that is similar to the best tree (i.e. within one standard error of the best tree) but has fewer nodes. Following selection of the tree variable importance measures are calculated along with prediction rates. Variable importance measures how much of the reduction in cost is associated with a particular variable. CART allows use of all variables (including those never used in the tree) to be included or the use of variables associated with splitting of the tree. Variable importance measures are scaled so the greatest value is 100. We used just the variables associated with splits in the calculations. Prediction rates were also calculated on test data to provide a conservative estimate of prediction success. The catchment data have a large number of observations and this lead to difficulties with the memory for the CART analysis. To simplify the analysis and to use all the observations, we first used the R package rpart to identify important variables and used a subset of the variables in the analysis.

Results and Discussion

Using extensive, fine scale, catchment occupancy data we found that brook trout currently occupy 51.61% of the watersheds; 31.91% of the subwatersheds and 13.97% of the catchments in the southeastern United States within their historic native range (Table 3). In the original EBTJV assessment the analysis was limited to subwatersheds because the lack of extensive fine scale data in the northeastern United States (Hudy et al. 2008). These patterns of occupancy have important implications for status and vulnerability assessment. Although there is some uncertainty with respect to historic occupancy rates at the finest (catchment) scale, our observation that < 14% of catchments are currently occupied suggest a high level of vulnerability to current and future threats, with brook trout restricted to one or two small populations in isolated headwater habitats. While current and historic data collected from EBTJV members clearly show that unoccupied watersheds and subwatersheds historically had brook trout and now have been extirpated (Hudy et al. 2008) our results suggest that these analyses may underestimate risk. Re-evaluating subwatersheds at the catchment level has improved identification of these at risk subwatersheds and helped set more informed priorities for restoration and conservation efforts. For example approximately 19 % of the catchments in North Carolina lost brook trout since the 2005 assessment (Hudy et al. 2008). In other cases, previously unoccupied catchments were recolonized or restored (less than 2%). Based on this new analysis agencies managing the EBTJV and the Chesapeake Bay Executive Order have adopted catchment level metrics for monitoring status and trends.

The majority of brook trout populations throughout the southern range co-occur with non-native trout (rainbow and/or brown trout (watersheds: 7.55% allopatric; 44.06% sympatric; subwatersheds: 9.75% allopatric; 22.75% sympatric; catchments: 7.81% allopatric; 6.17% sympatric). While the establishment of non-native trout in brook trout watersheds has been previously addressed in a number of studies (Kelly et al. 1980; Larson and Moore 1985; Wagner et al. 2013), ours is the first to broadly document these patterns of co-occurrence across multiple scales. The data suggest that even catchments that currently contain only native brook trout are vulnerable to invasion from non-native trout established within their subwatersheds. These invaded populations may be at increased risk, as some studies have found negative impacts of non-native trout on wild brook trout (Kelly et al. 1980; Wagner

et al. 2013) and non-native trout may also be better able to persist in anthropogenically altered habitats (Wagner et al. 2013). Monitoring efforts need to focus on rates of non-native establishment at the catchment scale and the fate and status of brook trout populations currently in sympatry, particularly as compared to the few remaining allopatric populations. If negative impacts are detected, this would place particular emphasis on keeping those few subwatersheds that currently contain only brook trout free of non-native species.

Using CART models to predict occupancy yielded relatively high classification accuracy in most cases. Model results were sensitive to both scale and the number of classification categories with respect to classification accuracy, variable selection and variable threshold values (Table 3). Overall prediction rates were: Case 1 (watershed 80.19%; subwatershed 85.06%; catchment 71.13%); Case 2 were (watershed 69.31%; subwatershed 68.72%; catchment 57.38%) and Case 3 (watershed 58.91%; subwatershed 59.83%; catchment 47.59%)(Table 3). For all three cases, classification accuracy was lowest at the catchment scale, potentially reflecting stochastic population processes and barriers to movement, which would complicate predication based on landscape variables. Our best predictive models were for Case 1 at the subwatershed scale. A total of 39 of the original 85 metrics were used at least once in the 9 different models (Table 4). The metric of soil permeability was the most important variable for watershed and subwatershed models but was not important at the catchment scale (Table 4). Many of the important prediction metrics are fixed (i.e. elevation) but the majority can be influenced both short term and long term by management actions (i.e. soil permeability; canopy cover; land use; road density, SO_4 and NO_3 deposition). These models are therefore useful in targeting actions (increasing canopy cover, decommissioning roads, liming watersheds) that would increase brook trout population resilience.

Most of the data used here were provided by state and federal agencies and had not been published or peer reviewed. Despite the criteria developed for status classification, there remains some element of subjectivity in the assessment of status and occupancy. It was impossible to generate a comprehensive review without such data (Reiman et al. 1997). We attempted to limit errors, reduce subjectivity, and provide consistency in data by using consistency rules and data standards (quality and age); developing broad classification categories; and employing standard, validated procedures in consulting experts (Hudy et al. 2008). Moving forward, continued improvement and standardization of decision rules and data collection protocols, along with increasing understanding of the factors limiting brook trout population and incorporation of these factors into new models, will further increase our ability to assess status, predict trends, and target management actions.

Acknowledgements:

We thank the members of the EBTJV and the National Fish Habit Board Science and Data committee and Inland Assessment Team for providing their latest data.

References

- Breiman, L., J. Friedman, R. Olshen, and C. Stone. Classification and Regression Trees. Pacific Grove:Wadsworth, 1984. <u>http://www.salford-systems.com</u>.
- EBTJV (Eastern Brook Trout Joint Venture). 2006. About the Eastern Brook Trout Venture. Available: www. easternbrooktrout.org. (December 2006).

- Esselman, P.T., D.M. Infante, L. Wang, D.Wu, A.R. Cooper and W.W. Taylor. 2011. An Index of Cumulative Disturbance to River Fish Habitats of the Conterminus United States from Landscape Anthropogenic Activities. Ecological Restoration 29:1-2
- Hudy, M., T. M. Thieling, N. Gillespie, and E. P. Smith. 2008. Distribution, status, and perturbations to brook trout within the eastern United States. North American Journal of Fisheries Management 28:1069 -1085.
- Kelly, G. A., J. S. Griffith, and R. D. Jones. 1980. Changes in distribution of trout in Great Smoky Mountains National Park, 1900–1970. U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service Technical Paper 102.
- Larson, G. L., and S. E. Moore. 1985. Encroachment of exotic rainbow trout into stream populations of native brook trout in the southern Appalachian Mountains. Transactions of the American Fisheries Society 114:195–203.
- MacCrimmon, H. R., and J. S. Campbell. 1969. World distribution of brook trout, Salvelinus fontinalis. Journal of the Fisheries Research Board of Canada 26:1699–1725.
- Marschall, E. A., and L. B. Crowder. 1996. Assessing population responses to multiple anthropogenic effects: a case study with brook trout. Ecological Applications 6:152–167.
- McCormick, F. H., R. M. Hughes, P. R. Kaufmann, D. V. Peck, J. L. Stoddard, and A. T. Herlihy. 2001. Development of an index of biotic integrity for the mid-Atlantic Highlands region. Transactions of the American Fisheries Society 130:857–877.
- Moyle, P. B., and P. J. Randall. 1998. Evaluating the biotic integrity of watersheds in the Sierra Nevada, California. Conservation Biology 12:1318–1326.
- Reiman, B. E., D. C. Lee, and R. F. Thurow. 1997. Distribution, status, and likely future trends of bull trout within the Columbia River and Klamath River basins, North American Journal of Fisheries Management 17:1111–1125.
- Thieling, T. M. 2006. Assessment and predictive model for brook trout (Salvelinus fontinalis) population status in the eastern United States. Master's thesis. James Madison University, Harrisonburg, Virginia.
- Thurow, R. F., D. C. Lee, and B. E. Reiman. 1997. Distribution and status of seven native salmonids in the interior Columbia River basin and portions of the Klamath River and Great basins. North American Journal of Fisheries Management 17:1094–1110.
- Wagner, T., J.T. Deweber, J. Detar and J.A. Sweka. 2013. Landscape-Scale Evaluation of Asymmetric Interactions between Brown Trout and Brook Trout Using Two-Species Occupancy Models. Transactions of the American Fisheries Society 142:353-361.

Table 1. Eight wild trout occupancy categories used to classify 808 watersheds; 3,804 subwatersheds and 132,321 catchments. 1 =present; 0 =absent. Data collected from EBTJV members (Hudy et al. 2008).

| Occupancy classifications | Brook trout | Rainbow Trout | Brown Trout |
|------------------------------|-------------|---------------|-------------|
| 1. | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| 2. | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| 3. | 1 | 0 | 1 |
| 4. | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| 5. | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| 6. | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| 7. | 0 | 1 | 1 |
| 8. | 0 | 0 | 0 |

Table 2. Candidate metrics summarized by type, attribute base name, description, units, source, dataset, scale/resolution, date and website. All metrics used for developing predicative regression tree models. Metrics summarized by relevant scale of analysis (watershed, subwatershed, catchment).

Table 3. Occupancy and classification rates (crossvalidation) for watersheds (HUC10); subwatersheds (HUC12) and catchments (HUC14) for three cases of trout classification. Case 1: brook trout, no brook trout; Case 2: brook trout, non-native trout, no trout; Case 3: allopatric brook trout, sympatric brook trout, non-native trout, no trout).

Table 4. Variable importance for predicting brook trout (Case 1: brook trout, no brook trout; Case 2: brook trout, non-native trout, no trout; Case 3: allopatric brook trout, sympatric brook trout, non-native trout, no trout) for three scales (watershed (HUC 10); subwatershed (HUC 12); catchment (HUC 14)) using CART regression tree models. Each metric summarized by the relevant scale of analysis (watershed; subwatershed; catchment). Catchment data summarized by 4 methods for each metric (LC = metric summarized for entire area of local catchment; LB = metric summarized by 100 m buffer of the NHD+ stream layer within the local catchment; NC = metric summarized by the area of the stream network (local catchment plus all upstream catchments).

| Atribute Base Name Surficial Lithology, USGS ¹ | Description | Units | Scale/Resolution | Currentne |
|--|--|--|---|--|
| | Dewription | one | Seale 1 according to | |
| LITHO 1 | | | lim. | 2004 |
| LTHEO_3 | Non-Carborate Residual Material | proportion | 11mm | 2004 |
| UTTHO_5 | | proportion | lim. | 2004 |
| LITHO 8 | Collovial Sediment | proportion | 11mm | 2004 |
| LITHO_9 | Glacial Till, Clayey | proportion | lim | 2004 |
| | Ghuini Thi, Lummy | propertien | Սառ | 2004 |
| 1 THO_11 | | proportion | lim | 2004 |
| JTHO_12 JTHO_13 | Glarial Outwark and Glarial Lake Sediment, Course-Textured Glarial Lake Sediment Fine-Textured | proportion | Umu | 2004 |
| | | proportion | lim | 2004 |
| 1780_14 1780_15 | Glacial Outwark and Glacial Lake Sediment, Corre-Restored | proportion | 11mm | 2004 2004 |
| | | proportion | llann Llann | 2004 |
| 17HD_10 17HD_17 | Rolian Sediment, Counter-Hextured (Sand Dones) | proportion | llen. Llen | 2004 |
| | | proportion | lim | 2004 |
| | | proportion | lim lim | 2004 |
| JTHO 22 | Water | proportion proportion | 1.mm | 2004 |
| MI National Land Cover Database, MIXLC | | | | |
| LCD2001_II | Open Witter | proportion | 30 m | 2001 |
| LCD2001_21 | Developed, Open Space | proportion | 30 m | 2001 |
| LCID2001_22 | De velage de Low intensity De velage d, Miclian Intensity | proportion | 30 m | 2001 |
| CD2001 23 | Developed Minimum Intensity | proportion | 30 m | 2001 |
| LCD2001 24 | Developed, High Intensity | proportion | 30 m | 2001 |
| LCD2001 31 | | proportion | 30 m. | 2001 |
| LCD2001 41 | Deciduum Furent | poputin | 30 m | 2001 |
| LCD2001 42 | Everyteen Parent | proportion | 30 m. | 2001 |
| LCT02001_43 | Ninet Firet | poputin | 30 m | 2001 |
| 1.002001 52 | | proportion | 30 m | 2001 |
| LCD2001_71 | | pagantian | 30 m | 2001 |
| LCD2001_81 | | proportion | 30 m | 2001 |
| LCD2001 82 | | proposition | 30 m | 2001 |
| LCD2001_82 | Wanty Wetherds | proportion | 30 m | 2001 |
| LCD2001_95 | Kongent Hedra can Withmin | | 30 m | 2001 |
| LCD2001_95 Htt National Land Cover Database. MRLC' | NUMBER AND A CAR PENNEN | production (| ->-m | 2001 |
| | Open Witer | | 30 m | 2006 |
| LCD2006_11 | | proportion | | |
| LCID2006_21 LCID2006_22 | Developed, Open Space | poputin | 30 m 30 m | 2006 2006 |
| | Developed, Low Intensity | proportion | | |
| E.CD2006_23 E.CD2006_24 | Developed, Micham Intennity | proportion | 30 m 30 m | 2006 2006 |
| | Developed, High Intennity | | | |
| LCD2006_31 | Barren Land (Rock/Sand/Clay) | proportion | 30 m | 2006 |
| LCD2006_41 | Deciduum Forest | proportion | 30 m | 2006 |
| ECID2006_42 | | proportion | 30 m | 2006 |
| LCID2006_43 | Minert Formt | proportion | 30 m | 2006 |
| LCD2006_52 | Shmir/Semin | proportion | 30 m. | 2006 |
| LCD2006_71 | Grandwei/Hertneren | proportion | 30 m | 2006 |
| ALCID2006_81 | Pasture/Hay | | 30 m | 2006 |
| LCD2006_82 | | proportion | 30 m | 2006 |
| ILCID2006_90 | | | 30 m | 2006 |
| ILCID2006_95 | Konsegna Herbu, nam Withmin | proportion | 30 m | 2006 |
| tes-flow index grid for the conterminum United St | in, USGS' | | | |
| | | pen entage | lim. | 2003 |
| Managheriz Deparition I supleth Maga, National At- | angleric. Depention Program" | | | |
| IEENO3 MIRAN | Annual NO3 wet deputition averaged for 1994 - 2010 | hiligram/betae | 2.338 im | 1994-201 |
| JEINO3 MAX | Maximum NO3 wet deconition value taken from 1994 - 2010 a | hilograms/becture | 2.338 km | 1994-201 |
| IGINO3_MAXALL | Maximum NO3 wet deposition value taken across entire time span (1994 - 2010) b | hilling a construction of the later | 2.338 km | 1994-201 |
| JEPSO4_MEAN | Annual SO4 wet depusition averaged for 1994 - 2010 | kikgram/better | 2.338 km | 1994-201 |
| JERSO4_MAX | Maximum SO4 wet deposition value talon from 1994 - 2010 a | hilligram/hetae | 2.338 km | 1994-201 |
| JEPSO4_MAXALL | Maximum SO4 wet deposition value taken across entire time span (1994 – 2010) b | hilogram/becture | 2.338 km | 1994-201 |
| tational Elevation Dataset (acquired from NEILPhe | *I), USGS* | | | |
| LEV MAX | Minimum catchment elevation | | 30 m | 2005 |
| LEV_MEAN | Average calchment elevation | centimeten | 30 m | 2005 |
| LEV MIN | Minimum catchment elevation | centimeters | 30 m | 2005 |
| 110 U.S. Cenner, US Cenner Barran ⁴ | | | | |
| | Population density | ø/mi | 1:100,000 c | 2010 |
| OPDINS | | | | |
| OPDENS | Housine unit denity | Ø/Irm' | 1100.000 c | 2010 |
| CIFUENS LLINNS MI Rafamal Land Cover Database, MRLC ¹ | Ikaning unit demity | Ø/Icm² | 1:100,000 r | 2010 |
| CIFUENS LLINNS MI Rafamal Land Cover Database, MRLC ¹ | Hunning unit density | | | |
| OPDENS HURNS MIL Radianal Lamit Cover Database, MRLC ² LCD2000 LPC | Blanning totil decaily The campy coverage | pera entrage | 30 m | 2001 |
| OPDENS LDDNS HU Rafinal Land Cover Database, MKLC ¹ LCD2001_FC LCD2001_IS | Blanning totil decaily The campy coverage | pera entrage | | |
| CREDRAS HLIRAS HLIRAS HLIRAS HLCD2001_HC HLCD2001_HC HLCD2001_HS HLCD2001_HS | Hauming unit desnity Three campy coverage Joopnevicus and acce coverage | ber entite ber entite | 30 m 30 m | 2001 |
| CHERNS LEDROS 1011 Réfinant Jami Carer Database, MELC ² LED2001 JS LED2001 JS 1001 Réfinant Jami Carer Database, MELC ² | Hauming unit desnity Three campy coverage Joopnevicus and acce coverage | ber entite ber entite | 30 m | 2001 2001 |
| COPERSS LEDENS 1988 (Kalimat Land Cover Database, MRLC ⁺ 4.CD2001 [JS 4.CD2001 [JS 4.CD2000 [JS 7.CD2000 [JS 7.CD2000 [JS 7.CD2000 [JS 7.CD2000 [JS | Jikaming wini deniny Tire canage (menage Jimpervisan andrice unverage Jimpervisan andrice unverage | ber erste ber erste ber | 30 m 30 m 30 m | 2001 2001 2006 |
| CHERNS HERNS MI Reisen II. and Cover Database, MRCC ²⁴ 4.002001, US MI Reisen II. and Cover Database, MRCC ²⁴ 4.002001, US MI Reisen II. and Cover Database, MRCC ²⁴ 4.002006 JS MITSCO, USAS ²⁵ | Jikaning uni denity The campy unwage Jimgervina autore urwage Jimgervina autore urwage Awage ail permetolity yaka | per entage per entage | 30 m 30 m | 2001 2001 |
| CHEDRS MIR Relational Land Cover Database, MRX C ⁺ 4072001 UK 4072001 UK MIR Relational Land Cover Database, MRX C ⁺ 4072006 (S TATSTCO, USAS ² CLIPERIA 52, Climate Research (1991-2010), PRXSM Climate 6 | Jikamie jusi demity Tree cancpy toronage Impervisan andraz corecage Anenge and permetoliky rates camp | pen mispe pen mispe pen mispe imbes/hox * 100 | 10 m 30 m 30 m 1250,000 | 2001 2001 2006 1995 |
| CREDONS LEDRONS MR Periman I and Crewe (Barbaras, MASLE ¹ MLTD2001) [S MLTD2001] [| Jikamie, prist dennity The caracy concepts Jappevian natice coverage Jappevian natice coverage Anaroge nation presentability raise Carage | pen entage pen entage pen entage inches/hane * 100 millionters * 100 | 30 m 30 m 30 m 1250,000 800 m | 2001 2001 2006 1995 1981-201 |
| CREBNS 1200-CC 401 Reformed Tableson, MSLC ² 402 Reformed Tableson, MSLC ² 402 Reformed Tableson, MSLC ² 402 Reformed Tableson, MSLC ² 402 Reformed (1981) 2010, PSLSM Climate 1 402 Reformed (198 | Jikamie, print dennity Tire (anapy uronage Jimpervisan nachae uronage Anage and personability state | pro: entage pen: entage pen: entage instance * 100 entitioneters * 100 denzes C * 100 | 30 m 30 m 30 m 1250,000 800 m 800 m | 2001 2001 2006 1995 1981-201 1988-201 |
| CREDOSS LEIROS 401 Pedianal Jani Creer Dafahase, MASLE ¹ 8.022001 [JS 404 Pedianat Jani Creer Dafahase, MASLE ¹ 8.022002 [JS 8.022002 [JS 8.022002 [JS 12.02200] 12.02200 [JS MAX2010 10.022010 | Jikamie, pris demisy The carego concepts Japarevian antice coverage Japarevian antice coverage Asserge and percendisity saks Saving an and percendisity (2012-2010) Asserge mania da copratina (1051-2010) Asserge mania da comparisa (1051-2010) | pen estage pen estage insteadage insteadage * 100 englisseters * 100 depres C * 100 depres C * 100 | 30 m 30 m 30 m 1.250,000 800 m 800 m | 2001 2001 2006 1995 1981-201 1981-201 1981-201 |
| CREBNS LERRES 401 Refeatures, MaxLC ² 402 Robins M 402000, J.S. 402000, J.S. | Jikamie, rai dremity Tere cancpy tromage Jangervikan nafaze torenage Aneage mail permetoliky yako rangi Aneage mailman manda ik tongenako (USR-2010) Aneage mailman manda ik tongenako (USR-2010) Aneage mailman manda ik tongenako (USR-2010) Aneage mailman manda ik tongenako (USR-2010) | pro estape per estape inches/nor * 100 estates/nor * 100 depres C * 100 depres C * 100 | 30 m 30 m 30 m 1250,000 800 m 800 m 800 m | 2001 2001 2006 1995 1981-201 1988-201 |
| CREDNSS 120005 40720001 JC 40720001 JC 40720001 JC 40720001 JS 408 Pelantat J and Creer That desay, 1602 C ⁺¹ 40720001 JS 40720001 JS 4072000 JS 15 Claude Neumids (1961-2010), PEISM Claude 1 MAXC2010 MAXC2010 40700 | Jikamie pri dremity The campy comage Jangewinas autor coverage Jangewinas autor coverage Ascoge and percendulary nets and Ascoge maximum and at competitors (1988-2010) Ascoge maximum and at competitors (1988-2010) Ascoge minimum annual at trappentire (1988-2010) Ascoge minimum annual at trappentire (1988-2010) Them area | pen entage pen entage inches/hux * 100 millioneters * 100 degrees C * 100 degrees C * 100 degrees C * 100 | 30 m 30 m 30 m 1250,000 800 m 800 m 800 m 800 m 800 m 800 m | 2001 2001 2006 1595 1988-201 1988-201 1988-201 1988-201 |
| CRERONS LERONS MR National and Crew (Database, MRLC ¹ 4072001, PC 4072001, PC | Jikamie pri dremity The campy comage Jangewinas autor coverage Jangewinas autor coverage Ascoge and percendulary nets and Ascoge maximum and at competitors (1988-2010) Ascoge maximum and at competitors (1988-2010) Ascoge minimum annual at trappentire (1988-2010) Ascoge minimum annual at trappentire (1988-2010) Them area | pen entage pen entage inches/hux * 100 millioneters * 100 degrees C * 100 degrees C * 100 degrees C * 100 | 30 m 30 m 30 m 1250,000 800 m 800 m 800 m 800 m 800 m 800 m | 2001 2001 2006 1995 1981-201 1981-201 1981-201 |
| CHERNSS HERNSC MIT, Robin JL, Chen (Darlacso, MSELC ⁺) MIT, Robin JL, Chen (Darlacso, MSELC ⁺) MIT, March JL, Starler (Darlacso, MSELC ⁺) MIT, March JL, Starler (DMIT, 2016), PSESM (Climate) MAX2030 MAX2030 MAX2030 MAX2030 MIT, National Andergepoint Rearistic Dataset, USRS USRAS/QUM | Jikamie proi dremity The campy trovenge Impervisan nation coverage Ascoge and percendulity yates Samp ¹ Ascoge samon and percendulity (VAR-2010) Ascoge samon and at trouperstare (VAR-2010) Ascoge samon at trouperstare (VAR-2010) Ascoge samon at it trouperstare (VAR-2010) Zone area | per estage per estage inchestance * 100 degrees C * 100 | 30 m 30 m 30 m 1250,000 800 m 800 m 800 m 800 m 800 m 800 m | 2001 2004 2006 1995 1988-201 1988-201 1988-201 1988-201 |
| CREDONS UERNS 90 Relational Land Cover Database, MASLC ¹ 4.070001 [FC 4.070001 [S1 Land Cover Database, MASLC ¹ 4.07000 [IS1 Land Cover Database, MASLC ¹ 4.07000 [IS1 Land Cover Database, MASLC ¹ 1.5. Cleaned Fernande (1981-2010), PSISM (Cleanede 1 MASC2010 MA | Jikamie pri ok denity Inspervison natice coverge Inspervison natice coverge Jacorgo nal perconduity rales Average mod perconduity rales Average mod are for perconduity (1984-2010) Average mod are for percode (1984-2010) Zoos met Zoos met | pen entage pen entage inches/hars * 100 entitioneters * 100 degrees C * 100 degrees C * 100 degrees C * 100 jam ³ | 30 m 30 m 30 m 12 20 0000 800 m 800 m 800 m 800 m 800 m NA NA NA | 2001 2001 2006 1995 1981-201 1981-201 1988-201 1988-201 N/A 2012 |
| CREDONS LEDROS MERCIAL LESS MERCIAL LESS MERCIAL LESS MERCIAL LESS MERCIAL LESS MERCIAL DESS NUTRISA NUTRISA MERCIAL M | Jikamie pri ok denity The narog concepts Jargervinas aufate coverage Jargervinas aufate coverage Aneoge nau Jarenshilly yaks Aneoge nau Jarenshilly yaks Aneoge nau Jarenshilly (1984-2010) Aneoge nau Jarenshilly (1984-2010) Zene aneo Zene aneo | pen entage pen entage inches/harr * 100 entitionetes * 100 degrees C * 100 degrees C * 100 degrees C * 100 jam ² Ø/amol stream re-Sourk: | 30 m 30 m 30 m 1250,000 800 m 800 m 800 m 800 m 800 m 800 m | 2001 2004 2006 1995 1988-201 1988-201 1988-201 1988-201 |
| CREDONS LIBROS LIBROS LADDOOL FC LADDOOL FC | Jikamie, nai deminy Ther ampy townspr Japarekan andraz coverage Japarekan andraz coverage Japarekan andraz coverage Japarege and a promobility takk Sawage anna at a copiahan (1981-2010) Assege anna at a coprashan (1981-2010) Dam deminy 2000 National Investory of Dama cost | jeen entage jeen entage inches/bace * 100 millioneters * 100 degreen C * 100 degreen C * 100 degreen C * 100 degreen C * 100 jeen* S/Ammof atoms ve bouck court | 30 m 30 m 30 m 1250,000 800 m 800 m NA NA NA NA | 2001 2001 2006 1995 1988-201 1988-201 1988-201 1988-201 1988-201 1988-201 2012 2009 |
| CREDOSS UEROSS UR Referent J. Can Comer (Darkness, MASLC ²) MR Referent J. Can Comer (Darkness, MASLC ²) MR Referent J. Can Comer (Darkness, MASLC ²) MR Referent J. Can Comer (Darkness, MASLC ²) UCREDA J. S. Canada X. Namana (MRI-2016), PSISM Clance I TATUSCO, USSUS UCREDA J. S. Canada X. Namana (MRI-2016), PSISM Clance I MRASCOLO | Jikamie pri ok denity The carego concepts Jargeevisan antice coverage Jargeevisan antice coverage Jargeevisan antice coverage Average annot al percendulity rates Average annot al coverage (1981-2010) Average annot al coverage (1981-2010) Dan denity 2000 Manual Investment of Dana cover | per estage per estage inches/nux * 100 millionetres * 100 depres C * 100 | 30 m 30 m 30 m 1250,000 1250,000 800 m 800 m 800 m 800 m NA NA NA NA | 2001 2006 1995 1988-201 1988-201 1988-201 1988-201 1988-201 1988-201 2009 7 2003 |
| CREDOSS LERNES MIL RECOVER That Cover (Databases, MASL C ⁺¹ MIL ROOM), HC MIL 202000, HC MIL 202000, HS MIL 20200, HS MIL 202000, HS MIL 20200, HS MIL 202000, HS MIL 202000, HS MIL 202000, HS MIL 202000, | Jikamie, rai dewity The campy toronge Imprevious autors correnge Actorge and percendelity nets say Actorge mailmen autors in temperature (1988-2010) Actorge mailmen autors in temperature (1988-2010) Acto | jern redays jern redays jern redays inches/nor * 100 redisorter * 100 deprese C * 100 deprese | 10 m 30 m 30 m 30 m 800 m NGA NGA NGA NGA | 2001 2001 2006 1595 1588-201 1988-201 1988-201 1988-201 1988-201 1988-201 1988-201 2007 2003 |
| CREDONS UERNS MR Relational Family Coner (Darkness, MRSLC ¹ MR Network) Family Coner (Darkness, MRSLC ¹ L202000) IS MR Network Classics (DRSL ²) (CLEDON LERDAN IS: Classic Plannak (DRSL ² 010), PRESM Classic MRSD00 M | Jikamie pri ok denity The narog concepts Jargervisan aufste coverage Jargervisan aufste coverage Aneoge nail permethility raise Aneoge nail permethility raise Aneoge nail at expension (1981-2010) Aneoge nail at expension (1981-2010) Dan Aneogy Jane at expension (1981-2010) Dan Aneogy Jane Aneoge (1981-2010) Dan Aneogy Dan Aneoge (1981-2010) Dan Aneoge (1981-2010) D | jem minge jem minge jem minge militeriers * 100 disperse C * 100 disperse | 30 m 30 m 30 m 12 50 p000 800 m 800 m | 2001 2004 2006 1995 1988-201 1988-201 1988-201 1988-201 1988-201 1988-201 1988-201 2009 2007 2007 2007 |
| DEPENDENS DEPENDENS DEPENDENCE LEADORD INC. LEADORD INC. LEADORD INC. LEADORD INC. LEADORD INC. LEADORD INC. LEADORD INC. MERICALL USESS' LEADORD INC. MERICALL USESS' LEADORD INC. MERICALL USESS' MERICALL USESS' | Jikamie, prie dremity The campy correspond Jargervican aufste correspond Jargervican aufste correspond Jargervican aufste correspond Average aussimum autoria in compensator (1981-2010) Average maximum autoria in compensator (1981-2010) Average maximum autoria in temperature (1981-2010) Average maximum autoria in temperature (1981-2010) Towa autor Zone area Zone area Dano density 2000 Makanzal Interesting of Dann corret Markon Jarona Danieg (2022) pine density BMA Markon Delsen Density (2022) pine density BMA Markon Delsen Density (2022) pine density | jen: matage jen: matage jen: matage jen: matage jen: matage dispose C * 100 degrees C * 100 de | 30 m 30 m 30 m 30 m 1250,000 800 m 800 | 2001 2001 2006 1995 1988-201 1988-201 1988-201 1988-201 1988-201 2009 2007 2007 2007 2007 |
| CHERNS LERNS LERNS LERNS LERNS LERNS MARKEN LERNS MARKEN MARKEN LERNS | Jikamie pri ni denity Jikamie pri ni denity Jingerviana antice coverge Jingerviana antice coverge Jingerviana antice coverge Jingerviana antice coverge Jingerviana antice coverge Jingerviana antice coverge Antege anna al action former (1984-2010) Antege anna al action former (1984-2010) Antege antice coverge antice (1984-2010) Dom denity 2009 National Investory of Dama cover Jinger Investory of Dama cover Jinger Investory for antice (1984-2010) Dim denity 2009 National Investory of Dama cover Jinger Investory (1984-2010) Dam denity 2009 National Investory (1984-2010) Dam denity 2009 National Investory (1984-2010) Dam denity 2009 National Investory (1984-2010) 2009 National Investory of Dama cover 2009 National Investory (1984-2010) 2009 National Investory (1984-2010) 2009 National Investory of Dama cover 2009 National Investory of Dama cover 2009 National Investory (1984-2010) 2009 National Investory (1984-201 | jen ndage jen ndage jen ndage interstrukt 100 milienters * 100 degree C * 100 deg | 10 m 30 m 30 m 30 m 800 m | 2001 2001 2006 1995 1988-201 1988-201 1988-201 1988-201 1988-201 1988-201 1988-201 1988-201 2007 2003 2007 2007 2007 2007 2007 2007 |
| CREDONS LEDRONS URING LEDRONG LEDRONG, MARLE ¹ MR Related LeDRONG LEDRONG, MARLE ¹ MR Related LeDRONG LEDRONG MR Related LeDRONG LEDRONG LEDRONG MR Relation LEDRONG MR RACOLO MR RACOLO | Jikamie pri ni denity Jikamie pri ni denity Jingerviana antice coverge Jingerviana antice coverge Jingerviana antice coverge Jingerviana antice coverge Jingerviana antice coverge Jingerviana antice coverge Antege anna al action former (1984-2010) Antege anna al action former (1984-2010) Antege antice coverge antice (1984-2010) Dom denity 2009 National Investory of Dama cover Jinger Investory of Dama cover Jinger Investory for antice (1984-2010) Dim denity 2009 National Investory of Dama cover Jinger Investory (1984-2010) Dam denity 2009 National Investory (1984-2010) Dam denity 2009 National Investory (1984-2010) Dam denity 2009 National Investory (1984-2010) 2009 National Investory of Dama cover 2009 National Investory (1984-2010) 2009 National Investory (1984-2010) 2009 National Investory of Dama cover 2009 National Investory of Dama cover 2009 National Investory (1984-2010) 2009 National Investory (1984-201 | jen: matage jen: matage jen: matage jen: matage jen: matage dispose C * 100 degrees C * 100 de | 10 m 30 m 30 m 30 m 800 m | 2001 2001 2006 1995 1988-201 1988-201 1988-201 1988-201 1988-201 2009 2007 2007 2007 2007 |
| CHERNS ELEMPS MIL TRODUCT (Concern Darbaces, MASL C ⁺¹ MIL TRODUCT) (CO2000) [15 MIL TRODUCT) MIL TRODUCT MIL TRODUCT MIL TRODUCT (CO2000) [15 MIL TRODUCT MIL TRODUCT (CO2000) [15 MIL TRODUCT (CO | Jikamie, prie dremity Jiaparekan andraz coverage Jangarekan andraz coverage Aneorge mai percentekty case - Saminger and aperceptication (1981-2010) Aneorge mani at competition (1981-2010) Dam Aneorge Theory at cover Jane Aneorge Maniferration (1981-2010) Jane Aneorge Maniferration (1981-2010) Aneorge Manife | jent mange jent mange instanten van 2000 instanten van 2000 degrese C * 1000 degrese C * 10000 degrese C * 10000 degrese C * 10000 degrese C * 10000 degrese C | 30 m 30 m 30 m 30 m 30 m 1230,000 800 m 800 m N6A 800 m N6A 800 m 1400,000 1400,000 | 2001 2004 1995 1998-201 1988-201 1988-201 1988-201 1988-201 1988-201 1988-201 1988-201 2007 2007 2007 2007 2007 2007 2007 2 |
| CHERNS LERRES 401 Referent 2: AUD2001_15 4022001_15 4002001_15 40020001_15 40020001_15 40020001_15 40020000000000000000000000000000000000 | Jikamie, ruń dewisy Jikamie, ruń dewisy Jargarwian antisz coverzyc Jargarwian antisz coverzyc Jargarwian antisz coverzyc Jargarwian antisz coverzyc Jargary an and presentibility sałs Jargary antisz dowiski (1981-2010) Ascego zwasi at interpretator (1981-2010) Ascego zwasi at interpretator (1981-2010) Ascego zwasi at interpretator (1981-2010) Ascego zwasi at interpretator (1981-2010) Dom dewity 2000 balance Jarczego Zalaki (1992) Dom dewity 2000 balance Jarczego Zalaki (1992) Dom dewity 2000 balance Jeanse Jarcego Zielenionica, Speien ale dewity Zielenion Pellinenio Darlongo Zielenionica, Speien ale dewity Zienio tran on stroka (coming dewity Kand length dewity | jent mange jent mange instanten van 2000 instanten van 2000 degrese C * 1000 degrese C * 10000 degrese C * 10000 degrese C * 10000 degrese C * 10000 degrese C | 10 m 30 m 30 m 30 m 800 m | 2001 2004 1995 1998-201 1988-201 1988-201 1988-201 1988-201 1988-201 1988-201 1988-201 2007 2007 2007 2007 2007 2007 2007 2 |
| CHERNS LERNES MI, Record Lever (Database, MSLC ⁺) MI, Room JL, Care (Database, MSLC ⁺) MI, Room JL, Care (Database, MSLC ⁺) MI, Robert JL, MSLC ⁺ MI, Robert JL, MSLC ⁺ MI, Robert JL, MSLC ⁺ MI, Robert JL, Malanagayani, Harvier Dataset, USC MI, Dena MI, | Jikamie na devoiry Jike e nange voorsege Jangeviens andrac overage Jangeviens andrac overage Average and generatebility nate a seg Jangeviens andrac overage Average voor alt e normer hand (1958-2010) Average voor alt e normer hand (19 | jern rodage jern rodage jern rodage instemburg * 100 millioners * 100 degres C * | 30 m 30 m 30 m 30 m 12 S0 000 800 m 800 m <td>2001 2006 1995 1998-201 1998-201 1998-201 1998-201 1998-201 1998-201 1998-201 2007 2007 2007 2007 2007 2007 2001 2007 2001</td> | 2001 2006 1995 1998-201 1998-201 1998-201 1998-201 1998-201 1998-201 1998-201 2007 2007 2007 2007 2007 2007 2001 2007 2001 |
| CHERNSS EIRNSS ACTIONAL F.C. ACTIONAL F.C. ACTIONAL F.C. ACTIONAL F.C. ACTIONAL S.C. ACTIONAL S.C. A | Jikamie jni dremity Jingervinan antice coverge Jingervinan antice coverge Jingervinan antice coverge Jingervinan antice coverge Averge main antice coverge Averge main antice coverge Averge main antice coverge (USK 2010) Averge (USK 2010) | jena matage jena matage jena matage interstruct * 100 malikestru * 100 degrese C * 100 degrese | 30 m 30 m 30 m 10 m | 2001 2006 1995 1998-201 1988-201 1988-201 1988-201 1988-201 1988-201 2009 2009 2009 2007 2007 2001 2001 2001 2001 2001 |
| CHEROSS LERDES MR. Resolut JC. MR. Resolut JC. | Jikamie pri demity Jikamie pri demity Jingervina antice correspo Jingervina antice correspo Anergy and personiality sales Anergy and and anergy (CBAC) ality const BMA Shyring Holdman Danisy (CBAC) ality const Anergy and ality and ality and ality and ality and ality and ality and ality Antice and the ality and ality | jern rotage jern rotage inter-braze * 100 millionetec * 100 desprese C * 1 | 30 m 30 m 30 m 12 50 000 800 m 800 m 800 m 800 m 800 m 800 m 1800 | 2001 2006 1995 1988-201 1988-201 1988-201 1988-201 1988-201 1988-201 2007 2007 2007 2007 2007 2001 2001 2 |
| CHERNS EIRNS MILTONI JC. (202001) EC (202001) EC (2020 | Jikamie pri demity The campy comorp. Jargervians autice correspond Jargervians autice correspond Average and percendinity subs and percendinity subs and percendinity subs and percendinity subs and percendinity and an antipercent (1981-2010) Average annual antipercent (1981-2010) Average and antipercent (1981-2010) Average and antipercent (1981-2010) Average and antipercent (1981-2010) Average antipercent (1981-2010) Avera | jern rotage jern rotage inter-braze * 100 millionetec * 100 desprese C * 1 | 30m 30m 30m 30m 30m 30m 30m 10m 800 m 800 m 800 m 8 | 2001 2006 1995 1998-201 1988-201 1988-201 1988-201 1988-201 1988-201 2009 2009 2009 2007 2007 2001 2001 2001 2001 2001 |
| CHERNS LERRS 401 Refault Land Coner Darkness, MSL C ⁺¹ 402 Robins Landscongergenic Restor Darkness, USCS ⁺¹ 403 Robins Landscongergenic Restor Darkness, USCS ⁺¹ 404 Robins, and Mainer al Processing Plants, USCS ⁺¹ 404 Dece 405 Robins, and Mainer al Processing Plants, USCS ⁺¹ 404 Dece 405 Robins 404 Dece 404 Dece 405 Dece 405 Dece 405 Dece 405 Dece 405 Dece 404 Dece 404 Dece 405 D | Jikamie pri of denity Jingervinan anfate correspo Jingervinan anfate correspo Jingervinan anfate correspo Anerop and premohidiy sales Anerop and premohidiy sales Anerop and a frequentian (1961-2010) Anerop annot al in competator (1961-2010) Jonn denity Jonn denity BMA States I Potentian Discope Sciences System also denity BMA States I Potence Lindenge Sciences Jonaris to Lindenge Janet comp Janet states I person in generating al in | jest rotage jest rotage insteaded insteaded and a second degrees a * 100 degrees a * 100 degre | 30 m 30 m 30 m 30 m 30 m 12 sogoo 800 m 800 m 800 m | 2001 2006 1995 1995 1998-201 1998-201 1998-201 1998-201 1998-201 1998-201 1998-201 1998-201 2007 2007 2007 2007 2007 2007 2007 |
| CHERNS LERRS 401 Refault Land Coner Darkness, MSL C ⁺¹ 402 Robins Landscongergenic Restor Darkness, USCS ⁺¹ 403 Robins Landscongergenic Restor Darkness, USCS ⁺¹ 404 Robins, and Mainer al Processing Plants, USCS ⁺¹ 404 Dece 405 Robins, and Mainer al Processing Plants, USCS ⁺¹ 404 Dece 405 Robins 404 Dece 404 Dece 405 Dece 405 Dece 405 Dece 405 Dece 405 Dece 404 Dece 404 Dece 405 D | Jikamie, rui denniky Jike e nangu ruinen gy Jampeviana natica curvenge Jampeviana natica curvenge Anenge nail permethiky nate s ange Jampeviana natica ruinenge Anenge maai nati ruingehan (1981-2010) Anenge maai nati ruingehan (1981) Jam Anenge Jam Anenge Jam Anenge Jam Anenge Jam Anenge Jam Anenge Jam Anenge Jam Anenge J | jest rotage jest rotage insteaded insteaded and a second degrees a * 100 degrees a * 100 degre | 30 m 30 m 30 m 12 50 000 800 m 800 m 800 m 800 m 800 m 800 m 1800 | 2001 2006 1995 1988-201 1988-201 1988-201 1988-201 1988-201 1988-201 2007 2007 2007 2007 2007 2001 2001 2 |
| CHERNS EIRNS MIL Rect (Julie Court Database, MSL C ⁺¹ MIL Rect) (J. 4022001, J. 4022001, J. 402200, J. 40220, J. 402200, J. 40220, J. 402200, J. 402200, J. 402200, J. 40200, J. 40200, J | Jikamie, rui denniky Jike e nangu ruinen gy Jampeviana natica curvenge Jampeviana natica curvenge Anenge nail permethiky nate s ange Jampeviana natica ruinenge Anenge maai nati ruingehan (1981-2010) Anenge maai nati ruingehan (1981) Jam Anenge Jam Anenge Jam Anenge Jam Anenge Jam Anenge Jam Anenge Jam Anenge Jam Anenge J | jest rotage jest rotage insteaded insteaded and a second degrees a * 100 degrees a * 100 degre | 30 m 30 m 30 m 12 30 pool 12 30 pool 800 m 800 m 800 m 800 m 800 m 800 m 800 m 100 m 10 | 2001 2006 1995 1995 1998-201 1998-201 1998-201 1998-201 1998-201 1998-201 1998-201 1998-201 2007 2007 2007 2007 2007 2007 2007 |
| CHERNSS EIRING ALTONOLUS Canad Coner Darkason, MASL C ⁺¹ ALTONOLUS CANCERNS, MASL C ⁺¹ ALTONOLUS | Jikamie pri ni denity The narego concepts Jangervisan aufster coverage Jangervisan aufster coverage Annege nan Jacobie (1981-2010) Annege nan Jacobie (1981-2010) Jacobie (1981-2010) Jac | jen: rotage jen: rotage jen: rotage inter-braz * 100 rotalizator * 100 degree C * | 30 m 30 m 30 m 30 m 30 m 12 m 12 m 800 m | 2001 2006 1995 1998-201 1988-201 1988-201 1988-201 1988-201 1988-201 2007 2007 2007 2007 2007 2007 2007 2 |
| CHEROSS LERDES 400 Resource (Databases, MASLC ⁺) 400 Resource (Databases, MASLC ⁺) 4 | Jikamie pri demity Jikamie pri demity Jingervina antice correspo Jingervina antice correspo Anergy and permethidi y take Anergy and permethidi y take Anergy and performance of the second second Anergy maniference of the second | jen: rotage jen: rotage inter-shape inter- | 30 m 30 m 30 m 30 m 30 m 12 solution 30 m 80 m 800 m 800 m 800 m 800 m 800 m 800 m 800 m 10 n Not 10 n Not 10 n 1400,000 11 00,000 1400,000 11 00,000 1400,000 11 00,000 | 2001 2006 1995 1998-201 1988-201 1988-201 1988-201 1988-201 1988-201 2007 2007 2007 2007 2007 2007 2007 2 |
| CHEROSS HERDSC HERDS | Jikamie pri deniny The campy comorp Jargervian antice correspond Jargervian antice correspond Average and percendinity subsec- strange Average annual percendinity (1981-2010) Average annual articopression (1981-2010) Biological and articopression (1981-2010) Biological anteropression (1981-2010) Biological anteropr | jen: rotage jen: rotage inter-shape inter- | 30 m 30 m 30 m 30 m 30 m 12 m 12 m 800 m | 2001 2001 2006 1595 1598-201 1598-201 1598-201 1598-201 1598-201 1598-201 2007 2007 2007 2007 2007 2007 2007 2 |
| CORDONS LEDRONS 400 Reliand L. Can Cover Darkness, MACL C ⁺¹ 400 Reliand L. Can Cover Darkness, MACL C ⁺¹ 4002000 [JS 4002000 [JS 40020000 [JS 4002000 [JS 40020000 [JS 4002000 [JS 40020000 [JS 40020000000000000000000000000000000000 | Jikamie pri ok denity Jikamie pri ok denity Jingervinan antice correspe Jingervinan antice correspe Anengy nal premohility sales | jest rotage jest rotage instantiation * 100 dagese C * 100 dagese | 30 m 30 m 30 m 30 m 30 m 12 solution 30 m 80 m 800 m 800 m 800 m 800 m 800 m 800 m 800 m 10 n Not 10 n Not 10 n 1400,000 11 00,000 1400,000 11 00,000 1400,000 11 00,000 | 2001 2001 2006 1595 1598-201 1598-201 1598-201 1598-201 1598-201 1598-201 2007 2007 2007 2007 2007 2007 2007 2 |

Team. Int. [Intel NetDeke v1 derem s 1. http://mgs.cs.usgs.gov/ecospierrel.usa.html 2. http://www.rst.gov/ 3. http://www.rst.gov/ 4. http://www.rst.gov/ 5. http://gov.st.gov.cs.gov/ 5. http://gov.st.gov.cs.gov.gov.gov.gov.gov.first.gov.firs

a = averaged pixt (maximum value within spatial zone) b = on a grid cell trais-(susceptomaximum within spatial zone using highest value for each grid cell accrossall years) c = harowet is coment lock group d = includes on Wicki a parts through valuebolocies = eincludes coments and a de "stroomy/inces" for the national WHAP accessment

Watershed unit

HUC10

HUC12

Catchment

| | Correct Classification Rate (crossvalidation) | , | Correct Classification Rate (crossvalidation) | , | Correct Classification Rate (crossvalidation) |
|---|---|---|---|--|---|
| CASE 1 HUC10 (n) (% of total) | Casel HUC10 | CASE 1 HUC12 (n) (% of total) | Casel HUC12 | CASE 1 Catchment (n) (% of total) | Case1 Catchment |
| brook tront (417) (51.61%) no brook tront (391) (48.39%) | 83.45 (75.06) 76.73 (72.63) | brook trout (1,214) (31.91%) no brook trout (2,590) (68.09%) | 87.81 (80.56) 83.78 (79.77) | brook tront (18,491)(13.97%) no brook tront (113,830)(86.03%) | 80.16 (73.26) 69.97 (69.15) |
| Overall correct rate (808) | 80.19 (73.88) | Overall correct rate (3,804) | 85.06 (80.02) | Overall correct rate (132,321) | 71.13 (69.72) |
| Case 2 HUC10 (n) (% of total) | Case2 HUC10 | Case 2 HUC12 (n) (% of total) | Case2 HUC12 | <u>Case 2 Catchment (n) (% of total)</u> | Case2 Catchment |
| brook trout (417) (51.61%) | 70.02 (63.55) | brook tront (1,214) (31.91%) | 71 (68.20) | brook trout (18,491) (13.97%) | 60.88 (56.34) |
| non-native tront (74) (9.16%) | 79.73 (60.81) | exotic tront (357) (9.38%) | 79.55 (61.06) | exotic trout (9,917)(7.49%) | 73.1 (61.55) |
| no tront (317) (39.23%) | 65.93 (60.57) | no tront (2,233) (58.71%) | 65.74 (62.70) | no tront (103,913)(78.53%) | 55.26 (53.27) |
| Overall correct rate (808) | 69.31 (62.12) | Overall correct rate (3,804) | 68.72 (64.30) | Overall correct rate (132,321) | 57.38 (54.31) |
| Case 3 HUC10 (n) (% of total) | Case3 HUC 10 | Case 3 HUC12 (n) (% of total) | Case3 HUC12 | Case 3 Catchment (n) (% of total) | Case3 Catchment |
| Allopatric brook trout (61) (7.55%) | 72.13 (42.62) | Allopatric brook trout (371) (9.75%) | 59.03 (54.45) | Allopatric brook tront (10,329)(7.81%) | 47.89 (41.34) |
| Sympatric brook front (356) (44.06%) | 46.91 (46.63) | Sympatric brook front (843) (22.16%) | 62.16 (51.72) | Sympatric brook tront (8,162)(6.17%) | 65.9 (53.30) |
| non-native tront (74) (9.16%) | 72.97 (52.70) | Exotic trout only (357) (9.38%) | 71.99 (61.62) | Exotic trout only (9,917)(7.49%) | 67.87 (56.70) |
| no tront (317) (39.23%) | 66.56 (63.72) | no tront (2,233) (58.70%) | 57.14 (56.29) | no tront (103,913)(78.53%) | 44.20 (44.12) |
| Overall correct rate (808) | 58.91 (46.41) | Overall correct rate (3,804) | 59.83 (55.59) | Overall correct rate (132,321) | 47.59 (45.43) |

| Watershed Unit | HUC10 <u>Case1</u> | HUC12 <u>Case1</u> | Catchment Casel | HUC10 <u>Case2</u> | HUC12 <u>Case2</u> | Catchment** Case2 | HUC10 Case3 | HUC12 <u>Case3</u> | Catchment Case3 |
|---------------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|------------------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|----------------------|----------------|-----------------------|---------------------|
| Metric Variable | | | | | | | | | |
| SOILPICRM | 100 | 100 | | 100 | 100 | | 100 | 100 | |
| NO3 MAX | 21.7 | 47.9 | NH-100.00 | 66.38 | 11,11 | | 57.84 | 7.48 | |
| ELICY_Mean | 44.89 | | | 43.3 | 86.8 | NB=68.57; LB=13.52 | 72.43 | 28.18 | NB=56.64; LB=56.48 |
| ELICY_MAX | | 37.88 | LB=24,50 | 53.1 | 54.65 | 1.3 ± 14.82 | 38.42 | 72.93 | |
| NO3_MAXALL | | | NB=36.42 | | 16.54 | LC=100.00; LB=86.38 | 56.28 | 14.58 | LB=100.00; NC=73.19 |
| DIPOSITION | | | | 85.91 | 10.17 | 1.8 ± 14.46 | 74.8 | | NB=69.76 |
| NCLD2001_FC | | 37.43 | | 37.66 | 31.47 | | 34.29 | 32.36 | |
| TMEAN2010 | | | | | 20.69 | NC=59.68 | | 95.81 | NC=59.48 |
| NLCD2001_71 | | 4,49 | | | 27.57 | | 31.81 | 26.07 | |
| BF1 | | 12.92 | LB=84.67; NC=53.90; LC=48.66 | 5 | 46.89 | | | 83.11 | NC=82.79 |
| TMIN2010 | | 11.35 | NC=76.86 | | 74.07 | LB=96.67; NC=78.59 | | 18.87 | LB=99.71;NC=41.14 |
| ELICY_MIN | | | NC=63.83 | | 9.4 | 1.8 ± 97.48 | | 7.57 | 1.13 - 28.08 |
| TMAX2010 | | 8.03 | NB=78.29 | | | | | 13.7 | NC=30.55 |
| SO4_MAX | | 3.87 | NB= 89.52 | | 43.29 | | | 36.67 | |
| PPT2010 | | | | 33.23 | 6.43 | | | 10.65 | |
| POPDICNS | | 9.28 | | | 12.74 | | | | |
| NLCD2001_52 | | 4.62 | | | | | | | NB=15.48 |
| ROADCR_DENS | 14.81 | | | | | | | 14.34 | |
| NLCD2001_43 | | | | 45.24 | | | 66.07 | | |
| POPDICNS | | 9.28 | | | 12.74 | | | | |
| NLCD2001_52 | | 4.62 | | | | | | | NB=15.48 |
| TOTALJORESTI | | 3.99 | | | | | | 13.34 | |
| 1.11110_8 | | 2.46 | | | | | | 12.54 | |
| S04_MEAN | | | 1.C=90.29 | | | 1.8 ± 87.37 | | | |
| S04_MAXALL | | | NB=72.51 | | | 1.8-54,?1 | | | |
| LITHO_11 | 4 | | | | | NH=39.01 | | | NH=33.72 |
| NLCD2006_71 | 47.01 | | | | | | | | |
| LITHO_3 | | | | | | | | | |
| ROADLICN_KM | | 1.88 | 5111 AL 46 | | | | | | |
| N03_MEAN | | | NH=50.59 | | | | | | |
| LITHO_19 | | | | | 15.27 | | nh ee | | |
| NICTLICN_KM | | | | | | | 52.55 | | |
| NLCD2001_31 | | | | | | | | | |
| NLCD2001_42 | | | | | | | 35.14 | | |
| NLCD2001_41 | | 10.62 | | | | | 35.06 | | |
| NLCD2001_82 A DEAS(NEM | | 10.62 4.66 | | | | | | | |
| AREASQKM LITHO_12 | | 4.00 | | | | | | | |
| NLCD2006_23 | | 2.31 | | | | | | | |
| ROADLIN KM | | 1.89 | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | |