

PENNSTATE



Center for Statistical Ecology and Environmental Statistics

ECOSYSTEM HEALTH AND ITS MEASUREMENT AT LANDSCAPE SCALE:
TOWARDS THE NEXT GENERATION OF QUANTITATIVE ASSESSMENTS
Ganapati P. Patil, * Robert P. Brooks,† Wayne L. Myers,‡ David J. Rapport,§
and Charles Taillie*

*Center for Statistical Ecology and Environmental Statistics. †Cooperative Wetlands Center.

‡Office of Remote Sensing for Earth Resources.

*†‡The Pennsylvania State University, University Park, USA


§Department of Rural Planning and Development, School of Environmental Design and Rural Development, University of Guelph, Guelph, Canada and Department of Pharmacology and Toxicology, Faculty of Medicine and Dentistry, The University of Western Ontario, London, Ontario, Canada.

EPA Project Officer: Barbara Levinson

Prepared with partial support from U.S. EPA Star Grant for Atlantic Slope Consortium, Cooperative Agreement Number R-82868401. The contents have not been subjected to Agency review and therefore do not necessarily reflect the views of the Agency and no official endorsement should be inferred.

[Invited paper appears in Ecosystem Health, 7(4): 307—316, December 2001]

Technical Report Number 2002-0202
TECHNICAL REPORTS AND REPRINTS SERIES
February 2002



Department of Statistics
The Pennsylvania State University
University Park, PA 16802

G. P. Patil
Distinguished Professor and Director
Tel: (814)865-9442 Fax: (814)865-1278
Email: gpp@stat.psu.edu
<http://www.stat.psu.edu/~gpp>

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this paper is two-fold: (a) to describe the challenges of reporting on changes in ecosystem health at the landscape scales and b) to review the statistical and mathematical techniques that allow the derivation of landscape health assessments from a variety of data consisting of remote sensing imagery, demographic and socio-economic census, natural resource surveys, long-term ecological research, and other geospatial information that is site specific.

We draw upon seven innovative and integrative concepts and tools that together will provide the next generation of ecosystem health assessments at regional scales. The first is the concept of ecosystem health, which integrates across the social, natural, physical and health sciences to provide the basis for comprehensive assessments of regional environments. The second consists of innovative stochastic techniques for representing human disturbance and ecosystem response in landscapes, and the corresponding statistical tools for analyzing them. The third constitutes representation of spatial biocomplexity in landscapes through application of echelon analysis to assessment. The fourth concerns innovative combination techniques of upper-echelon-based spatial scan statistic to detect, delineate, and prioritize critical study areas for evaluating and prioritizing causal factors and effects. The fifth involves capability to compare and prioritize a collection of entities in light of multiple criteria, using poset mathematics of partial order with rank frequency statistics, to provide multi-criterion decision support. The sixth lies in extending data mining and visualization techniques to determine associations between geospatial patterns and ecosystem degradation at landscape scales. The seventh encompasses comprehensive studies conducted on different types of regional ecosystems.

Our focus is to show how the integration of recent advances in quantitative techniques and tools will facilitate the evaluation of ecosystem health and its measurement at a variety of landscape scales. The challenge is to characterize, evaluate, and validate linkages between socioeconomic drivers, biogeochemical indicators, multiscale landscape pattern metrics, and quality of human life indicators. Initial applications of these quantitative techniques and tools have been with respect to regions in the Eastern USA, including United States Atlantic Slope and Mid-Atlantic Region.

1. MEETING THE CHALLENGE OF ASSESSING LANDSCAPE CHANGE

Degradation of ecosystems is pervasive at local, regional, and biospheric scales (Arrow *et al.*, 1995; Vitousek *et al.*, 1997). Remotely sensed data of the earth's surface along with other sources of data offer enormous potential to assess changes in the health of the earth's ecosystems, identify risks of further degradation, and determine opportunities for restoration. Yet, little of this potential has been realized. Partly, this is owing to the lack of an appropriate conceptual framework to capture the biocomplexity of the system, including the socio-economic, biophysical and human health dimensions. And partly, it is owing to the lack of analytical methodologies sufficient to represent and predict the underlying biocomplexity (Geoghegan *et al.*, 1998; Michener *et al.*, 2001).

It is well known that human induced stressors progressively have impaired the capacity of ecosystems to provide essential services to humanity (Daily, 1997). The biocomplexity of impairment manifests itself through a wide variety of characteristics including generally reductions in terrestrial primary productivity, biodiversity, habitat suitability for endemic species, ecological integrity, while increasing fragility, vulnerability, resilience, etc. The proposed statistical and mathematical tools combined with a new generation of data availability allow a description of changes in biocomplexity both spatially and temporally.

In order to make ecosystem health assessments effective, these expressions must be captured rapidly, comprehensively, and economically. These requirements can potentially be achieved through utilization of advanced remote sensing capabilities in conjunction with available geospatial databases.

Attempts to assess the health of regions comprehensively considering the condition of humans as well as flora and fauna have experienced several limitations: the lack of essential synoptic data, assessments based on field studies generally constrained to small areas employing classical statistical tests (e.g. Wichert and Rapport, 1998), failure to integrate across humanistic and naturalistic dimensions (Epstein and Rapport, 1996; Huq and Colwell, 1996), and the lack of appropriate analytical methods (Patil and Myers, 1999; Patil, 2002b) capable of capturing the high degree of complexity inherent in these regional systems.

These barriers can be breached by marrying the concept of ecosystem health with advances in statistical and computational methodology for representing the spatial and temporal complexity of key indicators of ecosystem health on a landscape basis (Johnson *et al.*, 2002; Patil 2000, 2001bcd).

Our approach will contribute to model-based reproducible automated assessment and management of ecosystem health, distress, and degradation. We call this quantitative toolbox the MARMAP (Multiscale Advanced Raster MAP) system (Johnson *et al.*, 2002; Patil, 2000, 2001bcd, 2002a; Patil and Rodriguez, 2002). Details are available on the website <http://www.stat.psu.edu/~gpp/newpage11.htm>) together with 35 related publications, describing the methods, tools, case studies, outcomes, and references.

The MARMAP methods and tools have come about as a result of earlier research with agencies concerned with watershed ecosystem health related issues and approaches involving a multiplicity of empirical geospatial data and remote sensing information over Mid-Atlantic Region, Pennsylvania, China, and Italy. The problems and solutions required a toolbox of appropriate geoinformatic inferential capabilities. MARMAP is evolving in response to this need. This paper sketches how MARMAP can be put to effective use to assess ecosystem health at landscape scales.

2. INDICATORS OF ECOSYSTEM HEALTH AT LANDSCAPE SCALE

What Constitutes Ecosystem Health? A healthy ecosystem has been defined as one that is free from distress and degradation, maintains its organization and autonomy over time, and is resilient to stress (Rapport *et al.*, 1998). Ecosystem health can be assessed by indicators of vigor (productivity), organization and resilience (Mageau *et al.*, 1995, Costanza *et al.*, 1998a,b). Ecosystem health assessments, generally based on extrapolation from limited field data, provide empirical support for the use of such indicators for monitoring health (and conversely, degradation) in field situations (Hilden and Rapport, 1993; Rapport and Whitford, 1999; Rapport, Hilden, and Wepling, 2000).

Assessing Ecosystem Health at Regional Scales: The potential for multiple dynamic stable states of both natural and human-dominated ecosystems complicates the task of determining the extent to which ecosystem structure and function have been altered by human activity.

Nonetheless, numerous studies leave little doubt that ecosystem degradation has occurred in many systems well documented by the appearance of Ecosystem Distress Syndrome (Rapport and Whitford, 1999). This documentation enables examining groups of highly selected indicators and comparing their values with norms established for reference ecosystems.

Rapport *et al.* (1985) identified recurrent features of stressed terrestrial systems, including impairments in primary productivity, nutrient cycling, reduced resilience, altered community dominance favoring “r” selected species (shorter reproductive cycles, smaller size), increase in non-native species (exotics), increased disease prevalence, increased instability in component populations, reduced biodiversity, etc. These properties have been validated in a number of subsequent case studies (Hilden and Rapport, 1993; Rapport and Whitford, 1999). Using proxies for the key signs of ecosystem distress (e.g., biodiversity, community dominance, sediment loads, nutrient status of receiving waters) and relating these to appropriate synoptic data, provide a quantitative portrait of ecosystem health for each landscape context.

Relationship of Ecosystem Distress to Socioeconomic Activity: A critical element of biocomplexity entails delineating the complex temporal and spatial relationships between socioeconomic variables and ecosystem dynamics. Improved understanding of the relationships that exist between ecosystems and socioeconomic systems across time and space is essential to the design of economic, environmental, and natural resource policies that aspire to achieve sustainable outcomes with high levels of ecosystem health and quality of human life (Abler *et al.*, 2000; Bockstael, 1996; Shortle and Horan, 2001; Deacan *et al.*, 1998; Pickett and Rogers, 1997; Polasky *et al.*, 2001; Vernberg *et al.*, 1997; Wu, 2001). The necessary assessments must systematically integrate indicators of ecosystem health discussed above, with indicators of the quality of human life and the functioning and structure of socioeconomic systems (Bockstael, 1996; Conforth, 1997; Michalos, 1997).

3. ECOSYSTEM HEALTH, DISTRESS AND DEGRADATION OF WATERSHEDS AT LANDSCAPE SCALE

The Mid-Atlantic Region studies demonstrate the feasibility and practicality of ecosystem health assessments. This area provides an ideal case study because it is an ecoregion which is rich in synoptic data and it contains many of the geographical elements found in the eastern U.S., and other temperate regions. At least five major ecoregions occur in the Mid-Atlantic Region (i.e., Coastal Plain, Piedmont, Ridge and Valley, Unglaciaded Plateau, and Glaciaded Allegheny Plateau). These ecoregions extend in all directions increasing the utility of our findings to adjacent regions. The Mid-Atlantic Region also contains three major river drainages that vary in their physical, chemical, and biological attributes (i.e., Delaware, Susquehanna, and Ohio). A variety of land use types and patterns have evolved in the region, including, densely forested, high-density urban, agricultural, mined, and mixed land uses. Thus, the Mid-Atlantic Region's natural and human-induced landscapes, gradients, and boundaries provide a wealth of options to explore.

For example, Pennsylvania watersheds have been mapped at scales, ranging from 102 units for the State Water Plan to 9,855 units for individual named streams. These watershed units have been studied from diverse perspectives including non-point pollution, groundwater pollution potential, land cover, and animal habitats (Johnson, 1999, Johnson, *et al.*, 1998, 1999ab, 2001ab, 2002; Johnson and Patil, 1998; Myers *et al.*, 2000; Patil *et al.*, 2000ab). Pennsylvania watersheds vary in their ecology, geology, hydrology, degree of human influence, etc. Representing this complexity synoptically in a format that enables one to address questions of ecosystem health, integrity and resilience is our key challenge and goal. Using the collective data from the Mid-Atlantic Region, we confront the following types of questions in this context: What is the health status of a particular watershed and how does this compare with a similar but less stressed system? To what degree is ecosystem degradation associated with cumulative effects from population growth and economic development within the watershed? Do changes in spatial biocomplexity of key indicators of ecosystem distress serve as an early warning sign of loss of resilience at regional scales? Which watersheds show the greatest degree of fragmentation? Do these watersheds also indicate a loss of ecosystem services such as water quality and habitat? Is

the degree of fragmentation within watersheds correlated with the loss of ecosystems goods and services as measured by synoptic data on water quality, soil erosion, biodiversity, etc.?

There are relatively few synoptic, biological data sets available for large geographic regions. To represent features of biological diversity in landscape analysis, we can use habitat distributions for all vertebrates based on models from the National GAP Analysis Program for Pennsylvania (Myers *et al.*, 2000) and adjacent States. In addition, we have developed and used bird guilds as indicators of ecological integrity over regional landscapes (i.e., Bird Community Index (BCI), O'Connell *et al.*, 1998, 2000; Johnson *et al.*, 2002). The BCI is a multi-metric index of upland ecological integrity in the Mid-Atlantic Highlands, that has been extended to other ecoregions in the Mid-Atlantic for forested-, agricultural-, and urban dominated landscapes (O'Connell *et al.*, 1998). For aquatic parts of ecosystems, we can use fish models from the aquatic portion of GAP (Myers *et al.*, 2000) and available fish surveys from state and regional bioassessment surveys (e.g., EMAP 2000). Data from EMAP (2000) streams assessment are available for over 500 reaches in the region. And we have at our disposal the data warehouse, Pennsylvania Spatial Data Access (PASDA), a publicly funded web-based repository of geospatial data layers and meta-data for Pennsylvania, often with extensions of coverages for areas in neighboring states.

4. ECOLOGIC AND SOCIOECONOMIC INDICATORS FOR INTEGRATED ASSESSMENT

Every place of the planet has associated sets of naturalistic and humanistic characteristics that define its health in the broadest sense of the word. Climatic, geologic, hydrologic, biologic, and human-induced factors all combine to produce a set of ecological, economic, and social functions that characterize a place and determine its biocomplexity and socioeconomic complexity, as well as the extent to which social and ecological relationships are integrated. The complex array of natural and human factors in a region can be characterized by sets of socioeconomic and ecological indicators describing these zonal systems and their overlapping areas of tension (Conforth, 1997). By systematically collecting and examining such indicators, the patterns that emerge as these places are aggregated into landscapes, can be described quantitatively. Wherever possible, we search for indicators that reflect on current ecosystem and

socioeconomic conditions, socioeconomic drivers of ecosystem change, and indicators of ecological and economic sustainability (Horan *et al.*, 2000; Michalos, 1997).

Many indicators for landscape analyses are available for the Mid-Atlantic Region and have been catalogued by the Atlantic Slope Consortium (Brooks *et al.*, 1998, 2001). These spatial patterns can be explored within homogeneous regions, and across gradients and abrupt boundaries in the region. Similarly, a range of data sources is available for developing indicators of socioeconomic conditions, and the quality of life for various spatial units. A major source is U.S. Census Bureau data collected for census tracts, census blocks, zip codes, and counties covering a range of variables for describing populations and economic structure and performance. The USDA provides a range of socioeconomic indicators for rural areas (<http://www.ers.usda.gov/data/RuralMapMachine>). Importantly, methods have also been developed for constructing indicators of environmental amenities, an increasingly important determinant of the quality of life, from routine data sources (Deller *et al.*, 2001).

The same geographic elements, that are used to define an ecoregion, also influence how patterns of historic and current land uses develop. Human impacts, then, alter the original natural potential of an area. Natural and human factors are inexorably linked, and together define the ecosystem health and quality of life for a place. The interactive tension between them is analyzed by identifying socio-economic and ecological indicators that describe the separate systems, together with an additional set of indicators that captures the complexity of the relationships between them (Conforth, 1997; Michalos, 1997).

Although spatial landscape analyses have been conducted for years, it has been difficult to compare different locations when using multiple indicators simultaneously. However with the application of insightful sophisticated quantitative methods, it is possible to create truly integrative measures that characterize the synergistic relationships among landscape patterns and indicators. In particular, we explore the techniques described here for addressing multiple indicators, partial orderings, and multi-criterion decision support, along with echelons of spatial variation. We examine the resultant patterns within at least four distinct ecoregions, e.g. Piedmont, Ridge and Valley, Unglaciated Plateau, Glaciated Allegheny Plateau (Brooks *et al.*,

2001; Wardrop *et al.*, 2002), across boundaries of these same ecoregions, along rural-urban gradients (e.g., from Philadelphia to the northwest), across landscapes with forested, agricultural, urban, mixed land use patterns, and within and across watershed boundaries for the Delaware, Susquehanna, and Ohio drainages basins (Brooks *et al.*, 2001; Wardrop *et al.*, 2002). This approach allows one to search for and define consistent and recognizable landscape patterns, while at the same time, allowing one to define a set of reference conditions to understand the consequences, both favorable and unfavorable, that human actions have on biocomplexity. Data envelopment analysis techniques may also help explore sources of variation in the ecological and socioeconomic performance of regions.

5. MATHEMATICAL, STATISTICAL, COMPUTATIONAL, AND VISUALIZATION METHODS AND TOOLS

This section briefly describes applications of the emergent methodologies collectively known as the MARMAP System for landscape health assessments (Patil, 2000; Patil, 2001bcd; Patil, 2002abc. Also see <http://www.stat.psu.edu/~gpp/newpage11.htm>).

Modeling and Simulation of Thematic Raster Maps

A raster map depicts the landscape as a grid of uniform cells. Modeling and simulation of raster maps is employed for three general purposes. First, model fitting provides a set of estimated parameter values characterizing the spatial structure of the map (landscape). Second, simulation yields statistical confidence capability as well as response sensitivity to variation in the fitted parameter values. Third, model validation provides a check on tendencies to overfit the model. Three classes of map models are relevant: (a) Disjunctive Indicator Geostatistical (DIG) Model; (b) Hierarchical Markov Transition Matrix (HMTM) Model; and (c) Markov Random Field (MRF). DIG enables us to analyze (categorical) landscape condition mappings for vicinity influences to better understand the dynamics of health effects in space and time. HMTM helps us to sort out the effects of ecosystem health influences operating at different scales. MRF provides insights on the scope of variability that can occur without fundamental change in basic landscape pattern; i.e., temporal shifts in occurrence of sustainable pattern elements.

These address issues important to monitoring and diagnostics, such a need to determine and discriminate differing status with regard to degradation of habitat integrity across landscapes. From land cover maps derived by remote sensing, we examine naturalistic versus more strongly human disturbed situations through an index of conditional entropy to obtain profiles of disruption. This is illustrated in terms of watersheds (Figure 1a) for Pennsylvania wherein naturalistic cover would be predominantly closed forest. Profiles (Figure 1b) support recognition of increasing disruption from mostly forest to partially forest to largely deforested. The profiles themselves are parameterized to provide comprehensive representations of patch structure across scaling domains. Conditional simulation is informative with regard to the effect of spatial pattern on estimation of error matrix and associated parameters for assessing accuracy of thematic mappings that constitute the basis for landscape inquiry.

For more information, see Johnson (1999), Johnson and Patil (1998), Johnson *et al* (1998, 1999ab, 2001a), Patil *et al.* (2000ab), and Patil and Taillie (1999, 2000abc).




Figure 1. Fragmentation profiles for three Pennsylvania watersheds with distinct land cover patterns: mostly forested, transitional and mostly deforested (agriculture/urban/suburban).

Echelons of Spatial Variation

Echelons frame local values of synoptically mapped environmental indicators in regional context for comparative purposes and objective analysis of complex hierarchies in spatial variation across landscapes. The environmental indicators are considered as surface variables in virtual (or real) topographies as depicted in Figure 2. Echelons are structural entities consisting of peaks, foundations of peaks, foundations of foundations, and so on in an organizational

hierarchy. It is natural to cast the echelon hierarchy as a dendrogram, from which profiles of spatial complexity can be obtained and “principal families” determined as contiguous areas of criticality from perspectives of either pronounced ecosystem health or pronounced ecosystem distress. Echelons have proven effective for elucidating concentration and connectivity of biodiversity, complexity of landscape change induced by factors such as wildland fire, pattern of propagation for urban sprawl, etc. (Myers et al., 1995, 1997; Myers, Patil and Tallie, 1999; Kurihara *et al.*, 2000; Smits and Myers, 2000; Patil and Myers, 2002).




Figure 2. (a) Echelon decomposition of a surface and (b) associated echelon tree.

Contemporary study of human disease as a component of ecosystem health entails a spatial scan statistic (Kulldorff and Nagarwalla, 1995) for detecting geographic clusters of disease and other responses that are significantly elevated with respect to the regional setting. In conjunction with the spatial scan statistic (SATSCAN), echelon analysis can more clearly delineate zones of elevated intensity for focus of investigation (Patil and Taillie, 2001d).

Pattern-based Landscape Change Analysis

Landscape change analysis is becoming increasingly important for ecosystem monitoring. Deforestation, habitat fragmentation, and land-use conversion are growing concerns for conservation, landscape ecology, and planning. Long-term effects of global climate change are expressed in broad-area change of landscape patterns. Factoring the influences of localized human activity from broader scale changes induced by climatic effects is a major analytical challenge that cannot be addressed well until consistent methods for detecting change are available. Remote sensing data at different scales acquired by a variety of sensors are increasing rapidly in their availability. Effective and parsimonious methods are needed to make the

combinatorial challenges of comparative analysis manageable. It also becomes necessary to accomplish comparative analysis of data from different sensors. Composite mosaics of multiple images derived by pattern-based segmentation have proven particularly advantageous for extracting and representing change from remotely sensed image sequences, where previously analysis was largely restricted to consideration of image pairs taken at two times with the same sensor (Myers, 2000; Patil *et al*, 2000b).

Multiple Indicators, Partial Orderings, and Multi-Criterion Decision Support

To prioritize and rank means to linearize. Rather than derive a composite index, we will prioritize without having to integrate the indicators. This is now possible, and the approach is relatively novel and innovative. We have developed it for nationwide prioritization for UNEP with land, air and water indicators measuring the human environment interface at national level (Patil, 2001a). For another example, a landscape atlas published by U.S. EPA (1997) considers 33 indicators of ecological condition on 123 watersheds (7-digit HUCs) of the Mid-Atlantic region and attempts to rank the watersheds using clustering and quintile-frequency methods. We address the question of ranking a collection of objects when a suite of indicator values is available for each member of the collection. The objects can be represented as a cloud of points in indicator space, but the different indicators (coordinate axes) typically convey different comparative messages and there is no unique way to rank the objects. A conventional solution is to assign a composite numerical score to each object by combining the indicator information in some fashion. Consciously or otherwise, every such composite involves judgements (often arbitrary or controversial) about tradeoffs or substitutability between indicators.

Rather than trying to impose a unique ranking, we take the view that the relative positions in indicator space determine only a partial ordering and that a given pair of objects may not be inherently comparable. Working with Hasse diagrams of the partial order, we study the collection of all rankings that are compatible with the partial order and arrive at the ranking and prioritization as in Figure 3, using cumulative rank frequency (CRF) operator specially developed for the purpose (Patil and Taillie, 2001a).




Figure 3. The three diagrams on the left show the linearizing effect of the CRF operator. The two diagrams on the right show how ties can emerge during linearization. A poset is a partially ordered set.

Hierarchical Structure Analysis

Trees and other nodal graph structures arise in the map modeling, echelons, and poset components of MARMAP. Also important is the coupling of related structures. For example, when a suite of indicators is partitioned into subgroups (e.g., stressor, integrity, socioeconomic), the Hasse diagrams have a common set of labeled nodes but (potentially) different edges. Echelon trees for different surface variables over the same geographical region have their nodes partially coupled by overlapping spatial extent (Patil, 2001cd).

Mining Geospatial Data

Data structures and algorithms are under investigation for exploring associations between ecosystem degradation and spatial patterns employing higher-level models for detecting changes and finding interesting spatio-temporal patterns and trends (Rodriguez, 2001).

Interface Design and Visualization Toolbox

The main goal is to promote the discovery of inherent structures and patterns, enable the study of particular facets and dimensions of data, and provide means to visually assess the utility and accuracy.

Matrix of Case Studies and Quantitative Techniques

The matrix of Figure 4 describes the coupling of case studies and the quantitative techniques. An ‘x’ in a cell shows the expected coupling across case studies and the quantitative techniques. The prototype case studies of Pennsylvania, Mid-Atlantic, and Atlantic Slope are given.

	Techniques/Regions	DIG	HMTM	MRF	ECHELON	POSET	SATSCAN	PSI	HSA	MCSSG	DSAMG	IDVT	GQM
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
	<i>Prototype Case Studies</i>												
1	Pennsylvania	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
2	Mid-Atlantic	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
3	Atlantic Slope	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x

Figure 4. Matrix of case studies and quantitative techniques. DIG=Disjunctive Indicator Geostatistical model; HMTM=Hierarchical Markov Transition Matrix model; MRF=Markov Random Field model; PSI=Progressively Segmenting Images; HSA=Hierarchical Structure Analysis; MCSSG=Methodological Comparatives with Spatial Statistics and Geostatistics; DSAMG=Data Structures and Algorithms for Mining Geospatial Data; IDVT=Interface Design and Visualization Toolbox; GQM=General Quantitative Methods.

6. INTEGRATION OF RESEARCH, EDUCATION, AND TECHNOLOGY TRANSFER

An essential part of this proposed methodology is to introduce concepts and methods at the core of MARMAP to researchers in ecology, environment, socioeconomics, and quality of human life. It is timely to think of multidisciplinary groups for ecosystem health measurement at landscape level.

We have described both the challenges (Sections 1-3) and the opportunities to meet those challenges using advanced statistical and mathematical techniques (Sections 4-5). Pilot studies employing these methodologies include United States Atlantic Slope and Mid-Atlantic Region. The experiences gained from these studies feed back into refinements of methods. At the end of

the day, the thrust of this enterprise is to have quantification of ecosystem health at landscape scales from subwatersheds to major watersheds as an essential, replicable method of assessing our progress towards sustainability.

Acknowledgements

The authors are thankful to Greg Biging, Dan Brown, Mark Cochrane, Gil Pontius, and James Shortle for their comments and suggestions on earlier drafts. The paper has been prepared with partial support from U.S. EPA Star Grant for Atlantic Slope Consortium, Cooperative Agreement Number R-82868401, Barbara Levinson, Project Officer. The contents have not been subjected to Agency review and therefore do not necessarily reflect the views of the Agency and no official endorsement should be inferred.

References*

For references cited in the text for Johnson, Myers, Patil, and Taillie but not appearing in the references listed below, the reader is invited to visit the website:

<http://www.stat.psu.edu/~gpp/newpage11.htm>

Abler, D., Shortle, J., Rose, A. and Oladosu, D. (2000) Characterizing the regional economic impacts of climate change. *Global and Planetary Change* **25**: 67-81.

Arrow, K., Bolin, B., Costanza, R., Dasgupta, P., Folke, C., Holling, C.S., Jansson, B.O., Levin, S., Maler, K., Perrings, C., Pimentel, D. (1995) Economic growth, carrying capacity and the environment. *Science* **268**: 520-521.

Bockstael, N. (1996) Modeling, economics, and ecology: The importance of a spatial perspective. *American Journal of Agricultural Economics* **78**: 1168-1180.

Bremaud, P. (1999) *Markov Chains: Gibbs Fields, Monte Carlo Simulation, and Queues*. Springer Ver-Lag.

Brooks, R., Brinson, M., Hershner, C., Shortle, J. and Whigham, D. (2001) Development, Testing, and Application of Indicators for Integrated Assessment of Ecological and Socioeconomic Resources of the Atlantic Slope in the Mid-Atlantic. Penn State Cooperative Wetlands Center.

Brooks, R.P., O'Connell, T.J., Wardrop, D.H. and Jackson, L.E. (1998) Towards a regional index of biological integrity: the example of forested riparian ecosystems. *Environ. Monit. Assmt.* **51**: 131-143.

Conforth, I. (1997) Selecting indicators for assessing sustainable land management. *Journal of Environmental Management* **56**: 153-179.

- Costanza, R. (1992) Toward an operational definition of ecosystem health. In *Ecosystem Health: New Goals for Environmental Management*, Costanza, R., Norton, B. G. and Haskell, B. D. (eds.) pp. 3-19. Island Press, Washington, DC.
- Costanza, R., Mageau, M., Norton, B. and Patten, B.C. (1998a) What is sustainability? In *Ecosystem Health*, Rapport, D., et al. (eds.) pp. 31-239. Blackwell Science.
- Costanza, R., Mageau, M., Norton, B. and Patten, B.C. (1998b) Predictors of ecosystem health. In *Ecosystem Health*, D. Rapport, et al. (eds.) pp. 140-250. Blackwell Science.
- Cressie, N.A.C. (1991) *Statistics for Spatial Data*. Wiley.
- Daily, G. (ed) (1997) *Nature's Services: Societal Dependence on Natural Ecosystems*. Island Press, Washington, DC.
- Deacan, R., et al. (1998) Research trends and opportunities in environmental and resource economics. *Environmental and Resource Economics* **11**: 383-397.
- Deller, S., Tsai, T., Marcouiller, D. and English, D. (2001) The Role of Amenities in Rural Economic Growth. *American Journal of Agricultural Economics* **83**: 352-365.
- Di Battista, G., Eades, P., Tamassia, R. and Tollis, I.G. (1999) *Graph Drawing: Algorithms for the Visualization of Graphs*. Prentice Hall.
- EMAP (2000) Mid-Atlantic Highlands streams assessment. U.S. EPA, Final Report, EPA-903-R-00-015. 64 pp.
- Epstein, P.R. and Rapport, D.J. Changing coastal marine environments and human health. *Ecosystem Health* **2(3)**: 166-176.
- Geoghegan, J., Pritchard, L.Jr., Ogneva-Himmelberger, Y., Chowdhury, R.R., Sanderson, S. and Turner, B.L.II. (1998) "Socializing the Pixel" and "Pixelizing the Social" in land-use and land-cover change. In *People and Pixels. Linking Remote Sensing and Social Science*, Liverman et al. (eds) pp. 51-69. National Academy Press.
- Hilden, M. and Rapport, D.J. (1993) Four centuries of cumulative impacts on a Finnish rier and its estuary; an ecosystem health approach. *J. Aquatic Ecosystem Health* **2**: 261-275.
- Horan, R., Hubrovcak, J., Shortle, J. and Bulte, E. (2000) Green accounting with distributional weights. *Environment and Development Economics* **5**: 95-108.
- Johnson, G.D. (1999) Landscape Pattern Analysis for Assessing Ecosystem Condition: Development of a Multi-Resolution Method and Application to Watershed Delineated Landscapes in Pennsylvania. Ph.D. Thesis, Penn State University.

Johnson, G.D. and Patil, G.P. (1998) Quantitative multiresolution characterizations of landscape patterns for assessing the status of ecosystem health in watershed management areas, *Ecosystem Health* **4(3)**: 177-187.

Johnson, G.D., Myers, W.L., Patil, G.P. and Taillie, C. (2001a) Fragmentation profiles for real and simulated landscapes. *Environmental and Ecological Statistics* **8**: 5-20.

Johnson, G.D., Myers, W.L. and Patil, G.P. (2001b) Predictability of surface water pollution loading in Pennsylvania using watershed-based landscape measurements. *Journal of the American Water Resources Association* **37(4)**: 821-835.

Johnson, G.D., Brooks, R.P., Myers, W.L., O'Connell, T.J. and Patil, G.P. (2002) Predictability of bird community-based ecological integrity, using landscape measurements. In *Managing for Healthy Ecosystems*, Rapport, D., Lasley, W., Rolston, D., Nielsen, O., Qualset, C., and Damania, A. CRC Press.

Kulldorff, M. and Nagarwalla, N. (1995) Spatial disease clusters: detection and inference. *Statistics in Medicine* **14**: 799-810.

Kurihara, K., Myers, W.L. and Patil, G.P. (2000) Echelon analysis of the relationship between population and land cover patterns based on remote sensing data, *Community Ecology* **1(1)**: 103-122.

Mageau, M.T., Costanza, R. and Ulanowicz, R.E. (1995) The development and initial testing of a quantitative assessment of ecosystem health. *Ecosystem Health* **1**: 201-213.

Michalos, A. (1997) Combining social, economic and environmental indicators to measure sustainable well-being. *Social Indicators Research* **40**: 221-258.

Michener, W.K., Baerwald, T.J., Firth, P., Palmer, M.A., Rosenberger, J.L., Sandlin, E.A. and Zimmerman, H. (2001) Defining and unraveling biocomplexity. *Bioscience* **51(12)**: 1018-1023.

Myers, W.L. (2000) PHASE-Based Broad-Area Landscape Change Analysis. Final report on NASA Research Project NAGS5-6713. Environmental Resources Research Institute Research Report ER2005. Penn State University.

Myers, W.L., Patil, G.P. and Taillie, C. (1999) Conceptualizing pattern analysis of spectral change relative to ecosystem health. *Ecosystem Health* **5(4)**: 285-293.

Myers, W.L., *et al.* (2000) Pennsylvania Gap Analysis Project. Leading landscapes for collaborative conservation. Final Report for U.S. Geol. Surv., Gap Analysis Program, 142 pp.

O'Connell, T.J., Jackson, L.E. and Brooks, R.P. (1998) A bird community index of biotic integrity for the Mid-Atlantic Highlands. *Environment Monit. Assmt.* **51**: 145-156.

O'Connell, T.J., Jackson, L.E. and Brooks, R.P. (2000) Bird guilds as indicators of ecological condition in the central Appalachians. *Ecological Applications* **10(6)**: 1706-1721.

O'Neill, R.V., Hunsaker, C.T., Timmins, S.P., Jackson, B.L., Jones, K.B., Riitters, K.H. and Wickham, J.D. (1996) Scale problems in reporting landscape pattern at the regional scale. *Landscape Ecology* **11**: 169-180.

Patil, G.P. (2002a) Invited paper on Multiscale Advanced Raster Map Analysis System: Definition, Design, and Development. Joint Statistical Meetings, ASA, New York City, NY.

Patil, G.P. (2002b) Overview of Landscape Ecosystem Health Assessment Using Remote Sensing Data. In *Managing for Healthy Ecosystems*, Rapport, D. Lasley, W., Rolston, D., Nielsen, O., Qualset, C. and Damania, A. CRC Press.

Patil, G. P. (2002c) Conditional entropy profiles for multiscale landscape fragmentation and environmental degradation. In *Encyclopedia of Environmetrics, Volume 1*. A. El-Shaarawi and W. W. Piegorsch, eds. Wiley, pp. 413—417.

Patil, G.P. and Myers, W.L. (1999) Editorial: Environmental and ecological health assessment of landscapes and watersheds with remote sensing data. *Ecosystem Health* **5(4)**: 221-224.

Patil, G. P. and Myers, W. L. (2002) Echelon analysis. In *Encyclopedia of Environmetrics, Volume 2*. A. El-Shaarawi and W. W. Piegorsch, eds. Wiley, pp. 583—586

Patil, G.P. and Taillie, C. (2001a) On quantitative formulation of nationwide human environment index. Final Report. Division of Early Warning and Assessment, UNEP.

Patil, G. P., and Taillie, C. (2001b) A multiscale hierarchical Markov transition matrix model for generating and analyzing thematic raster maps. *Environmental and Ecological Statistics* **8**: 71-84.

Patil, G.P. and Taillie, C. (2001d) Powerpoint Presentations, <http://www.stat.psu.edu/~gpp>.

Patil, G.P. Johnson, G.D., Myers, W.L., and Taillie, C. (2000a) Multiscale statistical approach to critical-area analysis and modeling of watersheds and landscapes. In *Statistics for the 21st Century: Methodologies for Applications of the Future*, Rao, C. R. and Szekely, G. J. (eds) pp. 293-310. Marcel Dekker.

Patil, G.P. Myers, W.L., Luo, Z., Johnson, G.D., and Taillie, C. (2000b) Multiscale assessment of landscapes and watersheds with synoptic multivariate spatial data in environmental and ecological statistics. *Mathematical and Computer Modeling* **32**: 257-272.

Pickett, S. and Rogers, K. (1997) Patch Dynamics: The transformation of landscape structure and function. In *Wildlife and Landscape Ecology*. J. Bissonette (ed). Springer-Verlag.

Polasky, S., Camm, J., Garber-Yonts, B. (2001) Selecting biological reserves cost-effectively: An application to terrestrial vertebrate conservation in Oregon. *Land Economics* **77**: 68-78.

Rapport, D.J., Regier, H.A. and Hutchinson, T.C. (1985) Ecosystem behavior under stress. *The American Naturalist* **125(5)**: 617-640.

Rapport, D.J. and Whitford, W.G. (1999) How ecosystems respond to stress: Common properties of arid and aquatic systems. *BioScience* **49(3)**: 193-203.

Rapport, D.J., Hilden, M., Weppling, K. (2000) Restoring the health of the earth's ecosystems: A new challenge for the earth sciences. *Episodes* **23(1)**: 12-19.

Rapport, D.J., Christensen, N., Karr, J.R., Patil, G.P. (1999) The centrality of ecosystem health in achieving sustainability in the 21st century: concepts and new approaches to environmental management. *Transactions of the Royal Society of Canada, Series VI, Volume IX*, University of Toronto Press , 3-40

Rapport, D.J., Costanza, R., Epstein, P., Gaudet, C. & Levins, R. (eds) (1998) *Ecosystem Health*. Blackwell Science, Oxford, UK. 372pp.

Rodriguez, S. (2001). Statistical data mining of remote imagery for characterization, classification and comparison of landscape and watersheds of Pennsylvania. Ph.D. Thesis, Penn State University.

Shortle, J. and Horan, R. (2001) The economics of nonpoint pollution. *Journal of Economic Surveys* **15**: 255-290.

Smits, P.C. and Myers, W.L. (2000) Echelon approach to characterize and understand spatial structures of change in multi-temporal remote-sensing imagery. *IEEE Trans. Geoscience and Remote Sensing* **38(5)**: 2299-2309.

U.S. EPA (1997). An Ecological Assessment of the United States Mid-Atlantic Region. Office of Research and Development, EPA/600/R-97/130, U.S. EPA, Washington, DC.

Vernberg, W., Scott, G., Stozier, S., Bemiss, J. and Daugomah, J. (1997) The effects of urbanization on human and ecosystem health. In *Sustainable Development in the Southeastern Coastal Zone*. Vernberg, F., W. Vernberg and T. Siewicki (eds.). University of South Carolina Press.

Vitousek, P.M., Mooney, H.A. Lubchenco, J. and Milillo, J.M. (1997) Human domination of earth's ecosystems. *Science* **277**: 494-499.

Wardrop, D. H., Bishop, J. A., Easterling, M., Myers, W. L., Patil, G. P., and Taillie, C. (2002) Use of landscape and land use parameters for classification and characterization of watersheds in the mid-Atlantic across five physiographic provinces. Ecosystem Health Conference, Washington DC.

Wichert, G. and Rapport, D.J. (1998) Fish community structure as a measure of degradation and rehabilitation of riparian systems in an agricultural drainage basin. *Environmental Management* **22**: 425-443.

Wu, J. (2001) Environmental amenities and the spatial pattern of urban sprawl. *American Journal of Agricultural Economics* **83**: 691-697.

*For references cited in the text for Johnson, Myers, Patil, and Taillie but not appearing in the references listed above, the reader is invited to visit the website:

<http://www.stat.psu.edu/~gpp/newpage11.htm>