

The Routledge Handbook of Landscape Ecology

*Edited by Robert A. Francis, James D.A. Millington,
George L.W. Perry, and Emily S. Minor*

Contents

<i>Lists of figures</i>	viii
<i>Lists of tables</i>	xx
<i>Lists of contributors</i>	xxi
<i>Preface</i>	xxvii
<i>Acknowledgments</i>	xxx

1 A brief history and overview of landscape ecology <i>Robert A. Francis and Marc Antrop</i>	1
---	---

PART I

Theory and concepts in landscape ecology **23**

2 Landscape mosaics and the patch–corridor–matrix model <i>Marc Antrop</i>	25
---	----

3 Scale and hierarchy in landscape ecology <i>James D.A. Millington</i>	49
--	----

4 Landscape connectivity <i>Lenore Fahrig, Víctor Arroyo-Rodríguez, Eliana Cazetta, Adam Ford, Jill Lancaster, and Thomas Ranius</i>	67
---	----

PART II

Landscape processes **89**

5 Spatially structured ecosystems, connectivity, and movement <i>Finnbar Lee, Jingjing Zhang, Craig Eric Simpkins, Justine A. Becker, and George L. W. Perry</i>	91
---	----

6 Habitat fragmentation <i>Amanda E. Martin, Joseph R. Bennett, and Lenore Fahrig</i>	118
--	-----

Contents

7	Nutrient flows in the landscape <i>Erica A.H. Smithwick</i>	140
8	The disturbance regime concept <i>Brian J. Harvey, Sarah J. Hart, and C. Alina Cansler</i>	159
9	Impacts of climate changes and amplified natural disturbance on global ecosystems <i>Rachel A. Loehman, Megan M. Friggens, Rosemary L. Sherriff, Alisa R. Keyser, and Karin L. Riley</i>	175
10	Change from within: Bottom-up disturbances of ecosystems <i>James M.R. Brock and Sarah V. Wyse</i>	199
PART III		
Methods and tools for landscape ecology		217
11	Fieldwork in landscape ecology <i>Jesse E.D. Miller, Carly D. Ziter, and Michael J. Koontz</i>	219
12	Remote sensing and landscape mapping <i>Nathalie Pettorelli, Jennifer E. Smith, Mailys Lopes, and Henrike Schulte to Bühne</i>	230
13	Sensors in the landscape <i>John H. Porter</i>	250
14	The role of paleoecology in understanding landscape-level ecosystem dynamics <i>George L.W. Perry, Richard E. Brazier, and Janet M. Wilmshurst</i>	264
15	Landscape pattern analysis <i>Tarmo K. Remmel and Scott W. Mitchell</i>	283
16	Quantitative modelling and computer simulation <i>Calum Brown</i>	312
17	Landscape character assessment and participatory approaches <i>Andrew Butler and Ingrid Sarlöv Herlín</i>	335
18	Experimentation in landscape ecology <i>G. Darrel Jenerette</i>	352

PART IV	
Landscape ecology frontiers	365
19 Landscape ecology contributions to biodiversity conservation <i>Robert F. Baldwin, R. Daniel Hanks, and Jeremy S. Dertien</i>	367
20 Ecosystem services in the landscape <i>Matthew Mitchell</i>	386
21 Riverscapes <i>Todd Lookingbill, Kimberly Meitzen, and Jason P. Julian</i>	411
22 Landscape restoration <i>Aveliina Helm</i>	430
23 Landscapes and climate change – case studies from Europe <i>B.C. Meyer and G. Mezosi</i>	446
<i>Index</i>	461

Figures

1.1	The number of papers published each year containing the term 'landscape ecology' as a topic, from ISI's Web of Science, ranging from 1974 to 2020 (search performed September 4, 2020, so the 2020 total is lower than the full year)	4
1.2	Summary of some basic concepts related to the composition and configuration of the landscape: see text for explanation	13
1.3	Examples of landscape metrics of diversity and heterogeneity for patterns of different composition and configuration	14
1.4	Border types between land units	15
1.5	Design principles for patch properties related to effects of landscape fragmentation	16
2.1	The mosaic and the patch-corridor-matrix model for landscape analysis	28
2.2	The holistic method of landscape classification by stepwise subdivision of land units	30
2.3	Parametric landscape classification by overlaying thematic maps to make a map composite	31
2.4	(a) Two patches in vector format; (b) these patches after rasterizing: size, shape, and edge (border) are distorted; (c) only one patch remains when the grain size is doubled	32
2.5	Identifying patches by clustering of grid cells according to neighborhood rules	32
2.6	Variables to describe patches: the ratio between the edge and core depends on the size (area) and shape. A shape index expresses the compactness of the patch in comparison to a circle	33
2.7	Generally, the richness of a patch increases with its size. Simultaneously, the proportion of core species increases faster than the edge species	33
2.8	Different types of corridors: (a) linear, (b) strip corridors, (c) stream corridors. C: core, E edge, e: ecoduct. 1-7: cross-sections: 1, 3, 6 are corridors made by space bordered by vegetation, 2, 5 are corridors made by vegetation bordered by open space, 7 are stream corridors, often complexes of previous types	34
2.9	Matrix inversion in a landscape conceived as patches in a matrix. The matrix is the landscape type with the largest coverage and connectedness. When the number of patches increases and their summed area reaches the proportion of 0.5928 (in the case of a square grid cell with a 4-neighbors clustering rule), then the aggregated patches get the largest connectedness and become the matrix	35
2.10	Critical percolation thresholds for a 4-neighbor and 8-neighbor clustering rule. LC/LCmax is the ratio between the cluster size to the maximal possible cluster size, and P is the summed real proportion of the clusters. Once the percolation threshold is reached, the cluster size rapidly increases to its maximal size	36

- 2.11 When the functionality of processes in a spatial structure decreases, the structure is gradually replaced by a new one, increasing the functionality 37
- 2.12 A holon as an ecocodevice with its regulating functions and embedded ones at a lower hierarchical level 39
- 2.13 Use and applications of landscape metrics and indices according to peer-reviewed publications from 1994 to 2008 43
- 3.1 Varying scales of data for a forest study area. The original data in (a) from Millington et al. (2010) have been aggregated to a coarser grain but with identical extent to create data in (b). The number of map cells is maintained in (c) and (d), which have a progressively finer scale (i.e. smaller grain and smaller extent). Note how the number of land covers decreases with finer scale; this is by chance in this example, but in general, the number of discrete classes is expected to decrease 51
- 3.2 Four levels in a (nested) forest hierarchy. At the lowest level, *Gaps* (a) in the forest canopy are defined by the influence of large trees. Multiple gaps will be found in *Stands* (b) at the next level, defined by species composition and age structure. Many stands will be found within *Catchments* (c) at the next level, defined by local drainage basins. In turn, multiple catchments may be found at the *landscape* level (d), which may be defined by changes in land use and disturbance regime 53
- 3.3 The effect of changing grain and extent on spatial variance. As grain increases, more spatial variance is included within samples (e.g. pixels), and vice versa. A lower effect, increasing extent, may increase the number of classes (hence, spatial variance) 56
- 4.1 Illustration of the full concept of connectivity (a) and three major variants on this concept (b–d). Boxes in dark text represent components that are explicitly included, while boxes in light text represent components that are either ignored or implicitly assumed. We label the three main connectivity concepts for their originators, Gray Merriam, Reed Noss, and Ilkka Hanski, but note that a variety of alterations have been proposed by later authors 70
- 4.2 Illustration of two methods (A and B) for estimating landscape connectivity as originally defined (see Figure 4.1a) 71
- 4.3 The effect of landscape structure on population size (and therefore on population persistence) is only partly determined by connectivity (blue arrows). Landscape structure also affects population size through its effects on reproduction and survival (dashed red arrows). Hanski connectivity estimates patch immigration rate by linking patch isolation to population occurrence or colonization. However, immigration rate is affected not only by movement success but also by population size, which determines the number of emigrants and therefore, the number of potential immigrants to the patch – the population size effect. Therefore, Hanski connectivity combines effects of landscape structure on movement, reproduction, and survival 78
- 5.1 Different types of spatially structured populations along a gradient of dispersal rate from isolated populations with very infrequent immigration/emigration to patchy populations where movement between habitat patches is frequent; green patches are occupied by the species of interest and purple are unoccupied. The lines connecting habitats show dispersal with the grey-scale showing frequency 92

Figures

- 5.2 McArthur and Wilson's (1967) ETIB predicts equilibrium species richness (S^*) on islands as a function of immigration (I) and extinction (E) rates on islands of different size and isolation. Large islands that are near (NL) the mainland will hold more species than near-small (NS) or far-large (FL) islands, which will be similar (but not necessarily identical), and far-small (FS) islands will hold fewer still 93
- 5.3 (a) Temporal dynamics of the Levins metapopulation model with different c/m ratios, (b) the effects of limited dispersal on metapopulation dynamics ($c = 0.3$, $m = 0.15$), and (c) maps showing spatial pattern of occupancy (white) under dispersal limitation 95
- 5.4 Representation of the four metacommunity archetypes: (a) species sorting, (b) mass effects, (c) patch dynamics, and (d) neutral dynamics. Circles represent habitat patches of two types (colors), and squares represent populations of two species (colors). Larger squares are locally competitively superior, and solid lines are stronger dispersers than dashed lines 96
- 5.5 Representing functional connectivity as a spatial graph. (a) Binary and continuous dispersal kernels for two species (binary and continuous), (b) and (c) patches (nodes) and connections between them (edges) based on the binary and continuous dispersal kernels, respectively. In (c), the strength of the link is represented by the color of the edge (edges with strength less than 0.15 not shown for clarity) 102
- 5.6 Least-cost paths between four points in a landscape generated using the modified random clusters approach at three different grains: (a) original, (b) aggregated by a factor of 10, and (c) aggregated by a factor of 25. The lines show LCPs between a suite of locations in the landscape and the background coloring the patch-level resistance (blue [low] to yellow [high]). Note the changes in LCP with spatial grain (coarsening from a to c) 103
- 5.7 The movement ecology framework (Nathan et al. 2008) considers movement trajectories to emerge from interactions and feedbacks between an organism's internal state, external factors, and movement capacity 106
- 5.8 Three habitat corridors: (a) 'classical' forest corridor between isolated patches (Brazil), (b) wildlife overpass (Singapore), and (c) fish passage (River Otter, United Kingdom). (Images (a) and (b) come from Wikimedia Commons users Ipe-institutodepesquisasecologicas and Benjamin P.Y-H. Lee (University of Kent); both CC BY-SA.) 108
- 6.1 Removal of a given amount of habitat can result in (a) a more fragmented distribution of remnant habitat, if habitat removal results in subdivision of habitat patches, (b) no change in fragmentation, if habitat is removed by making patches smaller, or (c) a less fragmented distribution of remnant habitat, if entire habitat patches are removed. Dark grey = habitat, white = non-habitat 120
- 6.2 Depiction of a SLOSS (single large or several small) study design, which requires (a) a set of different-sized habitat patches and a list of the species found in each patch. Dark grey = habitat, white = non-habitat. (b) Subsets of patches are created, each with a different number of patches but the same total area of habitat, and the number of species in each subset is tallied. Black = patch included in subset, light grey = patch excluded from subset 121

- 6.3 Example site selection for a mensurative study designed to minimize correlations between habitat fragmentation per se (e.g. number of forest patches within a landscape) and habitat amount (e.g. the percentage of landscape covered by forest) by (a) randomly sampling landscapes within the study region; (b) plotting the relationship between habitat fragmentation per se and amount, and selecting ranges of values within which the correlation between variables is low; (c) subdividing each range of values to create four strata (low fragmentation–low amount, low fragmentation–high amount, etc.); and (d) randomly selecting an equal number of sampling sites from each stratum 122
- 6.4 Typical relationships between habitat amount and three measures of habitat subdivision: (a) mean patch size (patch size averaged over all patches in the landscape), (b) number of patches, and (c) edge density (length of habitat–non-habitat edge / landscape size; see also Fahrig, 2003). Dark grey = habitat, white = non-habitat 123
- 6.5 Structure of landscapes compared when evaluating the effects of habitat fragmentation per se (a–c) versus fragmentation as loss and subdivision (d–f) on an ecological response. To evaluate the effect of fragmentation per se on an ecological response, we would compare that ecological response across landscapes with the same amount of habitat but different numbers of habitat patches. In contrast, studies defining fragmentation as loss and subdivision would compare landscapes that differed in their habitat amounts and subdivision. Dark grey = habitat, white = non-habitat 124
- 6.6 Landscapes with less fragmented habitat, i.e. fewer and larger patches (a), tend to have, on average, longer distances among patches than landscapes with more fragmented habitat (b). Note that the total amount of habitat is identical in (a) and (b). Dark grey = habitat, white = non-habitat 128
- 6.7 Relationships between ecological responses and measures of (a) patch size (independent of fragmentation per se and habitat amount) and (b) habitat fragmentation per se (e.g. number of patches, independent of focal patch size and habitat amount) predicted for each proposed mechanism. Line thickness is proportional to the number of mechanisms that should produce a given relationship. Mechanisms functioning at the scale of individual patches could also affect responses to habitat fragmentation per se at the landscape scale. However, other mechanisms function only at the landscape scale, i.e. they involve interactions of individuals over multiple habitat patches. Positive effects of patch size would not translate across scales to negative effects of fragmentation per se if other mechanisms involving interactions of individuals over multiple habitat patches typically drive positive effects of habitat fragmentation per se that outweigh the patch-scale effects. Note that we show the ecological response being measured within the same-sized area within each focal patch, which avoids confounding effects of patch size/fragmentation per se on the ecological response with effects of sampling effort. Dark grey = habitat, white = non-habitat 130

Figures

- 6.8 Illustration to show that when (a) environmental conditions vary in space (depicted here as a gradient from black to light grey), a wider range of these conditions is covered when a given habitat amount is subdivided into more patches (b) than when it is subdivided into fewer patches (c). Thus, habitat is more heterogeneous in a landscape with more fragmented habitat. White = non-habitat 132
- 6.9 Example of the relationship between (a) focal patch size and habitat fragmentation per se, measured as the number of forest patches, (b) patch size and habitat amount, measured as the proportion of the landscape in forest, and (c) fragmentation per se and habitat amount. Empirical relationships were derived from a sample of 1000 circular landscapes (1-km radius) in southeastern Ontario, Canada. Each point represents a landscape. Contains information licensed under the Open Government Licence—Ontario (<https://geohub.lio.gov.on.ca/datasets/wooded-area>, accessed 23 November 2019) 134
- 6.10 Example of the strata that can be used to design replicate landscapes in an experimental study or to select sites for a mensurative study (see also Figure 6.3), when the goal is to minimize correlations between the focal patch size, a landscape-scale measure of habitat fragmentation per se (e.g. number of forest patches within a landscape), and habitat amount (e.g. the percentage of the landscape covered by forest). Here, the eight strata are defined by subdividing the range of values for each of the three variables (small patch size—few patches—low amount, large patch size—few patches—low amount, etc.). Sampling effort is kept constant across all landscapes by sampling the same-sized area in each focal patch. Black = habitat, white = non-habitat 135
- 6.11 Illustration of the design of a study to empirically estimate the appropriate landscape size. This is done by (a) measuring the ecological response (e.g. abundance) at sampling sites within habitat; (b) measuring the landscape-scale variable (e.g. number of habitat patches) within multiple landscape extents, represented by different-sized areas centered on each sampling site; (c) estimating the strength of relationship between the landscape variable and the ecological response measured at the central sampling site at each landscape extent; and (d) comparing the strength of relationship across extents and then selecting the extent where the relationship is strongest. Grey = habitat, white = non-habitat 136
- 7.1 Schematic figure describing nutrient fluxes on heterogeneous landscapes: (a) the occurrence of a process at a point (cell or patch), represented by columns (where the magnitude of the rate or flux is represented by the height of the column), and (b) lateral flows, the actual flow paths of nutrients across points (cell or patch), represented by arrows 141
- 7.2 Schematics of changes of nutrient flows in the Anthropocene: (a) increasing magnitudes of nutrient inputs (black) and outputs (gray), (b) increasing variability of nutrient distribution across space (e.g., hot spots), (c) increasing mediation of flows due to changes in landscape structure such as fragmentation or infrastructure, and (d) increasing flow lengths due to teleconnections 142

7.3	Changes in (a) pH, concentrations ($\mu\text{eq L}^{-1}$) of (b) sulfate (SO_4^{2-}), (c) nitrate (NO_3^-), and (d) ammonium (NH_4^+) in bulk precipitation and bulk deposition ($\text{keq ha}^{-1} \text{ yr}^{-1}$) of (e) hydrogen ion (H^+), (f) sulfate, (g) , and (h) ammonium with a closer distance (km) to the center of the nearest large cities	143
7.4	Nitrogen contained in internationally traded (a) fertilizer, (b) grain, and (c) meat	145
7.5	Generalized overview of the place of <i>Nutrient Geography</i> within other disciplinary domains (socio-ecological systems, geography, landscape ecology, and ecosystem ecology), and themes (scale and agents)	147
7.6	Changing lateral nutrient distribution capacity by terrestrial animals due to megafaunal extinctions	150
7.7	Interactions between predator-prey dynamics, carcass availability, the spatial distribution of nutrients, and vegetation	150
7.8	Seabird densities, biomass, and nitrogen input to islands with and without rats in the Chagos Archipelago	151
8.1	Mature trees that survive disturbances are important biological legacies, providing seed sources for new tree establishment, increasing structural diversity of the forest over the course of post-disturbance succession, and providing wildlife habitat	161
8.2	The 2006 Tatoosh Buttes fire (background slopes with little live tree cover) was a high-severity wind-driven fire that created extremely large homogeneous patches of almost complete tree mortality. A subsequent bark beetle outbreak (trees with red needles in the foreground) caused tree mortality outside the fire perimeter where host trees were available post-fire. These are two examples of top-down disturbances modified by bottom-up controls. Pasayten Wilderness, Washington, United States	163
8.3	A complex mosaic of patches of rock, herbaceous vegetation, shrublands, and forest stands with differing structures can be seen in this photo of the Illilouette Creek Basin in Yosemite National Park, California, United States. A recently burned area in the foreground has biological legacies in the form of dead standing trees (snags) and mature trees. In the background, denser forests are found in ravines, and non-forest and open forest stands are predominantly on convex topography. These topographic controls are expressed after 40 years in which wildfires have been allowed to burn for resource benefit by the National Park Service	164
9.1	Climate (temperature and hydrological drivers) and human land and resource use shape landscape patterns and processes at broad scales (e.g., distributions of plant and animal species, biological diversity, and species life history). At finer spatial scales, natural disturbances such as wildfires, geomorphologic events, and insect activity respond to and interact with climate drivers to create and maintain biological diversity and landscape heterogeneity and initiate ecosystem renewal or reorganization; however, anthropogenic climate changes, unprecedented over millennial time scales, are the cause of substantial and often unanticipated landscape change(s). These climate perturbations influence the timing, frequency, extent, magnitude, and impacts of other disturbances and amplify disturbance interactions, often resulting in profound shifts in landscape patterns and processes	176

9.2	Climate changes and other disturbances can cause highly visible, rapidly occurring, and/or persistent alteration of landscapes. (a) Uncharacteristically frequent fires favor increases in shrub cover, Wrangell–St. Elias National Park, Alaska. (b) Spruce bark beetle–caused mortality shifts forests from conifer-dominated to deciduous-dominated composition, Alaska Peninsula, Alaska. (c) Warming temperatures cause retrogressive thaw slumps along the Nigu River, Alaska. (d) Debris flow following wildfire transports sediments, changes hydrologic pathways, and alters landcover, Valles Caldera National Preserve, New Mexico	177
10.1	Schematic diagram depicting (a) pulse, (b) press, and (c) ramp disturbances with respect to the intensity of the effects on an ecosystem over time. Disturbance intensity can be defined as the strength of the effect (i.e. energy involved) per unit space and time	201
10.2	Red beech, <i>Fuscospora fusca</i> , regenerating on a fallen silver beech, <i>Lophozonia menziesii</i>	202
10.3	Species cohort regeneration in either top-down disturbance (grey arrows) or bottom-up disturbances (red arrows) such as canopy tree mortality. (Adapted from Ogden, J., <i>New Zealand Journal of Botany</i> , 23, 751, 1985.) The first cohort is divided into the recruitment phase during which seedling numbers and cohort biomass increases (A), thinning phase during which numbers of individuals decreases but biomass increases or remains constant (B), and a senescent phase during which biomass decreases (C). The second cohort (D) is only recruited when the first cohort begins to senesce. Columns 1, 2, and 3 are 50-year time spans during which observation of the population would reveal different population demographics	203
10.4	Post-disturbance response pathways highlighting the potential for novel communities to establish as an alternate stable state. The ball represents the ecosystem state and settles in stable states (the ‘valleys’). ‘Hilltops’ are unstable states. A large perturbation is required to shift the ecosystem from one stable state to another (i.e. to get the ball over the hill to an adjacent valley)	209
12.1	Examples of reflectance spectra of healthy vegetation (green) and of dry vegetation (red) acquired in a grassland field with a hyperspectral sensor. Remote sensors collect information about the reflectance over dozens or hundreds of sections, or bands, of the electromagnetic spectrum (multi- and hyperspectral sensors, respectively). Different surfaces can be distinguished if these bands cover those parts of the spectrum where their reflectance differs significantly	231
12.2	Overview of some of the most commonly used sensors in Earth observation. Multispectral and hyperspectral sensors are both passive and acquire information about the reflectance in the visible and infrared spectrum. Hyperspectral sensors have a much higher spectral resolution, meaning that they can distinguish between many more wavelengths than multispectral sensors. Active sensors include radar sensors, which send out a microwave signal and measure the returning backscatter, and LiDAR sensors, which emit a pulsed laser signal	232

12.3	Overview of the common platforms used to deploy sensors for Earth observation. Platforms can observe the Earth's surface from a large range of heights. Typically, as this height decreases, the footprint of a sensor (i.e., its 'field of view') becomes smaller, so more images are required to cover the same area. See Toth and Józkó (2016). *Nanosatellites or small satellites are an emerging technology for Earth Observations and not yet commonly used operationally	233
12.4	NDVI temporal signatures of three types of land cover (water, grass savannah, bare ground) in a savannah landscape measured with Sentinel-2 multispectral sensor. The temporal signature of bare ground remains stable over the year, whereas the temporal signature of grass savannah is marked by its seasonality. At the end of the dry season (April–May), pixels of water can have similar NDVI values to bare ground because of the drought. The images on the right are the Sentinel-2 color images acquired at different times of the year and the resulting classification map (blue: water, light green: grass savannah, brown: bare ground, yellow: shrub savannah, purple: tree savannah, dark green: woodland savannah). Satellite data courtesy of the European Space Agency	236
12.5	Greyscale images of the same landscape acquired with an optical sensor (a) and a radar sensor (b). Specifically, these images were acquired by the Sentinel-2 (NDVI) and Sentinel-1 (radar backscattering coefficient in Vertical-Horizontal polarization) satellites, respectively. Satellite data courtesy of the European Space Agency	237
13.1	Components in a typical sensor node. Some nodes may exclude specific components (e.g., storage or radio) or have only analog or digital sensors	252
13.2	(a) Star and (b) mesh topologies for sensor network design. Triangles represent sensor nodes, and squares represent 'sinks'. Sinks are nodes where data are extracted from the network	253
13.3	(a) A mesh sensor network where each sensor makes statistically independent measurements of the landscape. Here, the radio range is larger than the region of high spatial autocorrelation surrounding each node. (b) A mesh sensor network where the region of high spatial autocorrelation exceeds the range of the radios, leading to some level of redundancy in measurements	257
14.1	Bibliometric analysis of the interaction between paleoecological and landscape ecological research showing (a) publications vs. time, (b) publications vs. time normalized to 2000, and (c) journals with most publications (1980–2019). QSR = Quaternary Science Research, J Biogeog = Journal of Biogeography, Lsp Ecol = Landscape Ecology, P3 = Palaeogeography, Palaeoclimatology, Palaeoecology. Topic searches were conducted in Scopus for the title-abstract-keyword terms (i) 'landscape ecolog*', (ii) palaeoecolog* OR paleoecolog* and (iii) 'landscape ecolog*' AND (palaeoecolog* OR paleoecolog* OR 'long-term ecolog*' OR 'long term ecolog*'). Search was conducted on 25 August 2020, and the figure does not include 2020 citation information	266
14.2	Schematic overview of the landscape reconstruction algorithm (LRA) and multiple scenario approach (MSA) methods for inferring land cover from pollen records	267

Figures

14.3	Conceptual model of landscape equilibrium developed by Turner et al. (1993) showing how landscape dynamics might be qualitatively predicted from the temporal and spatial scaling of recurrent disturbances. The filled contours in (a) show the SD of mature vegetation through time with associated stability regimes. The orange circles in (b) show examples of three well-documented shifts in disturbance regime and associated change in landscape dynamics (arrows show direction of transition in time). YNP = Yellowstone National Park	270
14.4	Emerging 'no-analogue' plant communities on a recent fire site, Claris, Aotea-Great Barrier Island, northern New Zealand. Here, a range of native NZ species and invasives (e.g., <i>Pinus</i> , <i>Ulex</i> , <i>Hakea</i>) co-occur in a landscape shaped by a novel fire regime	276
15.1	Conceptual mapping of landscape metric options and influencers	285
15.2	Depicting the scale of analysis for landscape metrics: (a) categorical three-class landscape, (b) landscape metrics produce a single value for the entire landscape, (c) class metrics produce one value for each aggregate class on the landscape, and (d) patch metrics produce a value for each contiguous patch, however defined, for the landscape. In this case, there are three classes in (c), and thus, there would be a metric value computed for each of the dark, medium, and light grey areas in aggregate. Twelve metric values would be produced at the patch level (d) assuming a 4-neighbor connectivity rule. See also discussion of moving windows and potential problems with them in section on tools	292
15.3	Sample morphological segmentation of a binary landscape. The left panel is a binary input image with black representing the background and white the foreground. The right panel displays the MSPA output using a 1-pixel edge width and an 8-neighbor connectivity and transition turned on	293
16.1	Schematic timeline of major developments in ecological, social, and socio-ecological modelling	314
17.1	Simplified overview of the LCA characterization process.	338
17.2	When and how public participation can be incorporated in the LCA process	342
17.3	The pin mapping process in Lindö. Photo by the author	345
17.4	Front cover of the Landlaskaatlas for Langeland Municipality. Reproduced with the kind permission of the Danish Environmental Protection Agency (Miljøstyrelsen)	348
18.1	Biological Dynamics of Forest Fragments Project. (Credit Robert Johnson.)	356
18.2	Landscape Evolution Observatory	358
19.1	Schematic that shows a framework proposed by Leonard et al. (2017a) for the integration of cross-realm planning, where freshwater planning is represented by black boxes, and terrestrial planning is represented by grey boxes. Colored boxes show the integrated scenario of the author's landscape conservation design across the central and southern Appalachian Mountains	375

- 20.1 Conceptual diagram of the effects of landscape structure on the provision of ecosystem services. Landscape structure affects ecosystem service capacity by affecting natural capital. Landscape structure also affects patterns of human distribution, activities, and movement across the landscape and ecosystem service demand. Thus, ecosystem service flows and ultimately, service provision depend on how landscape structure affects the movement and distribution of both organisms and people. In turn, the benefit derived from an ecosystem service affects service demand by altering human well-being and needs, which in turn drives human activities that alter landscape structure (broken arrow). Ecosystem service provision can also directly affect natural capital (broken arrow) through overexploitation 389
- 20.2 The mechanisms by which landscape fragmentation, independently of a change in the area of natural land cover, can affect ecosystem service flow. Locations of natural land cover and ecosystem service capacity (green areas) provide ecosystem service flows (red arrows) and benefits (red areas) to the human-dominated matrix (light brown areas) that is affected by landscape fragmentation. Ecosystem service flows of organisms and people (arrows) can depend on proximity to natural areas (a) and will therefore be influenced by the interspersion of natural and anthropogenic land cover across the landscape (e.g., recreation, pollination, waste treatment, pest regulation). Simultaneously, increased isolation of patches and reduced connectivity (b), as well as decreased patch size (c), can decrease service flow in fragmented landscapes (e.g., pollination, seed dispersal, cultural services, watercourse recreation, water provision and regulation). Finally, for services that depend on restricting movement across landscapes, increased edge amounts with fragmentation (d) can help restrict the movement of water, waves, air or water pollutants, and soil, resulting in positive (e.g., storm protection, air quality regulation) or negative (e.g., water quality or soil erosion regulation) effects on ecosystem service flow. In each panel, the area of natural land cover and ecosystem service supply is unchanged between intact and fragmented landscapes 391
- 21.1 Common organization frameworks for studying riverscapes include hierarchical (e.g., Frissell et al. 1986) and longitudinal (e.g., Schumm 1977) models. This review emphasizes the cross-scale interactions and cumulative downstream impacts that can be extrapolated from these models. (Symbols and images courtesy of the Integration and Application Network, University of Maryland Center for Environmental Science; ian.umces.edu/symbols/) 412
- 21.2 Frequency of the use of riverscapes in peer-reviewed journal titles categorized by research focus since Ward (1998). The number in parenthesis indicates the number for each color-coded category 413
- 21.3 Envision the James provides an example of a collaborative initiative created to develop a regionally and locally endorsed community action agenda for the James River watershed. The many state, local, and federal government, non-profit, academic, and business organizations engaged in the initiative are represented on the map (www.envisionthejames.org) 416

Figures

- 21.4 The Gambles Mill Eco-Corridor project creates a multi-functional riverscape as part of the restoration of Little Westham Creek. The project includes a restored stream, a pollinator meadow, an enhanced community garden, outdoor classrooms, gathering spaces, and reflection areas. The project is designed to complement and reinforce clean water and associated goals at both local and watershed scales as articulated by the City of Richmond's Clean Water Plan and the Envision the James Watershed Initiative 417
- 21.5 Drainage network patterns by county in western Virginia and West Virginia. The distinct differences between the dendritic drainage seen for Nelson and Buckingham Counties in western Virginia and the trellis drainage of Augusta and Highland counties are due to differences in the geomorphology between the Piedmont and the Valley and Ridge Physiographic Provinces. Once atop the Appalachian Plateau in Randolph County, the dendritic pattern of streams is present once again. The map illustrates the greater number of headwater streams that would be crossed by a proposed regional pipeline project on public lands with more dendritic networks. A close-up of Nelson and Buckingham Counties illustrates the potential erosion flowpaths created by the pipeline construction and their impact on streams with desired attributes 419
- 21.6 Land use changes and associated changes in percent impervious surface (bar graph) for the City of Richmond taken at three time points: 2001, 2006, and 2011. Green represents forest; yellow represents agriculture/barren/shrub/grass; and the four shades of red represent urban development of increasing density. The two dashed boxes highlight areas of change along rivers 420
- 22.1 Forest landscape (500-m radius) in Estonia with low support for forest biodiversity, mostly due to fragmentation of forest areas, recent logging activities, and lack of high-quality habitats (among other indicators) 437
- 22.2 Forest landscape (500-m radius) in Estonia with high support for forest biodiversity, as indicated (among many other factors) by good connectivity of forest habitats, lack of recent disturbance, and high incidence of protected species in the observed landscape 438
- 22.3 User requests from Greenmeter between April and September 2020 in Estonia. Green regions indicate locations where landscape-scale biodiversity support is measured as high and red regions those where it was low and where landscape restoration is required 438
- 23.1 The four main Hungarian regional types of climate change exposure as a result of cluster analysis using all climatic factors based on regional climate models (Mezősi et al. 2013). Regions 1–17 are the meso-scale regions of Hungary. The main regional type clusters are differentiated into region types 449
- 23.2 Number of hazard class changes of indicators and additive sensitivity assessment of meso-regional hazard for 2021–2050 scenarios compared with the period 1961–1990 for Hungary 449
- 23.3 Changes in the PaDI₀ index for the periods 2021–2050 and 2071–2100 451
- 23.4 Number of years with serious drought (PaDI values >10) in the periods 1961–1990, 2021–2050, and 2071–2100, based on the averages of the REMO and ALADIN model simulations 452
- 23.5 Wind erosion sensitivity at a regional level overlaid with a land cover mask to exclude forest and urbanized areas. The study sites for validation where field survey data are available (a: Apatfalva, b: Kömpöc, c: Tisza plain) 453

23.6	(a) The area of arable lands (% compared with the total arable lands) in 5% intervals of the changes of wind erosion hazard between 1961–1990 and the two future periods based on ALADIN and REMO models; (b).wind erosion hazard on arable lands on the Great Hungarian Plain in the reference period (1961–1990) and its changes (%) for the future period of 2071–2100 based on ALADIN model simulation	454
23.7	Spatial pattern of the indicators and their distribution (%) according to landscape types: (a) soils with problematic water regime, (b) the areas affected by significant groundwater decrease, (c) the vegetation showing a high decrease of biomass production in arid years, (d) areas with high wind erosion hazard	456
23.8	Overlay of the sensitivity of protected areas of the Kiskunság National Park areas and the predicted increase of drought hazard ($PaDI_{\theta}$) for the period 2071–2100 based on ALADIN-REMO regional climate model simulations	457

Tables

1.1	Selected definitions and descriptions of 'Landscape Ecology' as a discipline, and the term 'Landscape' within the context of landscape ecology, over time	2
1.2	Sample definitions of some common terms used in landscape ecology literature	7
2.1	Comparison of models commonly used in landscape research	26
5.1	There are four broad types of metacommunity dynamics depending on the level of patch homogeneity and the importance of dispersal in the system (see Leibold and Miller 2004)	96
5.2	Predicted Movement and Population Response to Habitat Change (Fahrig 2007b)	107
6.1	Summary of the features, as defined in Box 6.1, included in each of the three major conceptualizations of habitat fragmentation	120
12.1	Non-exhaustive list of examples illustrating how remote sensing approaches can inform landscape ecology	235
15.1	Examples of area and edge metrics	286
15.2	Examples of shape metrics	287
15.3	Examples of core area metrics	287
15.4	Examples of contrast metrics	288
15.5	Examples of aggregation metrics	288
15.6	Examples of diversity metrics	288
15.7	Common tools for computing landscape metrics and morphological segmentation	290
16.1	Major model types with key references general reviews of model types are provided by Turner et al. (2001), Perry and Enright (2006), Houet et al. (2010), and Synes et al. (2016)	317
17.1	Levels of participation in a landscape character assessment, based on International Association of Public Participation (IAP2). The large circle represents the practitioners who compile the characterization, the small circles represent the individuals or groups whose knowledge is incorporated in the LCA, and the arrows represent the flow of information between the different actors during the characterization process	340