ORIGINAL PAPER

Developing landscape habitat models for rare amphibians with small geographic ranges: a case study of Siskiyou Mountains salamanders in the western USA

Nobuya Suzuki · Deanna H. Olson · Edward C. Reilly

Abstract To advance the development of conservation planning for rare species with small geographic ranges, we determined habitat associations of Siskiyou Mountains salamanders (*Plethodon stormi*) and developed habitat suitability models at fine (10 ha), medium (40 ha), and broad (202 ha) spatial scales using available Geographic Information Systems data and logistic regression analysis with an information theoretic approach. Across spatial scales, there was very little support for models with structural habitat features, such as tree canopy cover and conifer diameter. Model-averaged 95% confidence intervals for regression coefficients and associated odds ratios indicated that the occurrence of Siskiyou Mountains salamanders was positively associated with rocky soils and Pacific madrone (*Abutus menziesii*) and negatively associated with elevation and white fir (*Abies concolor*); these associations were consistent across 3 spatial scales. The occurrence of this species also was positively associated with hardwood density at the medium spatial scale. Odds ratios projected that a 10% decrease in white fir abundance would increase the odds of salamander occurrence 3.02–4.47 times, depending on spatial scale. We selected the model with rocky soils, white fir, and Oregon white oak (*Quercus garryana*) as the best model across 3 spatial scales and created habitat suitability maps for Siskiyou Mountains salamanders by projecting habitat suitability scores across the landscape. Our habitat suitability models and maps are applicable to selection of priority conservation areas for Siskiyou Mountains salamanders, and our approach can be easily adapted to conservation of other rare species in any geographical location.

N. Suzuki (✉)
Department of Zoology, Oregon State University, Corvallis, OR 97331, USA
e-mail: nobi.suzuki@oregonstate.edu

D. H. Olson
USDA Forest Service, Pacific Northwest Research Station, 3200 SW Jefferson Way,
Corvallis, OR 97331, USA

E. C. Reilly
USDI Bureau of Land Management, Medford District, 3040 Biddle Road, Medford, OR 97504, USA

      Springer

Abbreviations

AICc	Akaike's information criterion corrected for small sample size
DBH	quadratic mean diameter at breast height
DEM	Digital Elevation Model
GeoBOB	Geographic Biotic Observation
HS	Habitat Suitability
ISMS	the U.S. federal Interagency Species Management System
NRIS	Natural Resource Information System
PRISM	Parameter-elevation Regressions on Independent Slopes Model
TM	Thematic Mapper
TPH	number of trees per hectare
USDA	United States Department of Agriculture
USDI	United States Department of Interior
BLM	Bureau of Land Management

Introduction

With changing landscapes, conservation of rare species requires a clear understanding of species' habitat associations to prevent loss of suitable habitat through human activities and natural events. Conservation of rare endemic species with small geographic ranges is particularly critical in the Klamath–Siskiyou region of the Pacific Northwestern USA because of its exceptional concentration of rare endemic species among global temperate coniferous forest ecosystems and the accelerated rate of habitat loss in this biodiversity hotspot (Della-Sala et al. 1999; Myers et al. 2000).

The Siskiyou Mountains salamander (*Plethodon stormi*) is 1 of 3 closely-related rare salamander species endemic to the Klamath–Siskiyou region that straddles the Oregon–California border (Bury and Bury 2005). Because of the potential association of the Siskiyou Mountains salamander with late-successional forests, there is a concern that land management activities in forests, including timber harvesting, road building and rock quarrying, may adversely impact populations and habitats of this salamander (Thomas et al. 1993; Blaustein et al. 1995; Clayton and Nauman 2005; Clayton et al. 2005). Despite this presumed threat of land management activities, very little is known about the ecology or biology of the Siskiyou Mountains salamander. More importantly, to our knowledge, no study previously has demonstrated an effective way to integrate locally available resource or habitat inventory information, Geographic Information Systems (GIS) technology, and species-habitat relationships into conservation strategies across landscapes for this or other rare endemic species in the region.

Previously, habitat relationship models for rare *Plethodon* salamanders in the Klamath–Siskiyou region were developed primarily from field-measured micro- and macro-habitat data at site to forest stand scales (Diller and Wallace 1994; Welsh and Lind 1995; Ollivier et al. 2001). However, these habitat models generally are limited in their applicability to the conservation of species at broad landscape scales for a couple of reasons. First, field surveys to compile these types of data often are too labor intensive and costly to be conducted over a broad landscape. Second, use of existing landscape habitat data, typically available in the form of GIS layers, as surrogates for field-collected data is problematic. Landscape

data may not match variables used in these field-derived models. For example, landscape variables may differ from field-measured data in accuracy, precision, and spatial scale. Therefore, these field-derived models may not produce reliable predictions when existing landscape habitat data are applied.

Recent advances in remote sensing and GIS technologies not only make it possible to examine habitat relationships of organisms across broad landscapes, but they also allow for flexibility in developing conservation assessments at multiple spatial scales (Torgersen et al. 1999; Fleishman et al. 2001; Fuhlendorf et al. 2002; Luoto et al. 2002). Researchers have successfully incorporated GIS information into habitat relationship models for many vertebrate species (Murkin et al. 1997; Cox et al. 2001; Maehr and Cox 1995; Gros and Rejmánek 1999), including amphibians (Gustafson et al. 2001; Ray et al. 2002). However, there is no GIS-based habitat association model for Siskiyou Mountains salamanders for use in conservation planning across the landscape. We propose that GIS layers of habitat features across landscapes can be effectively used to determine habitat associations and to develop habitat suitability models that can be readily used for regional conservation planning.

The Siskiyou Mountains salamander occupies one of the most xeric portions of the range of the western *Plethodon* species (Blaustein et al. 1995; Bury and Pearl 1999). The local availability of cool and moist habitat is considered essential for the survival of this species during the hot and dry summers of the Klamath–Siskiyou region (Bury and Pearl 1999). Physiological constraints may explain why Siskiyou Mountains salamanders are documented to reach their highest abundance on north-facing, dense forest stands with talus slopes (Nussbaum et al. 1983; Leonard et al. 1993). Talus slopes and rocky substrates appear to provide these salamanders with a stable microclimate as well as reliable cover in a region where down wood often is not available (Bury and Pearl 1999). These observations have led some to suggest a close association of Siskiyou Mountains salamanders with late-successional forests (Thomas et al. 1993; Blaustein et al. 1995; Clayton and Nauman 2005; Clayton et al. 2005).

Our first research objective was to determine associations of Siskiyou Mountains salamander with abiotic factors, forest stand structure, and tree-species abundance by quantifying GIS information at 3 spatial scales. To guide our analyses, we formulated the following hypotheses about species-habitat associations from current knowledge of the Siskiyou Mountains salamander's range, life history, and patterns of habitat use as summarized below. Because salamanders avoid extreme heat and dry conditions as well as cold areas in high elevations, we hypothesized that Siskiyou Mountains salamanders are positively associated with rocky substrates and negatively associated with elevation and solar illumination. Solar illumination is an estimate of solar radiation inputs in GIS (see methods). Furthermore, we hypothesized that Siskiyou Mountains salamanders are positively associated with closed canopy conditions and large-diameter conifers. Cool and moist microclimates are maintained on the forest floor under closed canopies, and large conifers are an indicator of late-successional forest. Finally we used the abundance of 4 common tree species in the Klamath–Siskiyou region as indicators of microclimate conditions because each species occupies a different microclimate regime. We hypothesized that Siskiyou Mountains salamanders are negatively associated with white fir (*Abies concolor*), a species found in cold high-elevation habitats (Laacke 1990), Oregon white oak (*Quercus garryana*), a species found in hot and dry low-elevation habitats (Stein 1990), and Pacific madrone (*Abutus menziesii*), a species frequently associated with dry sites (McDonald and Tappeiner 1990), and positively associated with Douglas-fir (*Pseudotsuga menziesii*), an abundant species in mesic habitats (Herman and Lavender 1990). We additionally tested the relationship of Siskiyou Mountains salamanders with hardwood density based on a

previous observation of a positive association (Ollivier et al. 2001). Our second research objective was to develop habitat suitability models based on the findings under our first research objective and map habitat suitability for Siskiyou Mountains salamanders across the landscape at 3 spatial scales.

Materials and methods

Study area

The Applegate River Watershed is located at the Oregon–California border in the Klamath–Siskiyou ecoregion of the western USA (Fig. 1). For model development, we used available habitat and species data from a 121,406-ha area in the Applegate River Watershed within the range of the Siskiyou Mountains salamander. Elevations in the area range from 364 to 2067 m. Over 90% of the study area was in Jackson County, Oregon; the remaining <10% was in eastern Josephine County, Oregon, and northern Siskiyou County, California. The climate across this area is generally cold and wet in winter, and hot and dry in summer. Mean annual temperatures range from 8.3 to 10.5°C, and precipitation ranges from 60 to 170 cm at mid elevations (Franklin and Dyrness 1988). Mid-elevation vegetation falls within the Mixed-Evergreen zone in the western Siskiyou Mountains and the Mixed-Conifer zone in the eastern Siskiyou Mountains; the Interior Valley zone is found at lower elevations (<~700 m) and the White-fir zone occurs at upper elevations (~1400–1800 m; Franklin and Dyrness 1988).

Salamander location data and survey methods

We obtained 260 localities of Siskiyou Mountains salamanders from an existing spatial database, the U.S. federal Interagency Species Management System (ISMS; Molina et al. 2003) compiled by the U.S. Department of Interior, Bureau of Land Management (USDI BLM), and the U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service (USDA Forest Service). Distinct localities of Siskiyou Mountains salamanders referred to as "known sites" had been archived in the spatial database as part of the U.S. federal Protection Buffer and Survey & Manage provisions of the federal Northwest Forest Plan (Molina et al. 2003). ISMS data have been subsequently migrated to the Geographic Biotic Observation (GeoBOB) and Natural Resource Information System (NRIS) databases, and these have been maintained by USDI BLM and USDA Forest Service, respectively (Pres. Comm. Kelli Van Norman, BLM Oregon State Office, Portland). The 260 known sites of Siskiyou Mountains salamanders included all the localities of Siskiyou Mountains salamanders ever recorded in our study area up to the end of 2003, thus representing the most comprehensive distribution of this species at the initiation of this study. Of the 260 known sites, 213 (82%) were identified after 1993 based on surveys conducted by the USDI BLM and USDA Forest Service, and 47 sites (18%) were identified prior to 1993, largely from museum records archived by natural historians and field researchers (Nauman and Olson 1999). Of the 213 federally identified sites, 130 sites (50% of all 260 known sites) were identified as a result of surveys required under the U.S. federal Northwest Forest Plan when proposed land management activities were considered potentially disturbing to Siskiyou Mountains salamanders and their habitat (referred to as pre-disturbance survey); these potentially disturbing land management activities included timber harvesting, mining, road and trail development, and recreational development (Olson 1999; Nauman and Olson 1999). Other USDA Forest

Fig. 1 Map of the study area in the Applegate River Watershed of the Klamath–Siskiyou region, Oregon–California border, USA

Service projects identified 49 sites (19%) using a stratified random sampling during a field study (Ollivier et al. 2001) and 34 sites (13%) during surveys to fill the gaps in the species distribution (Nauman and Olson 2004).

Spatial habitat sampling with GIS Layers

From the GIS layer of 260 known Siskiyou Mountains salamander sites, we randomly selected 2 sets of 53 known salamander sites (hereafter, salamander sites) and 133 sites that were not known to have salamanders (hereafter, unoccupied sites) within 10-ha square

areas. Because of the rarity of the Siskiyou Mountains salamander, we assumed that the chances of these salamanders being present at randomly selected locations in the landscape were low. The 10-ha area approximates the typical size of a forest stand that is being considered for Siskiyou Mountains salamander conservation areas as well as for many proposed forest management projects. To our knowledge, there is no relevant biological or ecological information, such as home range size or movement pattern, to determine a spatial scale for the analyses of habitat associations of this species. Sample sizes for salamander (53) and unoccupied sites (133) were based on the observed ratio of salamander to unoccupied sites (approximately 2:5) from a previous field study of Siskiyou Mountains salamanders (Ollivier et al. 2001). We used the first 186 sites (53 + 133) to analyze habitat associations and to develop habitat suitability models; we used the second set to validate the habitat suitability models. The distance between any 2 selected sites was >1425 m to avoid redundant sampling, and we sampled no more than 1 site per 202 ha area. On average, this resulted in 1 site per 650 ha across the study area.

For each sample site, we quantified habitat features using GIS layers at fine (10 ha [25 acres]), medium (40 ha [100 acres]), and broad (202 ha [500 acres]) spatial scales, and we used a square as the sample shape to make our results compatible with pixel-shaped GIS grid layers. Fine and medium spatial scales approximated the sizes of common and large forest stands that are typically considered for land management and species conservation areas, and the broad spatial scale represented a small landscape. We quantified 10 habitat variables for the analyses of habitat associations. These habitat variables included 3 abiotic factors (abundance of rocky soils [%], elevation [m], solar illumination [index value between 0 and 254]), 3 stand structural features (tree canopy cover [%], conifer diameter [quadratic mean diameter at breast height in cm, DBH], and hardwood density [no. trees/ hectare, TPH]), and abundance (%) of 4 common tree species (Douglas-fir, white fir, Oregon white oak, and Pacific madrone).

The abundance of rocky soils was determined from digital soil survey maps from Jackson (1993) and Josephine Counties (1983), Oregon (USDA Natural Resources Conservation, available at http://www.or.nrcs.usda.gov/pnw_soil/or_data.html) and from USDA Forest Service Level 2 Soil Resource Inventory maps (Badura and Jahn 1977). Soil types associated with rocky deposits known to have interstitial spaces and those with ≥50% gravel or cobble content were classified as rocky soils (D. Clayton, personal communication). At each site, we estimated the proportion of 25-m pixels classified as rocky soils among all 25-m pixels in 10 ha (fine scale), 40 ha (medium scale), and 202 ha (broad scale).

Elevation and solar illumination at sites were taken from a 10-m resolution U.S. Geological Survey Digital Elevation Model (DEM; Gesch et al. 2002). Solar illumination is an index that represents the amount and extent of solar radiation reaching the ground surface, and it accounts for various topographic features that might cast shade over a given point. The solar illumination model was developed using the hillshade command in ArcView (Environmental Systems Research Institute 1996). The position of the sun at noon on June 21, 2003 for the specific longitude and latitude of each site was used to calculate solar illumination values. June 21 is the day each year that the sun is at its highest position. Solar illumination values ranged from 0 to 254, where smaller values indicated lower solar radiation inputs.

Three features of stand structure and abundance of 4 tree species were estimated from 25-m GIS grid layers of a remote sensing vegetation classification map based on the image analysis of Landsat Thematic Mapper (TM) data conducted by Geographic Resource Solutions in Arcata, California, in 1993 (Hill 1996). We calculated the average value

of 25-m pixels in 10 ha (fine scale), 40 ha (medium scale), and 202 ha (broad scale) at each sample site for percent tree canopy cover, conifer DBH, and hardwood density. To quantify the abundance of the 4 most common tree species in the region (Douglas-fir, Oregon white oak, white fir, and Pacific madrone), we estimated the proportion of 25-m pixels for which each tree species was classified as most abundant among all 25-m pixels in 10 ha, 40 ha, and 202 ha at each sample site. We used ArcGIS 9.0 to estimate all variables except solar illumination, which was estimated in ArcView (Environmental Systems Research Institute 2004).

In the image analysis of Landsat TM data, field data and Landsat imagery were compared to develop spectral classes of habitat variables referred to as supervised training sets, and the supervised classification method (Howard 1991) was used to initially produce habitat values for areas where field data were available (Hill 1996). Following the initial supervised classification, a maximum likelihood classification based on the supervised training sets was performed at a 90% probability threshold to estimate habitat values across the landscape. After calibrating the discrepancy in value between the supervised training sets and the initial maximum likelihood estimation, 3 additional maximum likelihood classifications were performed, 2 at a 95% probability threshold followed by 1 at a 100% probability threshold to estimate habitat values for the entire 25 m pixels in the Applegate River Watershed (Hill 1996). Ground truthing was conducted, and the accuracy of the image analyses for habitat variables ranged from 86 to 92% at the 2-ha aggregation level (Hill 1996).

The timeframes of our diverse data sets differ, leading to several assumptions in our analyses. Because the Landsat TM image was produced in 1993, our analysis compared habitat conditions in 1993 between the salamander sites and unoccupied sites. Salamander sites identified after 1993 are assumed to have been occupied by Siskiyou Mountains salamanders in 1993 when the Landsat imagery was produced, and sites identified before 1993 are assumed to be occupied in 1993. These assumptions are supported by the following. For the salamander sites identified after 1993 (213 of 260 sites), no land management activity or natural disturbance had significantly altered habitat conditions at these sites between 1993 and the time when these sites were identified. It also is unlikely that a significant number of these sites had been newly established well after 1993 because the Siskiyou Mountains salamander is suspected to be a low mobility species with high site fidelity, and their primary habitat component (i.e., rocky substrate) is patchily distributed across the landscape. For the known sites identified before 1993 (47 of 260 sites), aging of forests from the time when the sites were identified until 1993 is not likely to have adversely impacted habitat conditions for Siskiyou Mountains salamanders because they are known to occur in relatively high abundance in older forests (Nussbaum et al. 1983; Leonard et al. 1993; Blaustein et al. 1995; Clayton and Nauman 2005; Clayton et al. 2005). However, we were unable to determine the history of management activities and natural disturbance at these sites identified before 1993, hence it is possible that habitat conditions had been altered by 1993, potentially affecting species' occupancy of sites.

Data analysis

We used logistic regression analysis (PROC LOGIST, PROC GENMOD; SAS Institute 1999a) with an information theoretic approach (Burnham and Anderson 2002) to assess competing hypotheses about species-habitat associations and to develop Siskiyou Mountains salamander habitat suitability models from these results. We developed 26 a priori models from combinations of 10 habitat variables in 3 categories (abiotic habitat, stand

Table 1 Twenty six a priori models outlining hypotheses about Siskiyou Mountains salamander (*Plethodon stormi*) habitat associations in the Applegate River Watershed of the Klamath–Siskiyou Region along the Oregon–California border in the USA

Models and hypotheses[a]	Model No.
Abiotic models	
+Rocky soils	1
+Rocky soils, −Elevation,	2
+Rocky soils, −Solar illumination	3
+Rocky soils, −Elevation, −Solar illumination	4
−Elevation, −Solar illumination	5
Stand structure or abiotic and stand structure combination models	
+Canopy cover, +Hardwood density	6
+Rocky soils, +Conifer DBH	7
+Rocky soils, +Canopy cover, +Hardwood density	8
+Rocky soils, −Elevation, −Solar illumination, +Canopy cover	9
+Rocky soils, −Elevation, −Solar illumination, +Conifer DBH	10
+Rocky soils, −Elevation, −Solar illumination, +Canopy cover, +Hardwood density	11
−Elevation, −Solar illumination, +Canopy cover, +Hardwood density	12
Tree Species Models	
+Douglas-fir, +Pacific madrone	13
+Douglas-fir, −White fir	14
−White oak, −White fir	15
Tree Species and Abiotic Combination Models	
+Rocky soils, +Douglas-fir	16
+Rocky soils, −White fir	17
+Rocky soils, −White oak	18
+Rocky soils, +Pacific madrone	19
+Rocky soils, +Douglas-fir, +Pacific madrone	20
+Rocky soils, +Douglas-fir, −White fir	21
+Rocky soils, −White oak, −White fir	22
+Rocky soils, +Douglas-fir, +Pacific madrone, −Solar illumination	23
+Rocky soils, +Douglas-fir, −White fir, −Solar illumination	24
+Rocky soils, −White oak, −White fir, −Solar illumination	25
Global Model	26

[a] Positive (+) and negative (−) signs indicate that salamander presence was hypothesized to be positively or negatively associated with each variable

structure, and tree species abundance) underlining our hypotheses (Table 1) that could explain the habitat association of Siskiyou Mountains salamanders. Based on current knowledge of the biology and ecology of Siskiyou Mountains salamanders, we hypothesized positive associations of this species with 5 variables (tree canopy cover, conifer DBH, hardwood density, rocky soils, and Douglas-fir) and negative associations with 5 variables (elevation, solar illumination, white fir, Oregon white oak, and Pacific madrone). To avoid multicollinearity in regression analysis, correlations between variables were screened with Pearson's correlation coefficient using all selected sites ($n = 186$; PROC CORR; SAS Institute 1999b). Variables with a moderate to strong correlation ($r \geq 0.4$) were assessed in separate models in the logistic regression analysis. We tested for spatial autocorrelation in the deviance residuals from logistic regression models by calculating Moran's I statistic in ArcGIS 9.0 (Cliff and Ord 1981). Z-tests were used to examine the significance of Moran's I for the presence of spatial autocorrelation.

We calculated Akaike's Information Criterion corrected for small sample size (AICc) for each model and ranked the 26 a priori models from most- to least-supported given the data based on AICc values. We calculated Δi, the difference between the AICc value of a

particular model and the lowest AICc value of all the models, and Akaike weight (ω_i). Akaike weight is the proportional likelihood of each model over the sum of likelihood of all the a priori models. For a given spatial scale, we considered a model with $\Delta i \leq 2$ as having substantial support in making inference, and only reported those models with $\Delta i \leq 7$ as having some level of support (Burnham and Anderson 2002:127–128). We considered any model with $\Delta i > 7$ as having insufficient evidence to support it as the best model.

Best model selection took into account the number of competing models with $\Delta i \leq 2$, Akaike weight, and number of parameters in the model. For example, when more than one model had $\Delta i \leq 2$, the best model was the one with the highest Akaike weight and the fewest parameters. The best a priori model selected for each spatial scale was cross-validated with the second data set of 53 salamander and 133 unoccupied sites (validation data) in logistic regression analyses, and correct classification rates were calculated.

For each spatial scale, we developed a habitat suitability model to estimate relative likelihoods of species occurrence as a measure of habitat suitability using the odds ratio equation for habitat variables in the best a priori model: Habitat Suitability (HS) = $\exp(\beta_1\chi_1 + \beta_2\chi_2 + \ldots\ldots + \beta_{n-1}\chi_{n-1} + \beta_n\chi_n)$, where β is the coefficient and χ is the value for a particular habitat variable (Manly et al. 2002; Pearce and Boyce 2006). We did not use the logistic regression equation as a habitat-suitability model because the retrospective approach in our study limited our ability to estimate the prospective intercept and prospective probability of species occurrence (Ramsey and Schafer 1997, pp. 586–587), and relative likelihoods of occurrence based on the exponential function is an alternative approach suggested for rare species when probabilities of occupancy are low (Keating and Cherry 2004; Manly et al 2002; Pearce and Boyce 2006). We used our habitat suitability models to calculate HS scores of relative likelihoods of species occurrence from GIS layers of habitat variable. These HS scores were projected in pixels across the landscape to develop habitat suitability maps of Siskiyou Mountains salamanders at 3 spatial scales.

We addressed model-selection uncertainty by providing model-averaged coefficients with 95% confidence intervals in logistic regression analysis across the set of a priori models. The model averaged coefficient for a habitat variable was calculated by summing the multiples of normalized Akaike weights and the original coefficient across the a priori models with the variable in common, and the model-averaged 95% confidence interval for the coefficient was from the unconditional standard error (Burnham and Anderson 2002, pp. 118–158). From these model-averaged statistics, we calculated the odds ratio and 95% confidence interval of the odds ratio for each variable. We interpreted a habitat variable as having a significant association with Siskiyou Mountains salamanders when the model-averaged 95% confidence interval for the variable coefficient did not include 0, which indicated the habitat association of the salamanders with the variable was consistent across a priori models regardless of the presence of other habitat variables in these models. The same conclusion could be made by interpreting a habitat variable as having a significant association when the model-averaged 95% confidence interval of odds ratio for the variable did not include 1. We reported odds ratios and associated 95% confidence intervals for each 1- and 10-unit change for habitat variables to describe the strengths of habitat association of Siskiyou Mountains salamanders with each variable. Additional odds ratios and associated 95% confidence intervals for the change in 100-units (100 m) and 400-units (400 m) for elevation and the change in 100-units (100 trees per hectare) for hardwood density were reported because a change in 1 or 10 units generally is not biologically meaningful for these habitat variables.

Results

Correlations among habitat features

There were moderate to strong correlations between stand structure and tree species abundance (Fig. 2). Tree canopy cover increased as Douglas-fir increased (r range: 0.850 to 0.899) at all 3 spatial scales and decreased as Oregon white oak increased at medium ($r = -0.422$) and broad ($r = -0.503$) spatial scales. Conifer DBH increased as white fir increased at all spatial scales (r range: 0.652 to 0.730). Hence, tree canopy tended to be closed in areas where Douglas-fir was abundant and open in areas where Oregon white oak


Fig. 2 Relationships between tree species abundance and stand structure in the Applegate River Watershed of the Klamath–Siskiyou region, Oregon–California border, USA

was abundant, and many large-diameter trees tended to be found in areas where white fir was abundant.

Among abiotic habitat factors, elevation showed moderate to strong correlations with the abundance of most tree species (Fig. 3), with the exception of Douglas-fir, which was equally abundant across elevations (r range: -0.083 to -0.138). White fir increased with elevation at all spatial scales (r range: 0.698 to 0.819), whereas Pacific madrone (r range: -0.539 to -0.754) and Oregon white oak (r range: -0.437 to -0.612) decreased with elevation. The decrease in these 2 hardwood species coincided with the decrease in hardwood density with elevation (r range: -0.659 to -0.754).

Correlations between tree species also were apparent. Pacific madrone decreased as white fir increased with elevation, and this pattern was detected at all spatial scales (r range: -0.534 to -0.710). Furthermore, Pacific madrone increased as Oregon white oak increased at the broad spatial scale ($r = 0.507$); however, the correlation between these 2 hardwood species was weak at medium ($r = 0.390$) and fine ($r = 0.319$) spatial scales. Douglas-fir and Oregon white oak showed moderate negative correlations (r range: -0.401 to -0.449) at all spatial scales, indicating that Douglas-fir tended to increase as Oregon white oak decreased.

Species habitat associations

Overall, a priori habitat models of Siskiyou Mountains salamanders that received some support ($\Delta i \leq 7$) were similar across 3 spatial scales (Table 2). Explanatory variables for these models consisted of some combination of tree species abundance and 2 abiotic factors (rocky soils and solar illumination); however, no stand-structural features were present in these models. Two closely-related models (model with rocky soil, Oregon white oak, and white fir; and model with rocky soil, Oregon white oak, white fir, and solar illumination) received substantial support ($\Delta i \leq 2$) with combined Akaike weights of 74% and 67 % at fine and medium spatial scales. Three additional a priori models received substantial support at the broad spatial scale ($\Delta i \leq 2$). Although the same 2 models at the finer spatial scales remained as the top models at the broad spatial scale, the support for these models relative to other models, judged by the combined Akaike weight of 57%, was not nearly as high as that at finer spatial sales. In contrast, the relative support based on Akaike weights for the 3 bottom models (among the 5 top models) at the broad spatial scale was higher than that for the same models at finer spatial scales. Consequently, a total of 5 competing a priori models received substantial support at the broad spatial scale, whereas only 2 a priori models received substantial support at 2 finer spatial scales.

Across 3 spatial scales, model-averaged 95% confidence intervals for the logistic regression coefficients and associated odds ratios did not include 0 and 1, respectively, for elevation and abundance of rocky soils, white fir, and Pacific madrone, indicating that Siskiyou Mountains salamanders were positively associated with rocky soils and Pacific madrone and negatively associated with elevation and white fir across 3 spatial scales (Table 3). Only at the medium spatial scale did the coefficient and odds ratio for hardwood density not include 0 and 1, respectively, indicating that there was an additional positive association with hardwood density at the medium spatial scale.

On average across the models, a 10% increase in rocky soils increased the odds of salamander occurrence by $\sim$1.22–1.27 times across 3 spatial scales (Table 4). In comparison, a 10% decrease in white fir and a 10% increase in Pacific madrone increased the odds of salamander occurrence by $\sim$3.02–4.47 times and by $\sim$1.87–3.12 times, respectively, depending on spatial scales. Considerable changes in elevation are required to affect the odds of salamander occurrence compared to abundance of tree species. A decrease in

Fig. 3 Relationships between tree species abundance and elevation in the Applegate River Watershed of the Klamath–Siskiyou region, Oregon–California border, USA

Table 2 Ranking of habitat association models of Siskiyou Mountains salamanders (*Plethodon stormi*) at three spatial scales, showing varying levels of support ($\Delta i \leq 7$) based on the information theoretic approach, in the Applegate River Watershed of the Klamath–Siskiyou region, Oregon–California border, USA

Model[a]	K[b]	AICc[c]	Δi[d]	ω_i[e]
Fine scale (10 ha)				
Rocky soil, White oak, White fir	4	189.02	0.00***	0.51
Rocky soil, White oak, White fir, Solar illumination	5	190.57	1.55***	0.23
Rocky soil, White fir	3	192.14	3.12**	0.11
Rocky soil, Douglas-fir, White fir	4	192.92	3.90**	0.07
Rocky soil, Douglas-fir, White fir, Solar illumination	5	193.74	4.72*	0.05
Medium scale (40 ha)				
Rocky soil, White oak, White fir	4	190.16	0.00***	0.47
Rocky soil, White oak, White fir, Solar illumination	5	191.86	1.69***	0.20
Rocky soil, Douglas-fir, White fir	4	192.91	2.75**	0.12
Rocky soil, White fir	3	193.15	2.98**	0.10
Rocky soil, Douglas-fir, White fir, Solar illumination	5	194.32	4.16*	0.06
Global model	9	196.90	6.74*	0.02
Broad scale (202 ha)				
Rocky soil, White oak, White fir	4	190.57	0.00***	0.33
Rocky soil, White oak, White fir, Solar illumination	5	191.21	0.64***	0.24
Rocky soil, White fir	3	192.28	1.71***	0.14
Rocky soil, Douglas-fir, White fir	4	192.30	1.73***	0.14
Rocky soil, Douglas-fir, White fir, Solar illumination	5	192.57	2.00***	0.12
Global model	9	195.95	5.39*	0.02

[a] Rocky soil = Abundance of rocky soils (%), White oak = Abundance of Oregon white oak (%), White fir = Abundance of white fir (%), Douglas-fir = Abundance of Douglas-fir (%), Solar illumination = Index value between 0 and 254, Global model = global model of all possible variables. Descriptions of all 26 a priori models are found in Table 1

[b] Number of estimated parameters

[c] Akaike information criterion for data with small sample and parameter sizes

[d] Difference between AICc value of each model and the lowest AICc value of all models

[e] Akaike weight

*** indicates model has substantial support in making inference with $\Delta i \leq 2$

** indicates that model has moderate support with $2 < \Delta i < 4$

* indicates model has less support with $4 \leq \Delta i \leq 7$

elevation of 10 m increased the odds of salamander occurrence by only ~1.02 times across 3 spatial scales, whereas a decrease in 100 m increased the odds by ~1.20 times. The odds of salamander occurrence almost doubled (~1.98–2.16 times) with a decrease in elevation of 400 m. An increase in hardwood density by 10 trees per hectare increased the odds of salamander occurrence by only ~1.04 times at the medium spatial scale, whereas an increase by 100 trees per hectare increased the odds by 1.42 times at the same scale (odds ratio/100TPH = 1.421; CI = 1.072–1.887).

Habitat suitability models

To develop habitat suitability models for the species across the landscape, we chose an a priori model that was comprised of 3 explanatory variables (rocky soils, Oregon white oak, and white fir) as the best model across 3 spatial scales. This model was consistently more parsimonious than the second-best a priori model (rocky soils, Oregon white oak, white fir, solar illumination) and had the lowest AICc values and the highest Akaike

Table 3 Associations of Siskiyou Mountains salamanders with habitat variables at fine (10 ha), medium (40 ha), and broad (202 ha) spatial scales assessed from model-averaged estimates and 95% confidence intervals of coefficients and odds ratios

Variable	Model averaged coefficient		Odds ratio	95% CI of odds ratio
	Estimate	95% CI		
Fine scale				
Rocky soils*	**0.020**	**(0.008, 0.031)**	**1.020**	**(1.008, 1.031)**
Elevation*	**−0.002**	**(−0.003, −0.001)**	**0.998**	**(0.997, 0.999)**
Solar illumination	−0.007	(−0.024, 0.010)	0.993	(0.976, 1.010)
Canopy cover	0.005	(−0.017, 0.026)	1.005	(0.983, 1.026)
Conifer DBH	−0.030	(−0.075, 0.015)	0.970	(0.927, 1.016)
Hardwood density	0.002	(−0.001, 0.005)	1.002	(0.999, 1.005)
Douglas-fir	0.008	(−0.008, 0.024)	1.008	(0.992, 1.025)
White Fir*	**−0.111**	**(−0.171, −0.050)**	**0.895**	**(0.843, 0.951)**
White Oak	−0.041	(−0.084, 0.002)	0.960	(0.919, 1.002)
Madrone*	**0.062**	**(0.016, 0.109)**	**1.064**	**(1.016, 1.115)**
Medium scale				
Rocky soils*	**0.022**	**(0.009, 0.035)**	**1.022**	**(1.009, 1.035)**
Elevation*	**−0.002**	**(−0.003, <0.000)[a]**	**0.998**	**(0.997, <1.000)[b]**
Solar illumination	−0.007	(−0.029, 0.015)	0.993	(0.971, 1.015)
Canopy cover	0.018	(−0.009, 0.045)	1.018	(0.991, 1.046)
Conifer DBH	−0.032	(−0.085, 0.022)	0.969	(0.918, 1.022)
Hardwood density*	**0.004**	**(0.001, 0.006)**	**1.004**	**(1.001, 1.006)**
Douglas-fir	0.014	(−0.006, 0.033)	1.014	(0.994, 1.034)
White Fir*	**−0.118**	**(−0.185, −0.052)**	**0.888**	**(0.831, 0.950)**
White Oak	−0.052	(−0.107, 0.002)	0.950	(0.899, 1.002)
Madrone*	**0.082**	**(0.025, 0.139)**	**1.086**	**(1.026, 1.149)**
Broad scale				
Rocky soils*	**0.024**	**(0.008, 0.040)**	**1.024**	**(1.008, 1.041)**
Elevation*	**−0.002**	**(−0.003, <0.000)**	**0.998**	**(0.997, <1.000)**
Solar illumination	−0.020	(−0.053, 0.012)	0.980	(0.949, 1.012)
Canopy cover	0.029	(−0.004, 0.062)	1.029	(0.996, 1.064)
Conifer DBH	−0.036	(−0.109, 0.036)	0.964	(0.897, 1.036)
Hardwood density	0.004	(<0.000, 0.007)	1.004	(<1.000, 1.00711)
Douglas−fir	0.016	(−0.012, 0.048)	1.016	(0.988, 1.045)
White Fir*	**−0.150**	**(−0.236, −0.064)**	**0.861**	**(0.790, 0.938)**
White Oak	−0.050	(−0.107, 0.009)	0.952	(0.899, 1.009)
Madrone*	**0.114**	**(0.037, 0.190)**	**1.120**	**(1.038, 1.209)**

These model-averaged statistics were based on the full set of a priori logistic regression models (Table 2). Evidence for either positive or negative association of Siskiyou Mountains salamanders with a variable is indicated by an asterisk (*), and bold letters indicate when the confidence interval for coefficients and odds ratios did not include 0 and 1, respectively

[a] <0.000 indicates value less than 0.000 before the value was rounding to 3 significant digits

[b] <1.000 indicates value less than 1.000 before the value was rounding to 3 significant digits

weights among all 26 a priori models across all spatial scales (Table 2). We did not detect a significant spatial autocorrelation in the best model across 3 spatial scales; the Moran's I for fine, moderate, and broad spatial scales were −0.075 ($P = 0.756$), −0.010 ($P = 0.466$), and −0.012 ($P = 0.297$), respectively. The overall correct classification rates of the best a priori models assessed with validation data were 67% at the fine spatial scale (75% for salamander and 64% for unoccupied sites), 70% at the medium spatial scale (77% for salamander and 68% for unoccupied sites), and 68 % at the broad spatial scale (83% for salamander and 62% for unoccupied sites).

Table 4 Projected change in the odds of detecting Siskiyou Mountains salamanders per 10-unit increase and 10-unit decrease in values of 10 habitat variables estimated at fine (10 ha), medium (40 ha), and broad (202 ha) spatial scales in the Applegate River Watershed of the Klamath–Siskiyou region, Oregon–California border, USA

Variable	10-unit increase		10-unit decrease	
	Odds ratio	95% CI of odds ratio	Odds ratio	95% CI of odds ratio
Fine scale				
Rocky soils (%)*	**1.218**	**1.088–1.363**	**0.821**	**0.734–0.919**
Elevation (m)[a]*	**0.981**	**0.968–0.994**	**1.019**	**1.006–1.033**
Solar illumination (Index value)	0.934	0.786–1.109	1.071	0.901–1.272
Canopy cover (%)	1.046	0.845–1.295	0.956	0.772–1.184
Conifer DBH (cm)	0.741	0.470–1.167	1.350	0.857–2.127
Hardwood density (TPH)[b]	1.019	0.993–1.047	0.981	0.955–1.007
Douglas-fir (%)	1.083	0.921–1.274	0.923	0.785–1.086
White Fir (%)*	**0.331**	**0.181–0.604**	**3.023**	**1.654–5.525**
White Oak (%)	0.663	0.431–1.021	1.508	0.979–2.322
Madrone (%)*	**1.868**	**1.170–2.982**	**0.535**	**0.335–0.855**
Medium scale				
Rocky soils (%)*	**1.245**	**1.097–1.414**	**0.803**	**0.707–0.912**
Elevation (m)[a]*	**0.982**	**0.967–0.997**	**1.019**	**1.003–1.034**
Solar illumination (Index)	0.929	0.745–1.159	1.076	0.863–1.342
Canopy cover (%)	1.198	0.917–1.564	0.835	0.639–1.090
Conifer DBH (cm)	0.729	0.427–1.246	1.371	0.802–2.344
Hardwood density (TPH)*	**1.036**	**1.007–1.066**	**0.965**	**0.938–0.993**
Douglas-fir (%)	1.145	0.943–1.390	0.874	0.719–1.061
White Fir (%)*	**0.306**	**0.157–0.597**	**3.267**	**1.676–6.364**
White Oak (%)	0.592	0.345–1.017	1.689	0.983–2.90
Madrone (%)*	**2.276**	**1.288–4.024**	**0.439**	**0.249–0.777**
Broad scale				
Rocky soils (%) *	**1.270**	**1.082–1.491**	**0.787**	**0.671–0.925**
Elevation (m)[a]*	**0.983**	**0.968–0.998**	**1.017**	**1.002–1.033**
Soar illumination (Index value)	0.816	0.589–1.129	1.226	0.886–1.696
Canopy cover (%)	1.333	0.956–1.854	0.750	0.539–1.043
Conifer DBH (cm)	0.695	0.338–1.428	1.440	0.700–2.960
Hardwood density (TPH)	1.040	<1.000–1.073[c]	0.965	0.932–1.000
Douglas-fir (%)	1.173	0.889–1.549	0.852	0.646–1.125
White Fir (%)*	**0.224**	**0.095–0.528**	**4.467**	**1.893–10.540**
White Oak (%)	0.613	0.345–1.092	1.630	0.916–2.901
Madrone (%)*	**3.116**	**1.451–6.695**	**0.321**	**0.149–0.689**

A significant association of Siskiyou Mountains salamanders with a variable is indicated by an asterisk (*), and bold letters indicate when the confidence interval around odds ratios did not include 1

[a] A decrease in elevation of 100 m would increase odds only about 1.20 times at all the spatial scales (odds ratio/100 m = 1.212, 95% CI = 1.062–1.383 for fine scale; odds ratio/100 m = 1.201, 95% CI = 1.035–1.395 for medium scale; odds ratio/100 m = 1.187, 95% CI = 1.018–1.384 for broad scale), whereas odds of salamander occurrence would increase by 1.98–2.16 times with a 400 m decrease in elevation (odds ratio/400 m = 2.155, 95% CI = 1.271–3.655 for fine scale; odds ratio/400 m = 2.083, 95% CI = 1.147–3.783 for medium scale; odds ratio/400 m = 1.985, 95% CI = 1.074–3.669 for broad scale)

[b] number of tree stems per hectare

[c] <1.000 indicates value less than 1.000 before the value was rounded to 3 significant digits

Using the best a priori models, we developed the following habitat suitability models for 3 spatial scales (Table 5): (1) Habitat Suitability = exp(0.020*Rocky soils −0.115*white fir −0.043*Oregon white oak) at the fine spatial scale; (2) Habitat Suitability =

Table 5 Parameter estimates for the best logistic regression model (rocky soils, white fir, and Oregon white oak) selected in the information theoretic approach and the habitat suitability model for Siskiyou Mountains salamanders (*Plethodon stormi*) developed from the best model at fine (10 ha), medium (40 ha), and broad (202 ha) spatial scales in the Applegate River Watershed of the Klamath–Siskiyou region, Oregon–California border, USA

Model statistics[a]	Rocky soils	White fir	Oregon White oak
Fine scale			
Coefficient	0.020	−0.115	−0.043
SE	0.005	0.030	0.021
Odds ratio	1.020	0.891	0.958
Habitat suitability model	HS[b] = exp(0.020*ROCK-0.115*WFIR-0.043*WOAK)		
Medium scale			
Coefficient	0.022	−0.125	−0.054
SE	0.006	0.032	0.027
Odds ratio	1.022	0.882	0.948
Habitat suitability model	HS = exp(0.022*ROCK-0.125*WFIR-0.054*WOAK)		
Broad scale			
Coefficient	0.025	−0.162	−0.052
SE	0.008	0.041	0.028
Odds ratio	1.025	0.851	0.949
Habitat Suitability Model	HS = exp(0.025*ROCK-0.162*WFIR-0.052*WOAK)		

[a] Model specific coefficients, conditional standard errors (SE), and associated odds ratio per 1 unit change are provided. See Tables 4 and 5 for model averaged coefficients, unconditional standard errors, and model averaged odds ratios

[b] HS indicates habitat suitability scores calculated from the equation

exp(0.022*Rocky soils −0.125*white fir −0.054*Oregon white oak) at the medium spatial scale; and (3) Habitat Suitability = exp(0.025*Rocky soils −0.162*white fir −0.052*Oregon white oak) at the broad spatial scale. We calculated habitat suitability scores across the study area at 3 spatial scales by incorporating GIS layers of rocky soils, white fir, and Oregon white oak into our habitat suitability models. By projecting these habitat suitability scores across the landscape, we developed habitat suitability maps for Siskiyou Mountains salamanders at 3 spatial scales (Fig. 4).

Discussion

Habitat associations and landscape habitat models

The habitat associations of Siskiyou Mountains salamanders appeared to be more distinct and could be explained by a fewer number of a priori models at fine and moderate spatial scales than at the broad spatial scale. This is likely explained by the sedentary nature of Siskiyou Mountains salamanders and their predisposition to associate with fine-scale habitat features (Nussbaum et al. 1983; Leonard et al. 1993; Jones et al. 2005). Siskiyou Mountains salamanders appear to occur in rock deposits and talus slopes under a narrow range of habitat conditions, and suitable habitat conditions near these refugia may be best detected at fine and moderate spatial scales. The coarse-grained habitat features measured at the broad spatial scale may be too general to determine the distinct habitat associations of this species, which is evidenced by 5 a priori models receiving significant support at the broad spatial scale compared with 2 a priori models at the fine and moderate spatial scales. Nonetheless, an a priori model comprised of the same 3 explanatory variables (white-fir,

Fig. 4 Habitat suitability maps of Siskiyou Mountains salamanders at 3 spatial scales in the Applegate River Watershed of the Klamath–Siskiyou region, Oregon–California border, USA. Top 2 maps show habitat suitability of Siskiyou Mountains salamanders at the medium spatial scale (40 ha) with salamander sites ($n = 53$, top left) and with randomly selected potentially unoccupied sites ($n = 133$, top right), and bottom 2 maps show habitat suitability at fine (10 ha, bottom left) and broad (202 ha, bottom right) spatial scales. High value indicates high habitat suitability

Oregon white oak, and rock) was consistently ranked as the best model across all 3 spatial scales. The best model predicted that Siskiyou Mountains salamanders were more likely to be found with increasing abundance of rocky soils and decreasing abundance of both white-fir and Oregon white oak in the landscape.

A positive association of Siskiyou Mountains salamanders with abundance of rocky soils was not surprising as talus slopes or rock deposits have been considered as a primary habitat requirement for this species and the closely related Del Norte Salamander (Diller and Wallace 1994; Welsh and Lind 1995; Ollivier et al. 2001). In previous studies, rocky substrates were visually quantified in the field at selected sites as an element of salamanders' microhabitat

(Diller and Wallace 1994; Welsh and Lind 1995; Ollivier et al. 2001), but such field data on rocky substrates are not readily available across the landscape to facilitate conservation planning. Our study is the first to demonstrate the association of Siskiyou Mountains salamanders with rocky soils across the landscape based on widely available GIS soil conservation maps and to facilitate the application of these maps for conservation purposes.

In northwestern California, Siskiyou Mountain salamanders increased in abundance with a decrease in elevation (Ollivier et al. 2001). We similarly found their tendency to occur in low elevation habitats in southwestern Oregon. Paradoxically, a priori models containing elevation as an explanatory variable were not as effective at predicting salamander occurrence as models containing tree species abundances. Change in tree species abundance, which occurred along the elevation gradient, appeared to be more directly linked to the shift in salamander occupancy than elevation itself. Siskiyou Mountains salamanders were less likely to occur in areas of the landscape with higher abundance of white fir, which generally indicates cold and dry environments at high elevations (Laacke 1990), and were more likely to occur in areas with higher abundance of Pacific madrone at low elevations. Although we initially hypothesized a negative association of Siskiyou Mountains salamanders with Pacific madrone because it indicates potentially dry environmental conditions, our finding suggests that the salamanders may be able to tolerate some dry conditions within the distribution of Pacific madrone, perhaps because Pacific madrone can grow in rocky soils to which the salamanders are adapted. Pacific madrone was not an explanatory variable in the best models simply because it was negatively correlated with white fir to a high degree; therefore, the inclusion of white fir in the models indirectly accounted for Pacific madrone. In contrast to expectations, Douglas-fir also was not a good predictor of the occurrence of Siskiyou Mountains salamanders. This may be explained because Douglas-fir was well distributed across elevations while Siskiyou Mountains salamanders mainly occurred in the lower half of elevations within the Douglas-fir distribution.

Structural habitat features (e.g., tree canopy cover and conifer DBH) were not effective in predicting salamander occurrence likely due to their associations with tree species abundances. A positive association of the salamanders with an increasing density of hardwood probably was a result of an increase in hardwood, particularly Pacific madrone, at low elevation habitats, where the salamanders tended to occur. Alternatively, researchers hypothesized that higher densities of hardwood trees might positively affect Siskiyou Mountains salamanders by increasing the availability of cover objects, mainly downed hardwood materials on the forest floor (Ollivier et al. 2001) and that the presence of hardwood trees might enhance a multi-layered stand structure, cool and stable forest-floor microclimate, and biomass of invertebrate prey (Welsh and Lind 1995).

We also did not find solar illumination to be a good predictor of salamander occurrence in southwestern Oregon, and our finding is consistent with a previous field study conducted in our study area (Ollivier et al. 2001). However, in the southern portion of the salamander's range in northwestern California, where the climate is hotter and drier than that in southwestern Oregon, Siskiyou Mountains salamanders were most frequently found in the areas of landscape with low solar illumination (Ollivier et al. 2001). Therefore, the response of Siskiyou Mountains salamanders to solar illumination appears to vary with geographic location, perhaps depending on local climate conditions.

Management implications

Our habitat suitability models and maps are directly applicable to the conservation of Siskiyou Mountains salamanders in the Applegate River Watershed along the Oregon–California

border, USA. For example, our GIS maps of habitat suitability can aid conservationists and managers in selection of high priority conservation sites by allowing them to evaluate potential habitat quality and habitat connectivity in relation to locations of existing conservation reserves. Furthermore, ecological risk to the conservation of Siskiyou Mountains salamanders, including adverse human activities and natural disturbances, can be evaluated across the landscape using our habitat suitability map along with maps of fire hazard, land use allocations, road networks, or proposed management activities. Managers also can use our habitat suitability maps along with other available information to develop land management plans or modify existing ones to minimize adverse impacts on the salamander's suitable habitat. Importantly, conservation of Siskiyou Mountains salamanders based on our habitat suitability maps enhances protection of forested rocky-rubble habitats and may indirectly protect rare mollusks endemic to the region, many of which appear to occur in moist rocky substrates (Bury and Pearl 1999; Jules et al. 1999). Finally, our approach to develop a landscape habitat suitability model from locally available GIS data can be easily adapted and applied to conservation of a wide variety of rare species in different geographic regions.

Scope and limitation

We identify the scope and limitations of this study to ensure the appropriate use of our research results and to improve future research designs for the conservation of Siskiyou Mountains salamanders and advancement of landscape habitat studies. Because we lacked home range and movement information of Siskiyou Mountains salamanders, the 3 spatial scales used in this study were determined based on practical conservation and management considerations, rather than the species' biology or ecology. Therefore, our understanding of how the Siskiyou Mountains salamander responds to ecological or environmental factors across a range of spatial scales is still incomplete. Further studies are needed to determine home range size, activity pattern, or ecologically and biologically meaningful spatial scales for the better assessment of habitat association of Siskiyou Mountains salamanders across the landscape.

   We also were limited by the availability of GIS data in the analysis of habitat associations and development of habitat suitability models. Although we considered all the habitat variables available in GIS data when formulating a priori models, the occurrence of Siskiyou Mountains salamanders might be affected by habitat or ecological factors that were not available for our analyses. For example, we were unable to analyze the association of Siskiyou Mountains salamanders with climate data (precipitation, minimum and maximum temperature) because the spatial resolution of digital climate data (1600 ha/ 4000-m pixel) from Parameter-elevation Regressions on Independent Slopes Model (PRISM; Daly et al. 1994)) was too coarse for the spatial scale of our study, even at the broad spatial scale (500 ha/1425-m pixel). Therefore, some elements of climate conditions were indirectly assessed using surrogate climate variables, such as solar illumination and tree species abundance. Furthermore, our current habitat suitability maps are based on the image analysis of 1993 Landsat TM data. Therefore, updating habitat suitability maps, when the latest spatial habitat data becomes available, would improve precision and accuracy of current conditions and reduce bias of estimated habitat suitability; however, our current habitat suitability models and maps are applicable for management and conservation purposes because abundance of rocky soils and tree species across the study area has not significantly changed since 1993.

   Our models can effectively be used to compare relative habitat suitability scores across the landscape; however, our retrospective approach limited the ability of our models to

estimate the probability of species occurrence as well as to predict species presence or absence in relation to some objective threshold value (Ramsey and Schafer 1997, pp. 586–587). Data from a prospective study, in which outcomes of presence or absence are not known prior to the survey, are necessary to model predictive logistic regression equations (Ramsey and Schafer 1997, pp. 586–587).

This study focused on the northern genetic population of the Siskiyou Mountain salamander in the Applegate River Watershed at the Oregon–California border and did not include any part of the range of the southern genetic population in northwestern California (Mahoney 2004; Mead et al. 2005). A future study could determine whether there are differences in habitat associations between these 2 populations and test the applicability of our habitat models or develop new landscape habitat models for the southern population.

References

Badura GJ, Jahn PN (1977) Soil Resource Inventory for the Rogue River National Forest. U. S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Medford, Oregon

Blaustein AR, Beatty JJ, Olson DH, Storm RM (1995) The biology of amphibians and reptiles in old-growth forests in the Pacific Northwest. General Technical Report PNW-337, U. S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Portland, Oregon

Burnham KP, Anderson DR (2002) Model selection and multimodel inference: a practical information-theoretic approach. Springer-Verlag, New York

Bury RB, Bury GW (2005) Biogeographic patterns. In: Jones LLC, Leonard WP, Olson DH (eds) Amphibians of the Pacific Northwest. Seattle Audubon Society, Seattle

Bury RB, Pearl CA (1999) Klamath-Siskiyou herpetofauna: biogeographic patterns and conservation strategies. Nat Areas J 19:341–350

Clayton DR, Nauman RS (2005) Siskiyou Mountains salamander: *Plethodon stormi* Highton and Brame. In: Jones LLC, Leonard WP, Olson DH (eds) Amphibians of the Pacific Northwest. Seattle Audubon Society, Seattle

Clayton DR, Olson DH, Nauman RS (2005) Conservation assessment for the Siskiyou Mountains salamander (*Plethodon stormi*), Version 1.3. USDA Forest Service, Region 6, and USDI Bureau of Land Management, Oregon, Interagecy Special-Status and Sensitive Species Program. Portland, OR. Available via DIALOG. http://www.or.blm.gov/ISSSP/Conservation_Planning-and-Tools.htm. Cited 20 Dec 2006

Cliff AD, Ord JK (1981) Spatial processes: models & applications. Pion Limited, London

Cox JA, Baker WW, Engstrom RT (2001) Red-cockaded woodpackers in the Red Hills region: a GIS-based assessment. Wildl Soc Bull 29:1278–1288

Daly C, Neilson RP, Phillips DL (1994) A statistical-topographic model for mapping climatological precipitation over mountainous terrain. J Appl Meteorol 33:140–158

DellaSala DA, Reid SB, Frest TJ, Strittholt JR, Olson DM (1999) A global perspective on the biodiversity of the Klamath-Siskiyou ecoregion. Nat Areas J 19:300–319

Diller LV, Wallace RL (1994) Distribution and habitat of *Plethodon elongatus* on managed, young growth forests in north coastal California. J Herpetol 28:310–318

Environmental Systems Research Institute Inc (1996) ArcView version 3.2 and ArcView Spatial Analyst. Redlands, California

Environmental Systems Research Institute Inc (2004) ArcGIS version 9.0. Redlands, California

Fleishman E, Mac Nally R, Fay JP, Murphy DD (2001) Modeling and predicting species occurrence using broad-scale environmental variables: an example with butterflies of the Great Basin. Conserv Biol 15:1647–1685

Franklin JF, Dyrness CT (1988) Natural vegetation of Oregon and Washington. Oregon State University Press, Corvallis, Oregon

Fuhlendorf SD, Woodward AJW, Leslie DM Jr, Shackford JS (2002) Multi-scale effects of habitat loss and fragmentation on lesser prairie-chicken populations of the US southern Great Plains. Landscape Ecol 17:617–628

Gesch D, Oimoen M, Greenlee S, Nelson C, Steuck M, Tyler D (2002) The National Elevation Dataset. Photogrammetric Engineering and Remote Sensing 68:5–11

Gros PM, Rejmánek M (1999) Status and habitat preferences of Uganda cheetahs: an attempt to predict carnivore occurrence based on vegetation structure. Biodivers Conserv 8:1561–1583

Gustafson EJ, Murphy NL, Crow TR (2001) Using a GIS model to assess terrestrial salamander response to alternative forest management plans. J Environ Manage 63:281–292

Herman RK, Lavender DP (1990) *Pseudotsuga menziesii* (Mirb.) Franco: Douglas-fir. In: Burns RM, Honkala BH (technical coordinators), Silvics of North America, vol 1, Conifers, Agriculture Handbook 654. U. S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Washington, DC

Hill TB (1996) Forest biometrics from space. Geographic Resource Solutions, Arcata, California

Howard JA (1991) Remote sensing of forest resources: theory and application. Chapman & Hall, London

Jones LLC, Leonard WP, Olson DH (2005) Amphibians in the Pacific Northwest. Seattle Audubon Society, Seattle

Jules ES, DellaSalla DA, Marsden JK (1999) The Klamath-Siskiyou region. Nat Areas J 19:295–299

Keating KA, Cherry S (2004) Use and interpretation of logistic regression in habitat-selection studies. J Wildl Manage 68:774–789

Laacke RJ (1990) *Abies concolor* (Gord. & Glend.) Lindl. Ex Hildebr.: white fir. In: Burns RM, Honkala BH (technical coordinators) Silvics of North America, vol 1, Conifers, Agriculture Handbook 654. U. S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Washington, DC

Leonard WP, Brown HA, Jones LLC, McAllister KR, Storm RM (1993) Amphibians of Washington and Oregon. Seattle Audubon Society, Seattle

Luoto M, Kuussaari M, Toivonen T (2002) Modeling butterfly distribution based on remote sensing data. J Biogeogr 29:1027–1037

Maehr DS, Cox JA (1995) Landscape features and panthers in Florida. Conserv Biol 9:1008–1019

Mahoney MJ (2004) Molecular systematics and phylogeography of the *Plethodon elongatus* species group: combining phylogenetic and population genetic methods to investigate species history. Mol Ecol 13:149–166

Manly BFJ, McDonald LL, Thomas DL, McDonald TL, Erikson WP (2002) Resource selection by animals, 2nd edn. Kluwer Press, New York

McDonald PM, Tappeiner JC II (1990) *Arbutus menziesii* Pursh: Pacific madrone, In: Burns RM, Honkala BH (technical coordinators). Silvics of North America, vol 2, Hardwoods, Agriculture Handbook 654. U. S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Washington, DC

Mead LS, Clayton DR, Nauman RS, Olson DH, Pfrender ME (2005) Newly discovered populations of salamanders from Siskiyou county California represent a species distinct from *Plethodon stormi*. Herpetologica 61:158–177

Molina R, McKenzie D, Lesher R, Ford J, Alegria J, Culter R (2003) Strategic survey framework for the Northwest Forest Plan survey and manage program. General Technical Report, PNW-GTR 573, U. S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Pacific Northwest Research Station, Portland, Oregon

Murkin HR, Murkin EJ, Ball JP (1997) Avian habitat selection and prairie wetland dynamics: a 10-year experiment. Ecol Appl 7:1144–1159

Myers N, Mittermeier RA, Mittermeier CG, da Fonseca GAB, Kent J (2000) Biodiversity hotspots for conservation priorities. Nature 403:853–858

Nauman RS, Olson DH (1999) Survey and Manage salamander known sites. In: Olson DH (eds) Survey protocols for amphibians under the Survey & Manage provision of the Northwest Forest Plan, Version 3.0, October 1999. Interagency Publication of the Regional Ecosystem Office, Portland, Oregon. BLM publication, BLM/OR/WA/PT-00/033+1792, U.S. GPO: 2000-589-124/04022 Region No. 10. Available via DIALOG. www.or.blm.gov/surveyandmanage/SP/Amphibians99/protoch.pdf. Cited 10 Nov 2006

Nauman RS, Olson DH (2004) Strategic survey annual report, Siskiyou Mountains salamander northern population. The publication available at: USDA Forest Service, Region 6 and USDI Bureau of Land Management, Oregon and Washington, Interagency special-status and sensitive species program, Regional Office, Portland, Oregon

Nussbaum RA, Brodie ED Jr, Storm RM (1983) Amphibians and reptiles of the Pacific Northwest. University of Idaho Press, Moscow, Idaho

Ollivier LM, Welsh HH Jr, Clayton DR (2001) Habitat correlates of the Siskiyou Mountains Salamander, *Plethodon stormi* (Caudata: Plethodontidae); with comments on the species' range. Report to the

California Fish and Game. U.S. Department of Agriculture Forest Service, Redwood Science Laboratory, 1700 Bayview Drive, Arcata, CA 95521. June, 2001. Available via DIALOG. http://www.fs.usda.gov/psw/publications/4251/ollivier2.pdf. Cited 9 Nov 2006

Olson DH (1999) Standardized survey protocols for amphibians under the Survey and Manage and Protection Buffer Provisions. In: Olson DH (ed) Survey protocols for amphibians under the Survey & Manage provision of the Northwest Forest Plan, Version 3.0, October 1999. Interagency Publication of the Regional Ecosystem Office, Portland, Oregon. BLM publication, BLM/OR/WA/PT-00/033+1792, U.S. GPO: 2000-589-124/04022 Region No. 10. Available via DIALOG. http://www.or.blm.gov/surveyandmanage/SP/Amphibians99/protoch.pdf. Cited 9 Nov 2006

Pearce JL, Boyce MS (2006) Modelling distribution and abundance with presence-only data. J Appl Ecol 43:405–412

Ramsey FL, Schafer DW (1997) The statistical sleuth, a course in methods of data analysis. Wadsworth, New York

Ray N, Lehmann A, Joly P (2002) Modeling spatial distribution of amphibian populations: a GIS approach based on habitat matrix permeability. Biodiversity and Conservation 11:2143–2165

SAS Institute (1999a) SAS/ STATS users guide, version 8, Cary, North Carolina

SAS Institute (1999b) SAS procedures guide, version 8, Cary, North Carolina

Stein WI (1990) *Quercus garryana* Dougl. Ex Hook: Oregon white oak. In: Burns RM, Honkala BH (technical coordinators) Silvics of North America, vol 2, Hardwoods, Agriculture Handbook 654. U. S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Washington, DC

Thomas JW, Rphael MG, Anthony RG et al (1993) Viability assessment and management considerations for species associated with late successional and old-growth forests of the Pacific Northwest. Report by Scientific Analysis Team, U. S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Portland, Oregon

Torgersen CE, Price DM, Li HW, McIntosh BA (1999) Multiscale thermal refugia and stream habitat associations of chinook salmon in northeastern Oregon. Ecol Appl 9:301–319

Welsh HH Jr, Lind AJ (1995) Habitat correlates of the Del Norte salamander, *Plethodon elongatus* (Caudata: Plethodontidae), in northwestern California. J Herpetol 29:198–210