

Report Addendum

TO: Burke Wind, LLC

FROM: Atwell, LLC

DATE: November 27, 2018

RE: Burke County Wind Energy Center – Desktop Whooping Crane Habitat Assessment Addendum

Burke Wind, LLC (Burke Wind), a wholly-owned, indirect subsidiary of NextEra Energy Resources, LLC, contracted The Watershed Institute, Inc. to conduct a desktop whooping crane habitat assessment for the proposed Burke County Wind Energy Center (Project). This addendum provides an update to the Desktop Whooping Crane Habitat Assessment¹ dated July, 2018 and submitted under Docket PU-18-344 on September 19, 2018. The Project was originally designed to produce up to 300 megawatts (MW) of renewable wind energy. Burke Wind has recently reduced the Project size from 300 MW to 200 MW. This has resulted in a smaller Project Area and the elimination of 38 wind turbine generators (WTGs) from the proposed Project. As revised, the Project will consist of the construction and operation of up to 68 General Electric (GE) 2.72 MW and eight (8) GE 1.715 MW WTGs (total of 76 WTGs). The GE 2.72-MW WTGs will have a 295-foot (90-meter) hub height and a 381-foot (116-meter) rotor diameter; and the GE 1.715-MW WTGs will have a 262-foot (80-meter) hub height and a 337-foot (103-meter) rotor diameter.

The reduced 200 MW Project Area remains located in Burke County, North Dakota, covers 23,933 acres, and is fully encompassed within the western half of the original 300 MW Project Area. As the reduced Project Area is encompassed within the area evaluated in the 300 MW Desktop Whooping Crane Habitat Assessment, the discussion and results of the report are reflective of the reduced Project Area. Therefore, information contained within the original report is still applicable.

The 300 MW Desktop Whooping Crane Habitat Assessment identified 277 potentially suitable wetland habitats areas for Whooping Crane stopover within the 300 MW Project Area. The reduced Project Area now contains only 40 potentially suitable wetland habitats, which has reduced the potentially suitable Whooping Crane wetland stopover habitat by 237 wetland areas.

¹ Watershed Institute, Inc., "Desktop Whooping Crane Habitat Assessment; Burke Wind, LLC, Burke and Mountrail County, North Dakota," July 2018.

**DESKTOP WHOOPING CRANE HABITAT ASSESSMENT
BURKE WIND, LLC
BURKE AND MOUNTRAIL COUNTY, NORTH DAKOTA**



(Grus americana)

Prepared by:
WATERSHED INSTITUTE, INC.
1200 SW Executive Drive
Topeka, Kansas 66615



TABLE OF CONTENTS

<u>Section</u>	<u>Page</u>
1.0 INTRODUCTION	1
2.0 SITE DESCRIPTION	1
3.0 HABITAT ASSESSMENT METHODOLOGY	2
3.1 Unsuitability Habitat Screening	2
3.2 Habitat Suitability Assessment.....	3
4.0 HABITAT ASSESSMENT FINDINGS.....	6
5.0 References.....	7

APPENDIX A

FIGURE

- 1 Site Location Map
- 2 Site Layout Map
- 3 Ecoregion Map
- 4 Landcover Map
- 6 Wetland Habitats Map
- 7 Assessed Wetland Habitats Map
- 8 Potential Suitable Wetland Habitats Map

APPENDIX B

Desktop Assessment Scores

July 2018

1.0 INTRODUCTION

Burke Wind, LLC (Burke Wind) tasked the Watershed Institute, Inc. (TWI) to complete a desktop habitat suitability assessment (desktop assessment) for the endangered whooping crane (*Grus americana*). The desktop assessment is for proposed windfarm and transmission line development (Project) in Burke and Mountrail Counties, North Dakota (Appendix A, Figure 1). Burke Wind conducted this study as part of a holistic natural resources review approach to assess potential adverse effects from development of this Project on species of concern and their habitats. Results from this study will be combined with results from other natural resource studies and will aid in responsibly siting wind turbines, access roads, underground electric collection lines, an electric substation, overhead high-voltage transmission line, and other proposed infrastructure.

For the desktop assessment, TWI examined 2016 aerial photographs and reviewed wetland habitats, elevation data, North Dakota infrastructure data (i.e. highways, roads, powerlines) and landuse data. Burke Wind provided TWI delineated wetland habitats, elevation data, and land use data in electronic format for use with ArcGIS Desktop software (ESRI 1999-2017). TWI also solicited known location records of whooping cranes and the whooping crane migratory corridor from U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS). This report provides Project background information, outlines TWI's habitat assessment methodology (TWI 2013), and presents desktop assessment findings. Report figures are provided in Appendix A and the desktop assessment scoring summary in Appendix B.

2.0 SITE DESCRIPTION

The Project is in Burke and Mountrail Counties, North Dakota, and includes a proposed 72.7-square mile windfarm development area and a 195.0-square mile transmission line development area (Appendix A, Figure 1). The Project is found in the USFWS-defined 75-percent whooping crane migratory sighting corridor (Appendix A, Figure 2). The 75-percentile whooping crane migratory sighting corridor refers to the area encompassing 75-percent of confirmed sightings.

The Project encompasses portions of the Northern Dark Brown Prairie, Northern Missouri Coteau, Missouri Coteau Slope, and River Breaks ecoregions (Appendix A, Figure 3). The Northern Dark

Brown Prairie is part of the northern glaciated plains that is generally flat with some undulating topography (Bryce et al. 1996). This ecoregion contains high concentrations of temporary and seasonal wetlands. The Northern Missouri Coteau is part of the northwestern glaciated plains with a hummocky, rolling terrain (Bryce et al. 1996). There are numerous prairie pothole wetlands in this ecoregion. The Missouri Coteau Slope ecoregion is also in the northwestern glaciated plains and is a gently rolling plain sloping to the Missouri River (Bryce et al. 1996). The River Breaks is unglaciated and part of the northwestern great plains (Bryce et al. 1996). This ecoregion is highly dissected and borders major rivers and associated alluvial plains (Bryce et al. 1996). Overall, the Missouri Coteau Slope and River Breaks have fewer wetlands than the Northern Dark Brown Prairie and Northern Missouri Coteau.

Using landcover data from the 2011 GAP Analysis Program (GAP), cultivated land is the most common Project landuse covering 41.2-percent. Other significant Project landuses are shrublands at 22.6-percent, mixed-grass prairies at 20.6-percent, and wetlands/open water at 4.4-percent. A landuse map is shown in Appendix A, Figure 4.

3.0 HABITAT ASSESSMENT METHODOLOGY

Habitat assessment methods followed protocols recommended by the USFWS Aransas National Wildlife Refuge Complex (Tom Stehn *pers. comm.*), Manhattan, Kansas USFWS Ecological Services Office (Dan Mulhern *pers. comm.*), Region 6 Guidelines for Minimizing Effects from Power Line Projects within the Whooping Crane Mitigation Corridor (USFWS 2010), and habitat evaluation scientific literature. TWI's goal is to provide a reproducible methodology that provides clients with the appropriate information to make decisions that provide ecological value and protection. First, TWI developed an unsuitability screening process to eliminate wetlands that did not meet criteria based on wetland size, visual obstruction, and disturbance obstructions. After the unsuitability screening, TWI assessed remaining wetlands to determine habitat suitability based on water regime, distance to food, wetland size, wetland type (natural or created), and wetland density.

3.1 Unsuitability Habitat Screening

TWI assessed wetland habitats for potentially suitable habitat. TWI's approach was to screen the wetland habitats based on unsuitable habitat conditions (Tom Stehn *pers. comm.*).

First, TWI screened wetland habitats that were near human disturbances (i.e. highways, roads, railroads, and residential/commercial properties etc.). TWI generated buffers using distances in TWI's (2013) habitat assessment guideline around digital highway data (North Dakota Department of Transportation [NDDOT] 2017a), digital county road data (NDDOT 2017b), digital railroad data (Applied Data Consultants 2017), incorporated areas (NDDOT 2017c), digital transmission line data, and residential and commercial properties. TWI then clipped the buffered information to the Project extent and spatially analyzed the wetland habitats and human disturbance buffers. TWI selected wetland habitats located completely within the human disturbance buffers and removed the wetland habitats from the desktop assessment.

Next, TWI selected and eliminated wetland habitats equal to or less than 0.25 acres. These wetland features are deemed too small to designate as potentially suitable habitat (Tom Stehn *pers. comm.*).

For remaining wetland features, TWI visually inspected each wetland feature using the 2016 aerial photographs for tall, visual obstructions. If tall, visual obstructions were within 100 meters of a wetland habitat, TWI did not consider the wetland habitat as potentially suitable habitat.

Finally, TWI visually inspected all remaining wetland habitats using elevation data. TWI calculated a percent slope raster map and created a 1-meter topographic surface to inspect wetland habitat side-slopes. Visibility obstructions can be any feature, including topography, greater than 1.4 meters, the height at crane eye level (Armbruster 1990). TWI eliminated wetland habitats from the habitat quality assessment if side slopes, within 100-meters, were greater than 1.5-percent, a visibility obstruction for a whooping crane's open line of sight.

3.2 *Habitat Suitability Assessment*

TWI assessed remaining wetland habitats to rate habitat quality by assigning values to habitat criteria deemed important to migrating whooping cranes.

The first criterion was water regime. Since water is the primary attractant to whooping cranes, TWI scored wetlands with more permanent water higher as they would be a more consistent and likely stopover habitats from year to year (Table 1).

Table 1: Water Regime Habitat Score

Water Regime*	Score
Permanent (H)	5
Intermittently Exposed (G)	4
Semi-Permanent (F)	3
Seasonally Flooded (C)	2
Intermittent/Temporarily Flooded (J/A)	1

* Nontidal Water Regime from Cowardin et al. 1979

Distance to food was the second criterion. The literature states preferred roosting habitat is near food. The longest distance TWI found that a whooping crane would likely fly to food is 1.5 kilometers (Armbruster 1990). Table 2 shows the habitat scores based on distance from roosting sites and food.

Table 2: Distance to Food Habitat Score

Distance to Food	Score
Within or Adjacent to Cropfield	5
< 0.5 km	4
0.6-1.0 km	3
1.1-1.5 km	2
> 1.5 km	1

Wetland size was the third criterion. Whooping crane sighting records show them using a variety of wetland sizes from visual observations and radio collar data. The literature suggests that cranes will use small wetlands, but larger wetlands are preferable. Table 3 shows the habitat scores based on wetland size.

Table 3: Wetland Size Habitat Score

Wetland Size	Score
> 7 acres	5
5-6.9 acres	4
3-4.9 acres	3
1-2.9 acres	2

< 1 acre	1
----------	---

TWI then scored the wetlands based on whether they are natural or created. Natural wetlands received a higher score as they are assumed to have shallower water. Whooping cranes prefer wetlands that are shallow. Studies have stated that cranes prefer water depths less than 30 centimeters (Armbruster 1990, Faanes et al. 1992). Table 4 shows the scoring.

Table 4: Natural Wetland Habitat Score

Wetland Type	Score
Natural	2
Created	0

The last criterion TWI evaluated was wetland density. Literature suggests whooping cranes prefer areas that have a wetland mosaic. TWI considered a wetland mosaic to be 5 or more wetlands within a one-quarter section and no visual obstructions between the wetlands habitats. Table 5 shows the scoring.


Table 5: Wetland Density Habitat Score

Wetland Mosaic	Score
Yes	3
No	0

After TWI scored the criteria, TWI added the scores to develop an overall habitat quality score. To determine a habitat quality score that constitutes potentially suitable habitat, TWI determined the habitat quality of national wetland inventory (NWI) wetlands at Quivira National Wildlife Refuge (NWR). Quivira NWR is a traditional migratory stopover location and is considered critical habitat for migrating whooping cranes. TWI analyzed the habitat quality as described in TWI's (2013) methodology for Quivira NWR wetlands. After completing the unsuitability habitat screening process, TWI evaluated 499 Quivira NWR NWI wetland habitats. Wetland habitat scores ranged from 8 to 17 with an average score of 12.1 (Figure 5). Using the Quivira NWR average habitat score as a benchmark, TWI considers a habitat score of 12 or higher as

potential suitable habitat when assessing whooping crane wetland habitats within the USFWS migratory sighting corridor.

Figure 5: Distribution of Habitat Scores from Quivira NWR



4.0 HABITAT ASSESSMENT FINDINGS

TWI identified a total of 10,673 wetland habitats in or intersecting the Project (Appendix A, Figure 6). The dominant wetland habitat type was palustrine emergent (PEM) wetlands. Other wetlands habitat types TWI found were lacustrine (L), palustrine aquatic bed (PAB), and riverine (R).

Using the unsuitability habitat screening process, TWI eliminated 9,768 wetland habitats. Of the 9,768 wetland habitats, 4,923 wetland habitats were completely within disturbance area buffers, 1,551 wetland habitats were less than 0.25 acres, and 3,294 wetland habitats were within 100-meters of visibility obstructions or adjacent to steep side-slopes. TWI evaluated the remaining 905 wetland habitats for habitat suitability (Appendix A, Figure 7). Appendix B lists the wetland habitat and their habitat suitability score. TWI scored 277 wetland habitats a 12 or higher, considered potentially suitable habitat (Appendix A, Figure 8). For the riverine channels, TWI did not consider as potential suitable habitat as they did not meet the 100-meter width defined by Faanes et al. (1992).

5.0 REFERENCES

- Applied Data Consultants. 2017. NDHUB.RailRoads_24K. Accessed on-line at: <https://gishubdata.nd.gov/>.
- Armbruster, M.J. 1990. Characterization of Habitat Used by Whooping Cranes During Migration. *U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service Biological Report*. 90(4). 16 pages.
- Bryce, S.A., Omernik, J.M., Pater, D.A., Ulmer, M., Schaar, J., Freeouf, J., Johnson, R., Kuck, P., and Azevedo, S.H., 1996, Ecoregions of North Dakota and South Dakota, (color poster with map, descriptive text, summary tables, and photographs): Reston, Virginia, U.S. Geological Survey (map scale 1:1,500,000).
- Cowardin, L.M., Carter, V.M., Golet, F.C., and LaRoe, E.T. 1979. Classification of Wetlands and Deepwater Habitats on the United States. U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Biological Services Program, Washington, D.C. FWS/OBS-79/31. 103 pages.
- ESRI Inc. 1999-2017. ArcMap™ Software Version 10.5.1. Redlands, California.
- Faanes, C.A., Johnson, D.H., and Lingle, G.R. 1992. Characteristics of Whooping Crane Roost Sites in the Platter River. In *Proceedings of the North American Crane Workshop 6*: 90-94
- North Dakota Department of Transportation. 2017a. State Highways. Accessed on-line at: <https://gishubdata.nd.gov/>.
- North Dakota Department of Transportation. 2017b. County Roads. Accessed on-line at: <https://gishubdata.nd.gov/>.
- North Dakota Department of Transportation. 2017c. Corporate Boundaries. Accessed on-line at: <https://gishubdata.nd.gov/>.
- U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. 2010. Memorandum: Region 6 Guidance for Minimizing Effects from Power Line Projects Within the Whooping Crane Migration Corridor. Mountain-Prairie Region.
- Watershed Institute, Inc. 2013. *Potential Suitable Habitat for the Whooping Crane (Grus Americana)*. Topeka, Kansas. June.

APPENDIX A
FIGURES





Figure 1
Location Map

**Desktop Whooping Crane Habitat Assessment
Burke Wind, LLC Windfarm**







Figure 2
 U.S. Migratory Sighting Corridor Map
 Desktop Whooping Crane Habitat Assessment
 North Dakota









Figure 3
 Ecoregions Map
 Desktop Whooping Crane Habitat Assessment
 North Dakota









Figure 6
 Identified Wetland Habitats Map
 Desktop Whooping Crane Habitat Assessment
 North Dakota







Figure 7
 Assessed Wetland Habitats Map
 Desktop Whooping Crane Habitat Assessment
 Burke Wind, LLC Transmission Line






Figure 8
 Potential Suitable Habitats Map
 Desktop Whooping Crane Habitat Assessment
 North Dakota



APPENDIX B
HABITAT SUITABILITY ASSESSMENT SCORES

Habitat Suitability Assessment Scores

OBJECTID	ATTRIBUTE	ACRES	REGIME	FOOD	SIZE	TYPE	DENSITY	TOTAL
1	L1UBGh	1401.15	4	4	5	0	0	13
2	L2UBGh	106.36	4	5	5	0	0	14
3	PEM1A	6.84	1	4	4	2	0	11
4	PEM1A	0.67	1	5	1	2	0	9
5	PEM1A	4.37	1	5	3	2	0	11
6	PEM1A	1.62	1	4	2	2	0	9
7	PEM1C	1.28	2	4	2	2	0	10
8	PEM1C	0.77	2	5	1	2	0	10
9	PEM1C	1.87	2	5	2	2	0	11
10	PEM1C	1.02	2	4	2	2	0	10
11	PEM1C	0.31	2	5	1	2	0	10
12	PEM1C	0.66	2	5	1	2	0	10
13	PEM1C	0.52	2	5	1	2	0	10
14	PEM1C	0.97	2	4	1	2	0	9
15	PEM1Cd	0.29	2	5	1	0	0	8
16	PEM1Ch	0.30	2	4	1	0	0	7
17	PEM1C	2.20	2	5	2	2	0	11
23	PEM1Cd	17.42	2	5	5	0	0	12
26	PEMA	0.34	1	5	1	2	0	9
27	PEMC	0.66	2	5	1	2	0	10
28	PEMC	5.86	2	5	4	2	0	13
29	PEMC	3.25	2	4	3	2	0	11
30	PEMC	1.12	2	4	2	2	0	10
31	PEMC	3.76	2	5	3	2	0	12
32	PEMC	0.72	2	5	1	2	0	10
35	PEMC	0.28	2	4	1	2	0	9
36	PEMC	1.51	2	5	2	2	0	11
37	PEMC	2.19	2	5	2	2	3	14
38	L2ABG	81.28	4	5	5	2	0	16
39	PEMC	2.97	2	4	2	2	0	10
40	PEMA	0.56	1	5	1	2	0	9
41	PEMC	0.30	2	4	1	2	0	9
42	PEMC	10.71	2	4	5	2	0	13
43	PEMC	0.27	2	4	1	2	3	12
44	PEMC	1.04	2	5	2	2	0	11
45	PEMC	0.37	2	5	1	2	0	10
46	PEMC	0.86	2	5	1	2	0	10
47	PEMC	1.32	2	5	2	2	0	11
48	PEMC	5.54	2	4	4	2	0	12
49	PEMCd	1.12	2	5	2	0	0	9
50	PEMC	2.13	2	5	2	2	0	11
51	PEMA	0.42	1	5	1	2	0	9
52	PEMC	0.90	2	5	1	2	0	10

Habitat Suitability Assessment Scores

OBJECTID	ATTRIBUTE	ACRES	REGIME	FOOD	SIZE	TYPE	DENSITY	TOTAL
53	L2ABG	106.30	4	5	5	2	0	16
54	PEMAd	1.35	1	5	2	0	0	8
55	PEMC	1.08	2	4	2	2	0	10
56	PEMC	3.68	2	5	3	2	0	12
57	PEMCd	2.11	2	5	2	0	0	9
59	PEMC	4.68	2	5	3	2	0	12
60	PEMC	0.33	2	4	1	2	0	9
61	PEMC	0.39	2	5	1	2	0	10
62	PEMC	0.45	2	5	1	2	0	10
63	PEMCd	3.44	2	5	3	0	0	10
64	PEMC	2.36	2	4	2	2	0	10
66	PEMC	0.36	2	4	1	2	0	9
67	PEMC	9.65	2	4	5	2	0	13
68	PEMC	0.34	2	4	1	2	0	9
69	PEMC	15.48	2	5	5	2	0	14
70	PEMC	4.68	2	4	3	2	3	14
71	PEMC	0.35	2	5	1	2	0	10
72	PEMC	8.64	2	5	5	2	0	14
73	PEMC	0.80	2	4	1	2	3	12
74	PEMC	0.89	2	5	1	2	3	13
75	PEMA	0.27	1	3	1	2	0	7
76	PEMF	4.87	3	4	3	2	0	12
77	PEMC	2.18	2	4	2	2	0	10
78	PEMC	9.90	2	5	5	2	0	14
79	PEMF	2.66	3	4	2	2	3	14
80	PEMC	2.65	2	4	2	2	0	10
81	PEMC	0.38	2	4	1	2	0	9
82	PEMC	0.77	2	4	1	2	0	9
83	PEMFd	2.01	3	5	2	0	0	10
84	PEMC	0.48	2	4	1	2	3	12
85	PEMCd	5.72	2	5	4	0	0	11
86	PEMCd	0.70	2	5	1	0	3	11
87	PEMC	1.97	2	4	2	2	0	10
88	PEMC	0.32	2	4	1	2	0	9
90	PEMF	3.35	3	5	3	2	0	13
91	PEMC	0.47	2	5	1	2	0	10
92	PEMC	7.61	2	5	5	2	0	14
93	PEMF	2.72	3	5	2	2	0	12
95	PEMC	0.94	2	5	1	2	0	10
96	PEMC	0.36	2	5	1	2	0	10
97	L2ABG	52.09	4	5	5	2	0	16
100	PEMC	0.53	2	4	1	2	3	12
101	PEMC	0.29	2	4	1	2	3	12

Habitat Suitability Assessment Scores

OBJECTID	ATTRIBUTE	ACRES	REGIME	FOOD	SIZE	TYPE	DENSITY	TOTAL
102	PEMA	1.40	1	5	2	2	0	10
105	PEMC	20.85	2	4	5	2	0	13
107	PEMC	0.43	2	4	1	2	3	12
109	PABF	21.09	3	5	5	2	3	18
110	PABF	16.57	3	5	5	2	3	18
111	PEMC	6.65	2	4	4	2	3	15
112	PEMC	1.31	2	5	2	2	0	11
113	PEMCd	12.39	2	4	5	0	0	11
114	PABF	23.42	3	5	5	2	0	15
115	PEMC	3.74	2	4	3	2	0	11
117	PEMC	0.41	2	4	1	2	0	9
118	PEMC	1.75	2	4	2	2	3	13
119	PEMC	2.04	2	4	2	2	0	10
120	PEMC	5.21	2	4	4	2	3	15
121	PEMC	0.40	2	4	1	2	0	9
123	PABF	45.51	3	4	5	2	0	14
124	PEMC	0.83	2	4	1	2	0	9
126	PEMC	0.44	2	4	1	2	0	9
128	PEMC	0.72	2	4	1	2	0	9
129	PEMC	7.48	2	3	5	2	0	12
131	PEMC	0.63	2	5	1	2	0	10
132	PEMC	0.33	2	4	1	2	0	9
134	PEMC	1.60	2	4	2	2	3	13
136	PEMC	1.35	2	4	2	2	0	10
137	PEMC	2.97	2	5	2	2	0	11
138	L2ABG	48.08	4	4	5	2	0	15
140	PEMC	1.00	2	4	2	2	3	13
143	PEMC	6.80	2	5	4	2	0	13
144	PEMC	2.90	2	4	2	2	0	10
145	L2ABG	30.65	4	4	5	2	0	15
147	PEMC	1.29	2	5	2	2	0	11
148	PEMC	2.54	2	3	2	2	0	9
149	PEMC	3.04	2	3	3	2	0	10
152	PEMC	5.14	2	5	4	2	0	13
154	PEMA	6.51	1	4	4	2	0	11
156	PEMCd	29.90	2	5	5	0	0	12
157	PEMC	0.65	2	4	1	2	3	12
158	PABF	21.77	3	5	5	2	0	15
161	PEMC	0.66	2	5	1	2	0	10
162	PABF	12.88	3	5	5	2	3	18
165	PEMC	0.89	2	4	1	2	0	9
167	PEMC	1.49	2	4	2	2	3	13
169	PABF	11.07	3	5	5	2	0	15

Habitat Suitability Assessment Scores

OBJECTID	ATTRIBUTE	ACRES	REGIME	FOOD	SIZE	TYPE	DENSITY	TOTAL
171	PEMA	0.28	1	5	1	2	0	9
175	L2ABG	57.18	4	5	5	2	0	16
178	PEMC	0.40	2	4	1	2	3	12
183	PEMC	10.87	2	5	5	2	0	14
184	PEMC	0.37	2	5	1	2	0	10
185	PEMC	1.00	2	4	1	2	3	12
190	PEMC	0.75	2	4	1	2	0	9
192	PEMCd	0.98	2	5	1	0	0	8
197	PEMC	0.69	2	5	1	2	0	10
198	PEMC	0.91	2	4	1	2	0	9
200	PEMC	1.12	2	4	2	2	0	10
201	PEMC	1.48	2	5	2	2	0	11
202	PEMC	1.75	2	5	2	2	0	11
203	PEMC	4.75	2	5	3	2	0	12
204	PEMC	0.87	2	4	1	2	0	9
205	PEMC	0.83	2	4	1	2	0	9
206	PEMC	9.52	2	5	5	2	0	14
207	PEMCd	0.32	2	5	1	0	3	11
208	PEMC	1.30	2	4	2	2	0	10
209	PEMAd	46.05	1	5	5	0	0	11
210	PEMF	1.44	3	4	2	2	3	14
211	PEMC	2.32	2	4	2	2	0	10
212	PEMCd	0.85	2	5	1	0	0	8
213	PEMC	3.27	2	5	3	2	0	12
214	PEMC	3.35	2	4	3	2	0	11
215	PEMC	1.51	2	5	2	2	0	11
217	PEMC	7.72	2	5	5	2	0	14
218	PEMC	3.85	2	4	3	2	0	11
219	PEMAd	2.30	1	5	2	0	0	8
220	PEMC	23.21	2	4	5	2	0	13
221	PEMAd	0.65	1	5	1	0	0	7
222	PEMC	1.88	2	5	2	2	0	11
224	PEMC	0.63	2	4	1	2	0	9
225	PEMC	13.49	2	4	5	2	0	13
226	PEMC	0.58	2	5	1	2	3	13
227	PEMC	1.24	2	4	2	2	0	10
228	PEMA	0.46	1	5	1	2	0	9
229	PEMA	0.28	1	5	1	2	0	9
230	PEMCd	0.89	2	5	1	0	3	11
231	PEMA	8.77	1	5	5	2	0	13
232	PEMA	0.26	1	5	1	2	0	9
233	PEMF	4.40	3	4	3	2	0	12
234	PEMC	2.67	2	5	2	2	0	11

Habitat Suitability Assessment Scores

OBJECTID	ATTRIBUTE	ACRES	REGIME	FOOD	SIZE	TYPE	DENSITY	TOTAL
235	PEMCd	3.81	2	5	3	0	0	10
236	PEMC	7.72	2	5	5	2	3	17
237	PEMA	0.44	1	5	1	2	0	9
238	PEMC	10.08	2	5	5	2	0	14
239	PABF	7.35	3	5	5	2	0	15
240	PEMC	0.84	2	4	1	2	0	9
242	PEMC	2.06	2	5	2	2	0	11
243	PEMC	0.60	2	4	1	2	0	9
244	PEMC	7.18	2	4	5	2	3	16
245	PEMC	0.31	2	3	1	2	0	8
246	PEMC	2.42	2	5	2	2	0	11
247	PEMC	0.32	2	5	1	2	0	10
248	PEMC	0.40	2	5	1	2	0	10
249	PEMC	0.51	2	5	1	2	0	10
250	PEMC	0.85	2	4	1	2	0	9
251	PABF	10.90	3	5	5	2	0	15
252	PEMC	0.40	2	4	1	2	0	9
253	PEMC	0.39	2	4	1	2	3	12
254	PEMC	1.97	2	4	2	2	0	10
255	PEMA	0.69	1	5	1	2	0	9
256	PEMAd	0.68	1	5	1	0	0	7
258	PEMCd	0.50	2	4	1	0	0	7
259	PEMC	4.25	2	5	3	2	0	12
260	PEMFd	4.78	3	5	3	0	0	11
261	PEMF	1.26	3	4	2	2	0	11
262	PEMC	1.42	2	5	2	2	0	11
263	PEMC	4.23	2	4	3	2	0	11
264	PEMC	1.99	2	5	2	2	0	11
265	PEMC	80.36	2	5	5	2	3	17
266	PEMC	0.35	2	4	1	2	0	9
267	PEMC	0.34	2	4	1	2	0	9
268	PEMC	16.33	2	4	5	2	0	13
269	PABF	11.26	3	5	5	2	0	15
270	PEMCd	8.26	2	5	5	0	0	12
271	PEMC	0.32	2	4	1	2	0	9
272	PEMAd	0.72	1	5	1	0	0	7
273	PEMC	0.40	2	5	1	2	0	10
274	PEMCd	7.34	2	5	5	0	0	12
275	PEMC	0.65	2	5	1	2	0	10
276	PEMC	6.73	2	5	4	2	0	13
278	PEMC	0.29	2	4	1	2	0	9
280	PEMCd	0.55	2	5	1	0	0	8
281	PEMA	0.38	1	5	1	2	0	9

Habitat Suitability Assessment Scores

OBJECTID	ATTRIBUTE	ACRES	REGIME	FOOD	SIZE	TYPE	DENSITY	TOTAL
282	PEMC	9.83	2	5	5	2	0	14
283	PEMAd	0.65	1	5	1	0	0	7
284	PEMAd	0.82	1	5	1	0	0	7
286	PEMC	0.75	2	4	1	2	0	9
287	PEMC	1.76	2	5	2	2	0	11
288	PEMC	0.56	2	5	1	2	0	10
289	PEMC	1.10	2	4	2	2	0	10
290	PEMC	0.38	2	4	1	2	0	9
291	PEMC	4.44	2	5	3	2	0	12
292	PEMA	0.26	1	5	1	2	0	9
293	PEMC	0.58	2	4	1	2	0	9
294	PEMC	0.56	2	5	1	2	0	10
295	PEMC	1.16	2	4	2	2	3	13
296	PEMF	5.78	3	4	4	2	0	13
297	PEMF	10.60	3	4	5	2	0	14
298	PEMCd	0.77	2	5	1	0	0	8
299	PEMC	0.45	2	4	1	2	0	9
300	PABF	10.02	3	4	5	2	0	14
301	PEMA	2.99	1	4	2	2	0	9
302	PEMC	0.36	2	4	1	2	0	9
303	PEMC	0.27	2	4	1	2	0	9
304	PEMC	0.83	2	4	1	2	0	9
305	PEMF	0.79	3	4	1	2	0	10
306	PEMC	1.27	2	5	2	2	0	11
307	PEMC	5.22	2	4	4	2	0	12
308	PEMC	1.43	2	5	2	2	0	11
309	PEMC	0.34	2	5	1	2	0	10
310	L2ABG	28.43	4	4	5	2	0	15
312	PEMAd	0.28	1	5	1	0	0	7
313	PEMC	14.45	2	5	5	2	0	14
314	PEMC	0.57	2	4	1	2	3	12
316	PEMC	1.14	2	4	2	2	3	13
317	PEMC	2.38	2	4	2	2	0	10
318	PEMC	0.32	2	4	1	2	0	9
319	PEMC	6.16	2	5	4	2	0	13
321	PEMC	0.32	2	4	1	2	3	12
322	PEMC	0.31	2	4	1	2	0	9
323	PEMA	0.47	1	4	1	2	0	8
324	PEMC	0.72	2	5	1	2	0	10
325	PEMC	0.53	2	4	1	2	0	9
326	PEMC	0.89	2	4	1	2	0	9
327	PEMC	0.69	2	4	1	2	0	9
328	PEMC	0.53	2	5	1	2	0	10

Habitat Suitability Assessment Scores

OBJECTID	ATTRIBUTE	ACRES	REGIME	FOOD	SIZE	TYPE	DENSITY	TOTAL
329	PEMC	1.22	2	4	2	2	0	10
330	PEMAd	0.26	1	5	1	0	0	7
331	PEMC	0.50	2	5	1	2	0	10
332	PEMC	3.61	2	5	3	2	0	12
333	PEMC	11.36	2	5	5	2	0	14
334	PEMC	1.11	2	4	2	2	0	10
335	PEMC	0.43	2	5	1	2	0	10
336	PEMF	4.44	3	5	3	2	0	13
337	PEMC	6.00	2	5	4	2	3	16
338	PEMC	0.38	2	5	1	2	0	10
339	PEMC	0.50	2	5	1	2	0	10
340	PEMC	3.88	2	4	3	2	0	11
341	PEMC	1.08	2	4	2	2	0	10
342	PEMC	1.02	2	5	2	2	0	11
344	PABF	19.43	3	5	5	2	0	15
345	PABF	12.77	3	4	5	2	0	14
346	PEMC	0.27	2	5	1	2	0	10
347	PEMC	0.27	2	5	1	2	0	10
348	PABF	9.73	3	5	5	2	0	15
350	PEMC	1.02	2	5	2	2	0	11
351	PEMC	0.87	2	5	1	2	0	10
352	PEMC	1.17	2	5	2	2	0	11
353	PEMC	1.27	2	5	2	2	0	11
354	PEMC	0.69	2	5	1	2	0	10
355	PEMC	0.80	2	5	1	2	0	10
356	PEMA	0.27	1	5	1	2	0	9
357	PEMF	12.17	3	5	5	2	0	15
359	PEMC	1.10	2	5	2	2	0	11
360	PEMC	5.54	2	5	4	2	0	13
362	PEMC	0.42	2	4	1	2	0	9
363	PEMAd	0.35	1	5	1	0	0	7
364	PABF	18.81	3	5	5	2	0	15
365	PEMC	0.50	2	4	1	2	0	9
366	PEMC	3.77	2	5	3	2	0	12
367	PEMF	3.01	3	5	3	2	0	13
368	PEMC	3.25	2	4	3	2	0	11
369	PEMC	25.75	2	5	5	2	0	14
371	PEMC	0.31	2	5	1	2	3	13
372	PEMC	0.28	2	4	1	2	0	9
373	PEMC	1.75	2	4	2	2	3	13
374	PEMAd	0.89	1	5	1	0	0	7
375	PEMC	3.39	2	5	3	2	0	12
376	PEMC	0.47	2	5	1	2	0	10

Habitat Suitability Assessment Scores

OBJECTID	ATTRIBUTE	ACRES	REGIME	FOOD	SIZE	TYPE	DENSITY	TOTAL
377	PEMC	3.16	2	5	3	2	0	12
378	PEMCd	4.05	2	4	3	0	0	9
379	PEMA	0.38	1	5	1	2	0	9
380	PEMC	0.27	2	4	1	2	0	9
381	PEMA	1.03	1	4	2	2	0	9
382	PEMCd	0.35	2	5	1	0	0	8
383	PEMAd	0.54	1	5	1	0	0	7
384	PEMC	0.35	2	4	1	2	0	9
386	PEMC	0.67	2	5	1	2	0	10
387	PABFx	0.28	3	4	1	0	0	8
390	PEMC	5.44	2	5	4	2	0	13
391	PEMC	0.35	2	4	1	2	0	9
392	PEMC	3.79	2	5	3	2	0	12
396	PEMC	8.02	2	5	5	2	0	14
402	PEMC	3.31	2	3	3	2	0	10
404	PEMC	1.91	2	4	2	2	0	10
405	PEMC	0.33	2	4	1	2	0	9
406	PEMC	13.35	2	4	5	2	0	13
407	PEMC	1.53	2	3	2	2	0	9
408	PEMC	0.73	2	4	1	2	0	9
409	PEMC	3.13	2	4	3	2	0	11
410	PEMC	10.92	2	5	5	2	0	14
411	PEMF	5.07	3	5	4	2	0	14
412	PEMF	3.15	3	5	3	2	0	13
413	PEMC	1.24	2	4	2	2	0	10
414	PEMC	3.75	2	4	3	2	0	11
415	PEMC	1.42	2	5	2	2	0	11
416	PEMC	3.27	2	4	3	2	0	11
417	PEMC	0.78	2	4	1	2	0	9
418	PEMC	6.44	2	5	4	2	0	13
419	PEMC	1.86	2	5	2	2	0	11
420	PEMC	0.36	2	4	1	2	0	9
421	PEMC	0.55	2	5	1	2	0	10
422	PEMC	0.32	2	5	1	2	0	10
423	PEMC	10.66	2	5	5	2	0	14
424	PEMC	2.66	2	4	2	2	0	10
425	PEMC	0.75	2	5	1	2	0	10
426	PEMC	0.37	2	4	1	2	0	9
427	PEMC	9.61	2	4	5	2	0	13
428	PEMF	13.06	3	4	5	2	0	14
429	PEMC	5.77	2	5	4	2	0	13
430	PEMA	4.05	1	5	3	2	0	11
431	PEMC	0.43	2	5	1	2	0	10

Habitat Suitability Assessment Scores

OBJECTID	ATTRIBUTE	ACRES	REGIME	FOOD	SIZE	TYPE	DENSITY	TOTAL
432	PEMC	5.90	2	5	4	2	0	13
433	PEMC	0.42	2	5	1	2	0	10
434	PEMC	1.36	2	4	2	2	0	10
435	PEMC	2.15	2	5	2	2	0	11
436	PABF	15.93	3	5	5	2	0	15
437	PEMC	2.82	2	5	2	2	0	11
438	PEMC	4.78	2	4	3	2	0	11
439	PEMC	4.80	2	5	3	2	0	12
440	PEMC	1.17	2	5	2	2	0	11
441	PEMC	1.94	2	5	2	2	0	11
442	PEMC	2.65	2	5	2	2	0	11
443	PEMC	1.02	2	3	2	2	0	9
444	L2ABG	36.55	4	4	5	2	0	15
445	L2ABG	21.83	4	4	5	2	0	15
446	PEMC	0.70	2	4	1	2	0	9
447	PEMC	0.99	2	4	1	2	0	9
448	PEMC	1.07	2	4	2	2	0	10
449	PABF	15.93	3	4	5	2	0	14
450	PEMC	4.94	2	5	3	2	0	12
451	PEMC	1.62	2	4	2	2	0	10
452	PEMC	8.09	2	5	5	2	0	14
453	PEMC	4.55	2	4	3	2	0	11
454	PEMC	7.54	2	5	5	2	0	14
455	L2ABG	34.09	4	5	5	2	0	16
457	PEMC	0.27	2	5	1	2	0	10
458	PEMC	0.50	2	4	1	2	0	9
459	PEMC	0.29	2	4	1	2	0	9
460	PABF	2.87	3	5	2	2	0	12
462	PEMC	1.39	2	5	2	2	0	11
464	PEMC	2.47	2	5	2	2	0	11
466	PEMC	1.05	2	5	2	2	0	11
468	PEMC	0.70	2	4	1	2	0	9
469	PEMC	0.34	2	5	1	2	0	10
470	PEMAd	0.35	1	5	1	0	0	7
471	PEMAd	2.93	1	5	2	0	0	8
473	PEMC	0.38	2	5	1	2	0	10
474	L2ABG	36.96	4	4	5	2	0	15
475	L2ABG	80.10	4	5	5	2	0	16
476	L2ABG	168.16	4	4	5	2	3	18
477	L2ABG	65.05	4	4	5	2	0	15
478	L2ABG	23.58	4	4	5	2	0	15
479	L2ABG	20.08	4	5	5	2	0	16
480	L2ABG	23.83	4	5	5	2	3	19

Habitat Suitability Assessment Scores

OBJECTID	ATTRIBUTE	ACRES	REGIME	FOOD	SIZE	TYPE	DENSITY	TOTAL
481	L2ABG	48.96	4	5	5	2	0	16
482	L2ABG	24.98	4	5	5	2	0	16
483	L2ABG	42.29	4	5	5	2	0	16
484	L2ABG	29.18	4	5	5	2	3	19
485	PABF	3.76	3	4	3	2	3	15
486	PABF	0.27	3	4	1	2	0	10
487	PABF	1.98	3	4	2	2	3	14
488	PABF	19.21	3	4	5	2	3	17
489	PABF	0.60	3	4	1	2	0	10
490	PABF	11.84	3	5	5	2	3	18
491	PABF	3.65	3	4	3	2	0	12
492	PABF	10.59	3	5	5	2	0	15
493	PABF	6.77	3	4	4	2	0	13
494	PABF	5.71	3	5	4	2	0	14
495	PABF	22.72	3	5	5	2	0	15
496	PABF	2.11	3	4	2	2	0	11
497	PABFh	1.47	3	4	2	0	3	12
498	PABFx	0.65	3	3	1	0	0	7
499	PABFx	0.36	3	3	1	0	0	7
500	PABFx	0.49	3	5	1	0	0	9
501	PEM1C	1.06	2	5	2	2	0	11
502	PEM1C	1.03	2	4	2	2	0	10
503	PEM1C	2.82	2	4	2	2	0	10
504	PEM1/ABF	6.78	1	4	4	2	0	11
505	PEM1/ABF	2.73	1	3	2	2	0	8
506	PEM1/ABF	1.83	1	4	2	2	0	9
507	PEM1/ABFd	49.60	1	5	5	0	0	11
508	PEM1A	0.35	1	4	1	2	0	8
509	PEM1A	0.32	1	4	1	2	0	8
510	PEM1A	0.48	1	5	1	2	0	9
511	PEM1A	0.30	1	5	1	2	0	9
512	PEM1A	0.28	1	5	1	2	0	9
513	PEM1A	1.07	1	4	2	2	0	9
514	PEM1A	0.37	1	5	1	2	0	9
515	PEM1A	0.41	1	5	1	2	0	9
516	PEM1A	2.16	1	5	2	2	0	10
517	PEM1A	0.78	1	4	1	2	0	8
518	PEM1A	1.00	1	5	1	2	0	9
519	PEM1A	0.30	1	4	1	2	0	8
520	PEM1A	0.83	1	5	1	2	0	9
521	PEM1A	0.42	1	5	1	2	0	9
522	PEM1A	1.06	1	5	2	2	0	10
523	PEM1A	0.41	1	5	1	2	0	9

Habitat Suitability Assessment Scores

OBJECTID	ATTRIBUTE	ACRES	REGIME	FOOD	SIZE	TYPE	DENSITY	TOTAL
524	PEM1A	0.27	1	4	1	2	0	8
525	PEM1C	4.56	2	4	3	2	3	14
526	PEM1A	0.47	1	5	1	2	0	9
527	PEM1A	0.48	1	5	1	2	0	9
528	PEM1A	1.06	1	5	2	2	0	10
529	PEM1A	7.32	1	5	5	2	3	16
530	PEM1A	56.25	1	5	5	2	3	16
531	PEM1A	0.27	1	5	1	2	0	9
532	PEM1A	121.32	1	5	5	2	3	16
533	PEM1C	6.58	2	5	4	2	0	13
534	PEM1A	0.56	1	5	1	2	0	9
535	PEM1A	0.98	1	4	1	2	0	8
536	PEM1A	0.41	1	5	1	2	0	9
537	PEM1A	0.26	1	5	1	2	0	9
538	PEM1A	0.38	1	5	1	2	0	9
539	PEM1A	1.37	1	4	2	2	3	12
540	PEM1A	0.30	1	4	1	2	0	8
541	PEM1A	0.28	1	5	1	2	0	9
542	PEM1A	0.48	1	4	1	2	0	8
543	PEM1A	0.34	1	4	1	2	0	8
544	PEM1A	0.39	1	4	1	2	0	8
545	PEM1A	1.14	1	4	2	2	0	9
546	PEM1A	0.37	1	4	1	2	0	8
547	PEM1A	1.72	1	5	2	2	0	10
548	PEM1A	0.29	1	4	1	2	0	8
549	PEM1A	0.27	1	4	1	2	0	8
550	PEM1A	1.14	1	4	2	2	0	9
551	PEM1A	0.46	1	5	1	2	0	9
552	PEM1C	0.61	2	4	1	2	0	9
553	PEM1A	0.39	1	5	1	2	0	9
554	PEM1A	15.33	1	5	5	2	0	13
555	PEM1A	11.61	1	5	5	2	0	13
556	PEM1A	0.30	1	5	1	2	0	9
557	PEM1A	1.35	1	5	2	2	0	10
558	PEM1A	0.33	1	5	1	2	0	9
559	PEM1A	0.85	1	5	1	2	0	9
560	PEM1Ad	22.07	1	5	5	0	3	14
561	PEM1C	3.44	2	4	3	2	0	11
562	PEM1C	1.10	2	5	2	2	0	11
563	PEM1C	1.61	2	4	2	2	0	10
564	PEM1C	2.85	2	4	2	2	0	10
565	PEM1C	10.37	2	5	5	2	0	14
566	PEM1C	0.78	2	4	1	2	0	9

Habitat Suitability Assessment Scores

OBJECTID	ATTRIBUTE	ACRES	REGIME	FOOD	SIZE	TYPE	DENSITY	TOTAL
567	PEM1C	0.80	2	4	1	2	0	9
568	PEM1C	1.09	2	4	2	2	0	10
569	PEM1C	0.28	2	4	1	2	0	9
570	PEM1C	1.94	2	5	2	2	0	11
571	PEM1C	0.92	2	3	1	2	0	8
572	PEM1C	0.30	2	3	1	2	0	8
573	PEM1C	2.59	2	4	2	2	0	10
574	PEM1C	0.39	2	4	1	2	0	9
575	PEM1C	0.35	2	3	1	2	0	8
576	PEM1C	0.29	2	5	1	2	0	10
577	PEM1C	0.57	2	4	1	2	0	9
578	PEM1C	0.49	2	3	1	2	0	8
579	PEM1C	3.58	2	5	3	2	0	12
580	PEM1C	0.31	2	3	1	2	0	8
581	PEM1C	0.49	2	5	1	2	0	10
582	PEM1C	1.34	2	4	2	2	0	10
583	PEM1C	0.29	2	3	1	2	0	8
584	PEM1C	0.92	2	4	1	2	0	9
585	PEM1C	1.34	2	3	2	2	0	9
586	PEM1C	6.06	2	3	4	2	0	11
587	PEM1C	1.73	2	3	2	2	0	9
588	PEM1C	1.29	2	4	2	2	0	10
589	PEM1C	0.60	2	4	1	2	0	9
590	PEM1C	2.28	2	4	2	2	0	10
591	PEM1C	1.81	2	4	2	2	0	10
592	PEM1C	0.45	2	3	1	2	0	8
593	PEM1C	0.36	2	4	1	2	0	9
594	PEM1C	0.60	2	5	1	2	0	10
595	PEM1C	0.28	2	4	1	2	0	9
596	PEM1C	0.64	2	4	1	2	0	9
597	PEM1C	0.60	2	4	1	2	0	9
598	PEM1C	0.42	2	3	1	2	0	8
599	PEM1C	0.84	2	3	1	2	0	8
600	PEM1C	0.89	2	5	1	2	0	10
601	PEM1C	2.04	2	4	2	2	0	10
602	PEM1C	0.28	2	4	1	2	0	9
603	PEM1C	1.27	2	3	2	2	0	9
604	PEM1C	2.47	2	5	2	2	0	11
605	PEM1C	1.12	2	4	2	2	0	10
606	PEM1C	0.65	2	4	1	2	0	9
607	PEM1C	0.43	2	3	1	2	0	8
608	PEM1C	0.32	2	4	1	2	0	9
609	PEM1C	0.43	2	4	1	2	0	9

Habitat Suitability Assessment Scores

OBJECTID	ATTRIBUTE	ACRES	REGIME	FOOD	SIZE	TYPE	DENSITY	TOTAL
610	PEM1C	0.71	2	5	1	2	0	10
611	PEM1C	1.14	2	4	2	2	0	10
612	PEM1C	5.70	2	5	4	2	0	13
613	PEM1C	4.99	2	4	3	2	0	11
614	PEM1C	1.43	2	4	2	2	0	10
615	PEM1C	0.28	2	4	1	2	0	9
616	PEM1C	0.51	2	4	1	2	0	9
617	PEM1C	0.50	2	4	1	2	0	9
618	PEM1C	2.91	2	4	2	2	0	10
619	PEM1C	2.70	2	4	2	2	0	10
620	PEM1C	0.69	2	5	1	2	0	10
621	PEM1C	0.62	2	5	1	2	0	10
622	PEM1C	0.42	2	5	1	2	0	10
623	PEM1C	3.82	2	5	3	2	0	12
624	PEM1C	1.72	2	5	2	2	0	11
625	PEM1C	0.68	2	5	1	2	0	10
626	PEM1C	0.30	2	5	1	2	0	10
627	PEM1C	1.29	2	5	2	2	0	11
628	PEM1C	0.59	2	4	1	2	0	9
629	PEM1C	6.16	2	5	4	2	0	13
630	PEM1C	1.51	2	5	2	2	3	14
631	PEM1C	0.40	2	4	1	2	3	12
632	PEM1C	0.52	2	5	1	2	0	10
633	PEM1C	0.32	2	4	1	2	0	9
634	PEM1C	0.42	2	5	1	2	3	13
635	PEM1C	0.44	2	5	1	2	0	10
636	PEM1C	0.41	2	5	1	2	0	10
637	PEM1C	0.38	2	5	1	2	0	10
638	PEM1C	0.44	2	5	1	2	0	10
639	PEM1C	6.82	2	5	4	2	0	13
640	PEM1C	39.20	2	5	5	2	0	14
641	PEM1C	3.29	2	4	3	2	0	11
642	PEM1C	3.71	2	5	3	2	0	12
643	PEM1C	1.28	2	5	2	2	0	11
644	PEM1C	1.79	2	5	2	2	0	11
645	PEM1C	7.26	2	4	5	2	0	13
646	PEM1C	0.36	2	5	1	2	0	10
647	PEM1C	2.38	2	4	2	2	0	10
648	PEM1C	1.87	2	5	2	2	0	11
649	PEM1C	2.50	2	4	2	2	0	10
650	PEM1C	1.50	2	4	2	2	0	10
651	PEM1C	0.71	2	4	1	2	0	9
652	PEM1C	0.50	2	5	1	2	0	10

Habitat Suitability Assessment Scores

OBJECTID	ATTRIBUTE	ACRES	REGIME	FOOD	SIZE	TYPE	DENSITY	TOTAL
653	PEM1C	0.26	2	4	1	2	0	9
654	PEM1C	0.45	2	4	1	2	0	9
655	PEM1C	1.73	2	5	2	2	0	11
656	PEM1C	0.41	2	5	1	2	0	10
657	PEM1C	2.36	2	4	2	2	0	10
658	PEM1C	0.57	2	5	1	2	0	10
659	PEM1C	0.32	2	4	1	2	0	9
660	PEM1C	0.49	2	4	1	2	0	9
661	PEM1C	0.54	2	5	1	2	0	10
662	PEM1C	1.64	2	5	2	2	0	11
663	PEM1C	0.62	2	5	1	2	0	10
664	PEM1C	4.57	2	5	3	2	0	12
665	PEM1C	0.72	2	4	1	2	0	9
666	PEM1C	0.57	2	5	1	2	0	10
667	PEM1C	0.37	2	5	1	2	0	10
668	PEM1C	0.34	2	5	1	2	0	10
669	PEM1C	0.43	2	5	1	2	0	10
670	PEM1C	0.86	2	5	1	2	0	10
671	PEM1C	3.88	2	5	3	2	0	12
672	PEM1C	0.91	2	5	1	2	0	10
673	PEM1C	0.33	2	5	1	2	0	10
674	PEM1C	1.12	2	4	2	2	0	10
675	PEM1C	0.26	2	5	1	2	0	10
676	PEM1C	0.88	2	5	1	2	0	10
677	PEM1C	0.65	2	5	1	2	0	10
678	PEM1C	1.42	2	5	2	2	0	11
679	PEM1C	6.97	2	5	4	2	0	13
680	PEM1C	2.50	2	5	2	2	0	11
681	PEM1C	1.08	2	5	2	2	0	11
682	PEM1C	0.68	2	5	1	2	0	10
683	PEM1C	0.27	2	5	1	2	0	10
684	PEM1C	0.66	2	5	1	2	0	10
685	PEM1C	0.49	2	5	1	2	0	10
686	PEM1C	1.92	2	5	2	2	0	11
687	PEM1C	0.35	2	5	1	2	0	10
688	PEM1C	0.38	2	5	1	2	0	10
689	PEM1C	1.38	2	5	2	2	0	11
690	PEM1C	25.14	2	5	5	2	0	14
691	PEM1C	2.69	2	4	2	2	3	13
692	PEM1C	4.16	2	4	3	2	3	14
693	PEM1C	0.28	2	5	1	2	0	10
694	PEM1C	0.43	2	5	1	2	0	10
695	PEM1C	1.31	2	5	2	2	0	11

Habitat Suitability Assessment Scores

OBJECTID	ATTRIBUTE	ACRES	REGIME	FOOD	SIZE	TYPE	DENSITY	TOTAL
696	PEM1C	1.38	2	5	2	2	0	11
697	PEM1C	0.73	2	5	1	2	0	10
698	PEM1C	0.30	2	5	1	2	0	10
699	PEM1C	1.03	2	5	2	2	0	11
700	PEM1C	6.29	2	5	4	2	3	16
701	PEM1C	7.25	2	5	5	2	0	14
702	PEM1C	4.18	2	5	3	2	0	12
703	PEM1C	0.59	2	5	1	2	0	10
704	PEM1C	0.34	2	5	1	2	0	10
705	PEM1C	0.65	2	5	1	2	0	10
706	PEM1C	0.35	2	5	1	2	0	10
707	PEM1C	1.32	2	5	2	2	0	11
708	PEM1C	1.18	2	4	2	2	3	13
709	PEM1C	0.61	2	5	1	2	0	10
710	PEM1C	2.32	2	5	2	2	0	11
711	PEM1C	2.70	2	5	2	2	3	14
712	PEM1C	2.16	2	5	2	2	0	11
713	PEM1A	1.60	1	5	2	2	0	10
714	PEM1C	1.99	2	5	2	2	0	11
715	PEM1C	0.44	2	4	1	2	0	9
716	PEM1C	1.98	2	4	2	2	0	10
717	PEM1C	1.04	2	4	2	2	0	10
718	PEM1C	0.76	2	4	1	2	0	9
719	PEM1C	0.33	2	5	1	2	0	10
720	PEM1C	0.26	2	4	1	2	0	9
721	PEM1C	0.53	2	4	1	2	0	9
722	PEM1C	4.32	2	4	3	2	0	11
723	PEM1C	6.47	2	5	4	2	3	16
724	PEM1C	1.70	2	5	2	2	3	14
725	PEM1C	0.66	2	4	1	2	0	9
726	PEM1C	0.75	2	4	1	2	0	9
727	PEM1C	0.49	2	4	1	2	3	12
728	PEM1C	13.38	2	5	5	2	0	14
729	PEM1C	0.81	2	4	1	2	0	9
730	PEM1C	3.08	2	5	3	2	0	12
731	PEM1C	0.37	2	4	1	2	0	9
732	PEM1C	1.29	2	4	2	2	3	13
733	PEM1C	0.95	2	5	1	2	0	10
734	PEM1C	0.97	2	4	1	2	0	9
735	PEM1C	0.36	2	5	1	2	0	10
736	PEM1C	0.28	2	4	1	2	0	9
737	PEM1C	0.29	2	4	1	2	0	9
738	PEM1C	2.05	2	5	2	2	0	11

Habitat Suitability Assessment Scores

OBJECTID	ATTRIBUTE	ACRES	REGIME	FOOD	SIZE	TYPE	DENSITY	TOTAL
739	PEM1C	4.63	2	5	3	2	0	12
740	PEM1C	4.11	2	5	3	2	0	12
741	PEM1C	0.31	2	5	1	2	0	10
742	PEM1C	0.81	2	5	1	2	0	10
743	PEM1C	0.52	2	5	1	2	0	10
744	PEM1C	0.77	2	4	1	2	0	9
745	PEM1C	1.69	2	4	2	2	0	10
746	PEM1C	0.89	2	4	1	2	0	9
747	PEM1C	0.61	2	4	1	2	0	9
748	PEM1C	2.08	2	5	2	2	0	11
749	PEM1C	0.82	2	4	1	2	0	9
750	PEM1C	1.64	2	4	2	2	0	10
751	PEM1C	3.72	2	5	3	2	0	12
752	PEM1A	1.55	1	5	2	2	0	10
753	PEM1C	0.37	2	5	1	2	0	10
754	PEM1C	0.71	2	5	1	2	0	10
755	PEM1C	1.54	2	5	2	2	0	11
756	PEM1C	2.61	2	5	2	2	0	11
757	PEM1C	0.43	2	4	1	2	0	9
758	PEM1C	0.61	2	5	1	2	0	10
759	PEM1C	0.36	2	5	1	2	0	10
760	PEM1C	0.33	2	5	1	2	0	10
761	PEM1C	1.56	2	4	2	2	0	10
762	PEM1C	0.29	2	4	1	2	0	9
763	PEM1C	0.33	2	5	1	2	0	10
764	PEM1C	1.71	2	4	2	2	0	10
765	PEM1C	0.96	2	4	1	2	0	9
766	PEM1C	1.56	2	5	2	2	0	11
767	PEM1C	2.23	2	5	2	2	0	11
768	PEM1C	0.36	2	4	1	2	0	9
769	PEM1C	0.57	2	4	1	2	0	9
770	PEM1C	0.71	2	4	1	2	0	9
771	PEM1C	2.71	2	5	2	2	0	11
772	PEM1C	0.53	2	5	1	2	0	10
773	PEM1C	0.36	2	4	1	2	0	9
774	PEM1C	0.55	2	5	1	2	0	10
775	PEM1C	2.09	2	5	2	2	0	11
776	PEM1C	0.48	2	4	1	2	0	9
777	PEM1C	3.49	2	5	3	2	0	12
778	PEM1C	0.61	2	5	1	2	0	10
779	PEM1C	0.71	2	5	1	2	0	10
780	PEM1C	0.38	2	5	1	2	0	10
781	PEM1C	0.58	2	5	1	2	0	10

Habitat Suitability Assessment Scores

OBJECTID	ATTRIBUTE	ACRES	REGIME	FOOD	SIZE	TYPE	DENSITY	TOTAL
782	PEM1C	0.97	2	5	1	2	0	10
783	PEM1C	0.31	2	5	1	2	0	10
784	PEM1C	0.78	2	5	1	2	0	10
785	PEM1C	1.05	2	5	2	2	0	11
786	PEM1C	3.47	2	5	3	2	0	12
787	PEM1C	2.72	2	5	2	2	0	11
788	PEM1C	0.91	2	4	1	2	0	9
789	PEM1C	2.28	2	4	2	2	0	10
790	PEM1C	0.46	2	4	1	2	0	9
791	PEM1C	3.22	2	5	3	2	0	12
792	PEM1C	3.08	2	4	3	2	0	11
793	PEM1C	1.97	2	4	2	2	0	10
794	PEM1C	0.60	2	5	1	2	0	10
795	PEM1C	0.64	2	5	1	2	0	10
796	PEM1C	2.39	2	4	2	2	0	10
797	PEM1C	3.02	2	4	3	2	0	11
798	PEM1C	1.74	2	5	2	2	0	11
799	PEM1C	2.57	2	4	2	2	0	10
800	PEM1C	0.37	2	5	1	2	0	10
801	PEM1C	0.45	2	5	1	2	0	10
802	PEM1C	0.37	2	5	1	2	0	10
803	PEM1C	1.58	2	4	2	2	0	10
804	PEM1C	1.15	2	4	2	2	0	10
805	PEM1C	0.33	2	4	1	2	0	9
806	PEM1C	0.38	2	4	1	2	0	9
807	PEM1C	1.60	2	4	2	2	0	10
808	PEM1C	4.62	2	3	3	2	0	10
809	PEM1C	0.27	2	4	1	2	0	9
810	PEM1C	2.69	2	5	2	2	0	11
811	PEM1C	0.77	2	3	1	2	0	8
812	PEM1C	3.74	2	5	3	2	0	12
813	PEM1C	1.11	2	5	2	2	0	11
814	PEM1C	1.12	2	4	2	2	0	10
815	PEM1C	0.91	2	4	1	2	0	9
816	PEM1C	0.77	2	5	1	2	0	10
817	PEM1C	0.49	2	5	1	2	0	10
818	PEM1C	0.26	2	5	1	2	0	10
819	PEM1C	0.87	2	5	1	2	0	10
820	PEM1C	0.97	2	5	1	2	0	10
821	PEM1C	0.53	2	5	1	2	0	10
822	PEM1C	0.81	2	5	1	2	0	10
823	PEM1C	0.37	2	5	1	2	0	10
824	PEM1C	0.39	2	5	1	2	0	10

Habitat Suitability Assessment Scores

OBJECTID	ATTRIBUTE	ACRES	REGIME	FOOD	SIZE	TYPE	DENSITY	TOTAL
825	PEM1C	0.41	2	5	1	2	0	10
826	PEM1C	2.03	2	5	2	2	0	11
827	PEM1C	0.99	2	5	1	2	0	10
828	PEM1C	2.20	2	5	2	2	0	11
829	PEM1C	1.72	2	4	2	2	0	10
830	PEM1C	3.15	2	5	3	2	0	12
831	PEM1C	2.01	2	5	2	2	0	11
832	PEM1C	1.03	2	4	2	2	0	10
833	PEM1C	0.76	2	4	1	2	0	9
834	PEM1C	3.74	2	4	3	2	0	11
835	PEM1C	4.10	2	4	3	2	0	11
836	PEM1C	0.41	2	4	1	2	0	9
837	PEM1C	0.38	2	4	1	2	0	9
838	PEM1C	5.93	2	5	4	2	3	16
839	PEM1C	3.34	2	5	3	2	0	12
840	PEM1C	1.18	2	4	2	2	0	10
841	PEM1C	1.62	2	5	2	2	0	11
842	PEM1C	0.35	2	4	1	2	0	9
843	PEM1C	0.43	2	5	1	2	0	10
844	PEM1C	4.19	2	5	3	2	0	12
845	PEM1C	0.32	2	5	1	2	0	10
846	PEM1C	0.62	2	4	1	2	0	9
847	PEM1C	1.67	2	5	2	2	0	11
848	PEM1C	10.73	2	4	5	2	0	13
849	PEM1C	2.92	2	5	2	2	0	11
850	PEM1C	1.18	2	4	2	2	0	10
851	PEM1C	6.90	2	5	4	2	0	13
852	PEM1C	0.77	2	5	1	2	0	10
853	PEM1C	0.39	2	5	1	2	3	13
854	PEM1C	11.36	2	5	5	2	3	17
855	PEM1C	3.26	2	5	3	2	3	15
856	PEM1C	7.46	2	5	5	2	3	17
857	PEM1C	5.00	2	5	4	2	3	16
858	PEM1C	1.65	2	5	2	2	0	11
859	PEM1C	2.08	2	5	2	2	3	14
860	PEM1C	5.35	2	5	4	2	3	16
861	PEM1Cd	0.61	2	4	1	0	0	7
862	PEM1Cd	0.82	2	4	1	0	0	7
863	PEM1Cd	16.47	2	5	5	0	0	12
864	PEM1Cd	18.54	2	5	5	0	0	12
865	PEM1Cd	0.50	2	4	1	0	0	7
866	PEM1Cd	0.55	2	4	1	0	0	7
867	PEM1Cd	1.36	2	5	2	0	0	9

Habitat Suitability Assessment Scores

OBJECTID	ATTRIBUTE	ACRES	REGIME	FOOD	SIZE	TYPE	DENSITY	TOTAL
868	PEM1Cd	11.33	2	4	5	0	0	11
869	PEM1Cd	3.99	2	4	3	0	0	9
870	PEM1F	7.75	3	4	5	2	0	14
871	PEM1F	0.37	3	4	1	2	3	13
872	PEM1F	1.60	3	4	2	2	3	14
873	PEM1F	37.80	3	5	5	2	3	18
874	PEM1F	182.04	3	5	5	2	3	18
875	PEM1F	44.47	3	4	5	2	3	17
876	PEM1F	37.12	3	4	5	2	3	17
877	PEM1F	41.86	3	5	5	2	3	18
878	PEM1F	15.27	3	5	5	2	3	18
879	PEM1F	0.51	3	5	1	2	0	11
880	PEM1F	0.45	3	5	1	2	0	11
881	PEM1F	13.42	3	5	5	2	0	15
882	PEM1F	14.81	3	5	5	2	0	15
883	PEM1F	2.48	3	5	2	2	0	12
884	PEM1F	2.53	3	4	2	2	0	11
885	PEM1F	1.88	3	5	2	2	0	12
886	PEM1F	1.76	3	5	2	2	0	12
887	PEM1F	2.40	3	5	2	2	0	12
888	PEM1F	1.38	3	4	2	2	0	11
889	PEM1F	4.51	3	5	3	2	0	13
890	PEM1F	7.23	3	5	5	2	0	15
891	PEM1F	6.45	3	5	4	2	3	17
892	PEM1F	28.17	3	5	5	2	3	18
893	PEM1F	0.99	3	4	1	2	0	10
894	PEM1F	1.70	3	5	2	2	3	15
895	PEM1F	2.45	3	5	2	2	3	15
896	PEM1F	2.34	3	5	2	2	3	15
897	PEM1F	2.68	3	4	2	2	0	11
898	PEM1F	26.95	3	5	5	2	3	18
899	PEM1F	5.36	3	4	4	2	0	13
900	PEM1F	25.35	3	5	5	2	3	18
901	PEM1F	0.74	3	4	1	2	0	10
902	L2ABG	33.00	4	4	5	2	0	15
903	L2ABG	16.43	4	4	5	2	0	15
904	PABF	9.45	3	5	5	2	0	15
905	PABF	10.78	3	4	5	2	0	14
906	PABF	36.69	3	5	5	2	0	15
907	PABF	13.06	3	5	5	2	0	15
908	PABF	56.95	3	5	5	2	0	15
909	PABF	32.98	3	4	5	2	0	14
910	PABFd	19.79	3	4	5	0	0	12

Habitat Suitability Assessment Scores

OBJECTID	ATTRIBUTE	ACRES	REGIME	FOOD	SIZE	TYPE	DENSITY	TOTAL
911	PEM1A	0.76	1	5	1	2	0	9
912	PEM1A	0.29	1	4	1	2	0	8
913	PEM1A	0.47	1	5	1	2	0	9
914	PEM1A	0.74	1	5	1	2	0	9
915	PEM1Ad	0.49	1	5	1	0	0	7
916	PEM1C	0.65	2	5	1	2	0	10
917	PEM1C	0.28	2	5	1	2	0	10
918	PEM1C	0.82	2	5	1	2	0	10
919	PEM1C	0.74	2	5	1	2	0	10
920	PEM1C	0.63	2	5	1	2	0	10
921	PEM1C	1.60	2	5	2	2	0	11
922	PEM1C	0.69	2	5	1	2	0	10
923	PEM1C	4.81	2	4	3	2	0	11
924	PEM1C	0.65	2	4	1	2	0	9
925	PEM1C	2.03	2	5	2	2	0	11
926	PEM1C	1.80	2	4	2	2	0	10
927	PEM1C	0.65	2	5	1	2	0	10
928	PEM1C	0.55	2	3	1	2	0	8
929	PEM1C	2.34	2	3	2	2	0	9
930	PEM1C	1.01	2	3	2	2	0	9
931	PEM1C	0.37	2	5	1	2	0	10
932	PEM1C	1.04	2	5	2	2	0	11
933	PEM1C	1.36	2	5	2	2	0	11
934	PEM1C	0.85	2	5	1	2	0	10
935	PEM1C	0.55	2	4	1	2	0	9
936	PEM1C	9.92	2	5	5	2	0	14
937	PEM1C	1.34	2	4	2	2	0	10
938	PEM1C	2.10	2	5	2	2	0	11
939	PEM1C	0.97	2	5	1	2	0	10
940	PEM1C	5.63	2	5	4	2	0	13
941	PEM1C	3.43	2	4	3	2	0	11
942	PEM1C	0.58	2	4	1	2	0	9
943	PEM1C	0.39	2	4	1	2	0	9
944	PEM1C	9.94	2	4	5	2	0	13
945	PEM1C	2.05	2	4	2	2	0	10
946	PEM1C	2.29	2	5	2	2	3	14
947	PEM1C	18.36	2	4	5	2	0	13
948	PEM1C	8.74	2	5	5	2	0	14
949	PEM1C	4.20	2	4	3	2	0	11
950	PEM1Cd	4.64	2	5	3	0	0	10
951	PEM1F	3.82	3	5	3	2	0	13
952	L2ABG	120.44	4	5	5	2	3	19
953	PEM1C	16.08	2	4	5	2	0	13

Habitat Suitability Assessment Scores

OBJECTID	ATTRIBUTE	ACRES	REGIME	FOOD	SIZE	TYPE	DENSITY	TOTAL
954	PEM1C	2.11	2	5	2	2	3	14
955	PEM1C	0.37	2	4	1	2	0	9
956	PEM1C	0.33	2	3	1	2	3	11
957	PEM1C	0.37	2	5	1	2	0	10
958	PEM1C	1.81	2	4	2	2	0	10
959	PEM1C	0.74	2	5	1	2	0	10
960	PEM1C	3.54	2	5	3	2	3	15
961	PEM1C	3.57	2	4	3	2	0	11
962	PEM1C	1.03	2	4	2	2	3	13
963	PEM1C	0.53	2	5	1	2	0	10
964	PABF	11.12	3	5	5	2	0	15
965	PEM1C	1.24	2	5	2	2	0	11
966	PEM1C	0.72	2	5	1	2	0	10
967	PABF	7.86	3	5	5	2	0	15
968	PEM1C	6.91	2	5	4	2	0	13
969	PEM1C	3.04	2	5	3	2	0	12
970	PEM1C	5.57	2	5	4	2	0	13
971	PEM1F	3.55	3	4	3	2	0	12
972	PABF	32.71	3	5	5	2	0	15
973	PEM1Cd	1.37	2	4	2	0	0	8
974	PEM1F	3.38	3	5	3	2	0	13
975	PEM1F	4.38	3	4	3	2	0	12
976	PEM1F	4.35	3	5	3	2	0	13
977	PEM1A	0.29	1	5	1	2	0	9
978	PEM1C	0.32	2	4	1	2	0	9
979	PEM1C	0.33	2	4	1	2	0	9
980	PEM1C	3.20	2	5	3	2	0	12
981	PEM1C	1.81	2	4	2	2	0	10
982	PEM1C	4.46	2	5	3	2	0	12
983	PABF	8.83	3	5	5	2	0	15
984	PEM1C	1.58	2	4	2	2	0	10
985	PEM1C	7.92	2	4	5	2	0	13
986	PEM1C	5.98	2	5	4	2	3	16
987	PEM1C	5.15	2	5	4	2	0	13
988	PABF	8.52	3	5	5	2	0	15
989	PEM1C	1.66	2	5	2	2	0	11
990	PEM1C	0.49	2	4	1	2	0	9
991	PEM1C	2.25	2	4	2	2	0	10
992	PEM1C	0.30	2	4	1	2	0	9
993	PEM1C	0.45	2	4	1	2	0	9
994	PEM1C	5.98	2	4	4	2	0	12
995	PEM1C	1.11	2	4	2	2	0	10
996	PEM1C	2.20	2	5	2	2	0	11

Habitat Suitability Assessment Scores

OBJECTID	ATTRIBUTE	ACRES	REGIME	FOOD	SIZE	TYPE	DENSITY	TOTAL
997	PEM1A	3.33	1	5	3	2	0	11
998	PABF	58.26	3	5	5	2	0	15