

C:\temp\150999_0_art_file_1002634_k11zp1.doc

Biodiversity quality: a paradigm for biodiversity

Summary

A statistically-based assessment of biodiversity that allows biodiversity, and change in biodiversity, to be measured.

By Alan Feest^{1&2}, Timothy D. Aldred¹ and Katrin Jedamzik¹

1.

Water and Environmental Management Research Centre

University of Bristol

83 Woodland Road

Bristol BS8 1US

UK

A.Feest@bris.ac.uk

2. ecosulis ltd.

www.ecosulis.co.uk

C:\temp\150999_0_art_file_1002634_k11zp1.doc

Summary

The balance of biodiversity indices derived from *de novo* or metadata analysis of standardised biodiversity sampling allows a picture of **biodiversity quality** to be formed. This is an advance on the international definition of biodiversity, where it is referred to as the variability of genes, species and ecosystems, but where the precise meaning of the word 'variability' is not defined. This new approach, which expresses biodiversity as a series of numerical indices relating to functionality or quality, makes biodiversity open to statistical analysis for estimation of probability of difference over time, or between sites or taxonomic groups. The relationship to functional biodiversity is also discussed.

Abstract

The internationally accepted definition of biodiversity creates difficulty in measuring difference and change. The authors suggest that well-sampled data can be used to generate a range of numerical indices reflecting species group characteristics/functionality (Species Richness, Simpson's Index, Population Density, Biomass and Species Conservation Value) that can be viewed in combination to create a picture of **Biodiversity Quality**. This overall approach has considerable advantages over the currently accepted Convention on Biological Diversity definition, based on the "variability" of genes, species and ecosystems, since the numerical expression of the indices allows the probability of difference between biodiversity quality trends and values over time, and between sites or taxonomic groups, to be assessed for statistical inference of difference.

Introduction

The Convention on Biological Diversity defines biodiversity as follows: “**the VARIABILITY [our capitals] among living organisms from all sources including, *inter alia*, terrestrial, marine and other aquatic ecosystems and the ecological complexes of which they are part; this includes diversity within species, between species and of ecosystems**”. This definition hangs on the use of the word ‘variability’, in that this is at three levels: within species (genetic); between species; and between ecosystems. At the same time, ‘variability’ implies that a list of the different genes, species and ecosystems will describe the biodiversity. There are two major problems in this approach:

1. Two of the three levels of biodiversity present practical problems in their assessment:

i. **Genes** often require specific technical equipment and expertise to be studied fully, and due to the large number of variations of genes, only either very small populations, or clearly defined genetic variants (such as are demonstrated in domestic animals) can reasonably be studied. It is therefore impractical to study the large populations of many organisms at this level, as many individuals would be genetically different in some way from each other at some of the reference loci!

ii. **Ecosystems** suffer from a scale effect because they can be studied at landscape scale (e.g. a rainforest basin), locally (e.g. a woodland) or

microscopically (e.g. the composition of a soil particle). At what arbitrary scale do we measure ecosystem biodiversity, and why?

Most ecologists have taken the practical and sensible route of studying biodiversity at the species level (species are generally far easier to define), rather than attempt the more difficult gene or ecosystem elements.

Observations of species biodiversity will also have implications for the understanding of genetic and ecosystem biodiversity.

2. The use of the word “variability” carries a problem in that, whilst it encompasses “difference”, it does not help in the measurement of biodiversity. Common practice is to measure Species Richness (the number of species in a unit area) ¹. This has been a useful approach because changes in Species Richness at a site can be recorded easily; but Species Richness is an indiscriminate statistic that, whilst relatively easy to sample, conveys very little information ². How does one compare changes in Species Richness? Are all species equal? Is a tiger equal to a domestic cat? Obviously not.

The practical solution to these problems has been to use an indicator approach, for example the EU 2010 countdown process ³ has a proposed 26 indicators (mostly indicating pressures on biodiversity). However, this approach also has problems because an indicator is just that: a proxy for the real thing. An estimation of the reliability of the indicator is needed, but in most cases this reliability is unknown or just not considered. Indicators are therefore rarely (if ever) validated against what they are supposed to indicate.

For example, one would assume it was safe to conclude that predatory birds are good indicators of avian biodiversity (well-studied, large, countable, charismatic, top predators). Predatory birds in the UK have had a considerable renaissance and numbers and distribution are the best for at least thirty years or more. So is the avifauna of the UK thriving? No, there has been a disastrous decline of the smaller farmland birds and also some woodland birds, with some populations declining over 90% in the last twenty years ⁴. Predatory birds would have not indicated this fact.

So what is the way forward? We suggest that, at a time when change in biodiversity is of global concern, a new approach that allows easy statistical assessment of change in biodiversity is needed. We suggest that this approach can be accommodated in the CBD definition as a clarification of the word “variability”. For example: ‘Variability is expressed as a range of biodiversity-related indices’.

Hooper *et al.* ⁵ approached the problem of biodiversity from a theoretical basis. They assessed different measures of functional diversity and considered this term to include composition, richness, evenness and interactions. Searching for a pragmatic presentation of biodiversity that would be of utility to ecological consultants and their clients, Feest ⁶ considered biodiversity to consist of species richness, evenness/dominance, biomass, population and rarity/intrinsic value and proposed ways of measuring these elements. It can be seen that these two approaches have come to similar conclusions in attempting to take biodiversity beyond the current definition.

Macrofungi: the worst case

In our own studies we have, in the past, been asked to do macrofungal surveys (Agaricales, Boletales and Gasteromycetales) as part of the biodiversity baseline monitoring of sites threatened by development or of particular conservation interest.

It was obvious to us that a new approach was required to provide a meaningful survey methodology and biodiversity data information. We also assumed that any methodology that could solve the problem of macrofungal biodiversity recording might also be useful for other species groups. Our methodology allows the key role played by fungi to be integrated into community studies in a way that avoids several inherent problems ⁷. The following analysis also illustrates some of the problems of the current macrofungal biodiversity survey methodologies:

1. Historically, records have been collected in a random way (people with varying taxonomic expertise “walking about”) so that they are the result of an unknown skill, effort or time input. These records are often in the form of a site species list, which is not standardized in its compilation, nor does it have a methodology for determining when a species can reasonably be considered no longer present. Lists therefore grow and grow and represent cumulative historical input rather than current biodiversity levels. Tofts and Orton ⁸ recorded fungal species present on a site for 25 years. At the end of that time they were recording new species at the same rate as when they started; *ergo*,

it could be concluded that there was an infinite number of species at the site!. In our macrofungal methodology, the input effort is standardised and the species lists for each survey are therefore comparable. If required, a cumulative species list can be compiled for a site with an indication of the number of surveys contributing to the list and over what timescale.

2. Historically, the only records available are of fruiting bodies, but at any one time most of the fungi present are not fruiting. Ectomycorrhizal species can be recorded by the examination of mycorrhizal fine roots, but often not to the species level and the effort required is considerable. Given that we now know^{9, 10, 11} that the situation below ground is highly dynamic, how reliable will this information be? It has now also been demonstrated that the incidence of mycorrhizal species occurrence on tree roots varies considerably and may be seasonal¹². Our methodology samples the fruiting species as representing part of the whole species set. The root assessment technique does not, of course, deal with the occurrence of saprophytic fungi or those that vary in activity according to the prevailing conditions.

3. Mass fruit bodies may represent a single cloned individual, singular individuals or a mixture of both. What is to be counted? Our methodology assesses the biomass and therefore the relative biomass proportions of each species can be inferred as a component of biodiversity¹³.

4. Fruit body production is seasonal, so records are of those fruit bodies present at the time of the survey (date often not recorded!). Fruit body

production is also influenced by weather conditions, so the right weather is also a prerequisite of a survey. Our methodology partially addresses this problem as although population/biomass and species richness will vary with fruiting conditions, the other indices might not.

The Methodology

The methodology that was devised to solve the problem of macrofungal biodiversity recording was described fully in Feest ⁶ and in essence consists of recording numbers of fruit bodies in twenty standardised 4m radius circles ($\approx 1000 \text{ m}^2$) along a line transect and then calculating a variety of indices as follows:

Species Richness: the number of species in a unit area; 1000 m^2 ;

Even-ness/Dominance: Shannon-Wiener, Simpson and Berger-Parker indices, based on both numbers of fruit bodies and relative species biomass;

Density/population: total number of individual fruit bodies in 1000 m^2 ;

Relative Biomass: calculated from the area of the cap of the fungus multiplied by the number of individuals (see ¹³);

Species Conservation Value Index (SCVI): calculated as a mean number representing the commonness/rarity of the species recorded and referenced from authoritative identification handbooks ¹⁴. The standard deviation is also presented, so that the presence of a rare species will be indicated by the SD even if its presence is concealed in the mean value of the larger number of more common species.

A review of the existing data from other biodiversity recording schemes showed that the devised methodology contained the same elements as that of Pollard and Yates ¹⁵ butterfly survey, which is well accepted and fully validated. To test the broadness of the method, data collected for the Dutch Butterfly Monitoring Scheme (de Vlinderstichting) was subjected to the above treatment to see if it added further value to the data. Biomass was assumed to be proportional to wing width ¹⁶ but the difference between the largest and smallest species is much less than for macrofungi, so in essence biomass and population density are related for butterflies

The above methodology is based on the counting of individuals, but it is not possible to record all organisms in this way, so we also applied the technique to survey data of Bryophytes, recorded as presence or absence (1 or an empty cell) within twenty 4m radius circles. The biomass input was obviously not used in this analysis.

To speed up the processing of data, a simple computer programme (Fungib) was created that presented the data in such a way that not only were the indices calculated and presented, but also the species accumulation curve shown, so that one can estimate crudely when most easily-detected species have been recorded and further sampling effort is probably not justified.

Results

The results of the analysis of examples of three species groups (Macrofungi, Butterflies and Bryophytes) are given in Figures 1, 2 and 3 (the latter two to be found in Appendices 1 and 2?).

Figure 1:

Shows a site (Lower Woods: East Stanley Coppice, Gloucestershire UK)[surveyed for fungi. The calculated biodiversity indices are presented in the left hand corner. Note that the SD of the mean SCVI is presented and that the evenness/dominance indices are calculated based on individuals and also biomass; the latter is presented in parentheses. The species accumulation curve indicates that after sample sixteen, only two further species are recorded and that therefore the Species Richness of 47 is close to the total number of species present at the time of the survey. (Species Richness modelled Chao 1 = 57 ± 6 and Chao 2 = 65 ± 9)

Figure 2 (?Appendix 1):

Shows a survey of butterflies on Dutch site (169/03) in the Vlinderstichting scheme. Species richness of 23 is probably close to the actual because no new species are recorded after plot twelve (Species Richness modelled Chao 1 = 23 and Chao2 = 25) and the SCVI SD of 3.56 indicates the presence of a rare species.

Figure 3 (Appendix 2?):

Shows bryophytes recorded simultaneously with the fungi in the plots in Fig.1 indicated by presence (1) or absence (empty cell). The sum column indicates proportional incidence out of twenty. It is clear that the Species Richness is much lower than for macrofungi, indicated by the species accumulation curve. The steepness of the curve also shows that an estimation of the total species richness close to the actual is reached quickly.

Figure 3 shows that bryophytes are a good example of taxa that are not possible to count as individuals but can still yield information on a presence/absence basis.

These figures show that indices can be calculated *de novo* or retrospectively on well surveyed data and even such difficult groups as macrofungi can provide information.

The stability of some of these values despite the differences in the actual species recorded is an unlooked-for element. For macrofungi Feest¹⁷ reported several sites that had been surveyed over a number of years where the data of some indices (especially SCVI) remained very stable over time despite differences in weather each year (see Table 1).

Table 1: Macrofungal data for 1995 and 1997 at Pratt's Wood, Somerset, UK

Statistic	1995	1997	t-test
SCVI	3.19	2.97	P=0.45
Mean pop	11.7	7.15	P=0.20

Biomass	175	538	P=0.14
Species Richness	26	34	
Total Species List		51	

Only nine (<20%) species occurred in both years and yet the SCVI is very similar in both years. The biomass is different (but not quite significantly), illustrating that the years probably did differ in respect of the macrofungal fruit body yield of the site, even if the rarity of the species did not

Feest⁶ reported the macrofungi records from two sites: East End Wood, New Forest, Hampshire UK, and Weston Big Wood, Somerset, UK, where it was shown clearly how the sites differed statistically. F-tests of the SCVI, Fruit Body Density and Biomass showed the two sites are significantly different ($p = 0.05$). In Feest's paper, he also shows how the data is amenable to more complicated statistical analysis with a Principle Component Analysis of seventeen years of butterfly data in the Netherlands against nitrogen Critical Load Exceedence (see below).

Discussion

By assessing the balance between a range of indices and their relative magnitudes, we can ascertain the 'biodiversity quality' of a site. Using numerical values to represent the pattern of Biodiversity Quality, it becomes possible to compare sites statistically over time or spatially (see⁶ and¹⁸ for examples) both by the T-test and F-test (for mean values and variance).

Thus, in a comparison we can prioritise sites, depending on the objective of the prioritisation, for an individual statistic (e.g. Species Richness or Biomass), or for biodiversity quality, based on a suite of statistics ¹⁸. The latter option satisfies the criticism by Gaston & Spicer ¹⁹ that biodiversity cannot be encapsulated by a single number. A range of indices representing the various qualities of the biodiversity being studied is much more informative and open to interpretation and agrees with Hooper *et al.* ⁵ who prefer a “wide” definition of biodiversity that encompasses varying functional properties.

For example, a site may have a biodiversity quality that is dominated by the high biomass of a few species (low species richness), in contrast to another site where the opposite prevails. Under these circumstances, the biodiversity quality of the two sites is very different and the better value of one site over the other might be expressed by a third index such as SCVI.

A more practical example comes from research commissioned by the European Environment Agency, where Feest, van Swaay and Hinsberg ²⁰ were asked to link two of the proposed 2010 biodiversity indicators, namely: butterfly populations and nitrogen deposition (as expressed by the nitrogen critical load exceedence or CLE) (also reported in ¹⁸). The data was supplied by the Dutch Butterfly Conservation Society (de Vlinderstichting) who had a seventeen-year run of well-sampled standardized data for a large number of sites. These data were then allied with CLE data for the sites and a Principle Components Analysis (PCA) of all indices plus a created nitrogen sensitivity index (SNVI) produced the following result:

Species richness was not a suitable indicator of a linkage (whereas the other indices were) since the nitrogen-sensitive species were being replaced by the nitrophilic/generalist species. The usual way of equating biodiversity with species richness would have therefore missed the other linkages.

A further benefit of the Biodiversity Quality approach is that different taxonomic groups (fungi and bryophytes as in figs 1 and 3 above, or, for example, spiders and beetles) can be compared in terms of their Biodiversity Quality, thereby facilitating assessment of the 'biodiversity importance' of sites.

What is proposed here does not create any new individual indices or values for biodiversity and follows the recommendations of Hooper *et al.*⁵. The approach of viewing these in combination is new and, it is suggested, adds significantly to the study of biodiversity and changes occurring now as a result of global climate change, habitat alteration, nutrient enrichment²¹ and development pressures.

What emerges from this recommendation is a more complex picture of biodiversity, beyond political or economic interpretations, which reflects the situation far better and reduces the risk of misleading results that beleaguers the current approaches. The clarification of the word "variability" in the CBD definition through this biodiversity quality paradigm should assist ecologists in relating biodiversity to the socio-economic context that the CBD also recognises as important in the achievement of the 2010 aim of reducing the

rate of loss of biodiversity. The disciplines will be communicating in the same numerical terms something which is currently not possible and is impeding progress.

References

Baar, J. and T.W. Kuyper 1998. Restoration of the above ground ectomycorrhizal flora in *Pinus sylvestris* (Scots Pine) in the Netherlands by the removal of litter and humus. *Restoration Ecology* **6**:227-237.

Convention on Biological Diversity, 1992. (available from <http://www.biodiv.org/>)

Comas, L.H., Bouma, T.J. & Eissenstat, D.M. (2002) Linking root traits to potential growth rate in six temperate tree species. *Oecologia*, **132**:34-43

Eissenstat, D.M. and Yanai, R.D. (1997) The ecology of root lifespan. *Advances in Ecological Research*. **27**:1-59.

Espeleta, J.F. and Clark, D.A. (2007) Multi-scale variation in fine-root biomass in a tropical rain forest: A seven year study. *Ecological Monographs*: **77**(3): 377-404.

Feest, A. 2006 . Establishing Baseline Indices for the Quality of the Biodiversity of restored Habitats Using a Standardized Sampling Process. *Restoration Ecology* **14**: 112-122.

Feest, A. 2007. Getting the Best out of Sampling Data. Proceedings of IEEM Spring Conference. Institute of Ecology and Environmental Managers. , **43** Southgate Street, Winchester, Hampshire, SO23 9EH, UK.

Feest, A. van Swaay, C. and Hinsberg A. (2008) Research to test the integration of the Nitrogen Critical Load Exceedence model (EG4) into the

2010 target by linking it to the butterfly indicator (EG1). For the European Environment Agency (contract EEA/BSS/07010)

Gaston, K.J. and J.I. Spicer. 2004. Biodiversity: an introduction. Blackwell, Oxford. UK.

Guralnick, R.P. , A.W. Hill and Meredith Lane. 2007. Towards a collaborative, global infrastructure for biodiversity assessment. *Ecology Letters*. **8**: 663-672.

Hooper, D.U., Chapin, F.S.III, Ewel, J.J., Hector, A., Inchausti, P., Laval, S., Lawton, J.H., Lodge, D.M., Loreau, M., Naeem, S., Schmid, B., Setälä, H., Symstad, A.J., Vandermeer, J. and Wardle, D.A. (2005) Effects of Biodiversity on Ecosystem Functioning: A Consensus of Current Knowledge, *Ecological Monographs*, **75**(1): 3-35.

Mayor, J.R., Schuur, E.A.G., and Henkel, W.W. (2009) Elucidating the nutritional dynamics of fungi using stable isotopes. *Ecology Letters*. **12**:171-183.

Miller, W.E. (1977) Wing measure as a size index in Lepidoptera: the family Olethreutidae. *Annals of the Entomological Society of America*, **43**:223-235.

Newson, S.E., Woodburn, R.J.W., Noble, D.G., Baillie, S.R. and Gregory, R.D. (2005) Evaluating the Breeding Bird Survey for producing national population size and density estimates. *Bird Study*. **52**: 42-54

Petchey, O.L., Hector, A. and Gaston, K.J. (2004) How do different measures of Functional Diversity perform? *Ecology*. **85**:847-857.

Pollard, E and T.J. Yates 1993. Monitoring butterflies for Ecology and conservation. Chapman & Hall. London. UK.

Toth, B.B. and A. Feest. 2007. A simple method to assess macrofungal sporocarp biomass for investigating ecological change. *Can. J. Bot.* **85**: 652-658.

Walker, J.F., Miller, O.K.Jr & Horton, J.L. (2008) Seasonal dynamics of ectomycorrhizal fungus assemblages on oak seedlings in the southeastern Appalachian Mountains. *Mycorrhiza* **18**:123-132 .

1. R.P. Guralnick, A.W. Hill, Meredith Lane, *Ecology Letters*. **8**: 663-672 (2007).

2. O.L. Petchey , A. Hector, K.J. Gaston, *Ecology* **85**:847-857 (2004)

3. Technical Report 11/207; European Environment Agency, Copenhagen Denmark

4. S.E. Newson, R.J.W. Woodburn, D.G. Noble, S.R. Baillie, R.D. Gregory, *Bird Study*. **52**: 42-54 (2005).

5. D.U. Hooper, F.S.III Chapin, J.J. Ewel, A. Hector, P. Inchausti, *et al.* *Ecological Monographs*, **75**(1): 3-35. (2005).

6. A. Feest, *Restoration Ecology*, **14**: 112-122 (2006).

7. A. Feest, *Proceedings of IEEM Spring Conference*. Institute of Ecology and Environmental Managers. , **43** Southgate Street, Winchester, Hampshire, SO23 9EH, UK (2007).

8. R.J. Tofts, P.D. Orton, *The Mycologist* .12: 98-102 (1998).

9. L.H. Comas, , T.J. Bouma, D.M. Eissenstat, *Oecologia*. **132**:34-43(2002).

10. D.M. Eissenstat, R.D. Yanai, *Advances in Ecological Research*. **27**:1-59 (1997).

11. J.F. Espelata, D.A. Clark, *Ecological Monographs*. **77**(3):377-404 (2007).

12. J.F. Walker, O.K.Jr Miller, ,J.L. Horton, *Mycorrhiza*. **18**:123-132 (2008).

13. B.B. Toth, A. Feest, *Can. J. Bot.* **85**: 652-658 (2007).

14. R. Coutecuisse, B. Duhem, *Mushrooms and toadstools of Britain and Europe* (Harper Collins, London, UK.1995).

15. Pollard, E and T.J. Yates, *Monitoring butterflies for Ecology and Conservation*. (Chapman & Hall. London. UK. 1993).

16. W.E. Miller, *Annals of the Entomological Society of America*, **43**:223-235 (1977).

17. A. Feest, *J. Practical Ecol. Conserv.* **3**: 23-32 (1999).
18. A. Feest, *Management of Environ. Quality.* **20**: 21-32 (2009).
19. K.J. Gaston, J.I. Spicer, *Biodiversity: an introduction* (Blackwell, Oxford. UK. 2004).
20. A. Feest, C. van Swaay, A. Hinsberg, *Research to test the integration of the Nitrogen Critical Load Exceedence model (EG4) into the 2010 target by linking it to the butterfly indicator (EG1).* For the European Environment Agency (contract EEA/BSS/07010) (2008).
21. J. Baar, T.W. Kuyper, *Restoration Ecology* **6**:227-237 (1998).
1. Convention on Biological Diversity, 1992. (available from <<http://www.biodiv.org/>>)

Figure 1.

Fungib program printout of a biodiversity survey of macrofungi in East Stanley Coppice, Lower Woods Gloucestershire, UK. Species are listed down the left-hand column and the occurrence of macrofungi in the 20 plot samples are given across the figure. The three right-hand columns give the total number of fruit bodies recorded for each species, their relative conservation value and their relative biomass. The calculated biodiversity quality indices are given in the left hand corner. The species accumulation curve can be seen to come to an asymptote at around plot 18.

Figure 2.

Fungib program printout of a butterfly survey conducted by de Vlinderstichting. Details as for figure 1.

Figure 3.

Fungib printout of a bryophyte survey conducted simultaneously with the macrofungal survey shown in Figure 1. Details as for Figure 1.

Lower Woods East (Shoreline Plot)
26/1/2009

Species Name	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	25	26	27	28	29	30	31	32	33	34	35	36	37	38	39	40	41	42	43	44	45	46	47	48	49	50	51	52	53	54	55	56	57	58	59	60	61	62	63	64	65	66	67	68	69	70	71	72	73	74	75	76	77	78	79	80	81	82	83	84	85	86	87	88	89	90	91	92	93	94	95	96	97	98	99	100	101	102	103	104	105	106	107	108	109	110	111	112	113	114	115	116	117	118	119	120	121	122	123	124	125	126	127	128	129	130	131	132	133	134	135	136	137	138	139	140	141	142	143	144	145	146	147	148	149	150	151	152	153	154	155	156	157	158	159	160	161	162	163	164	165	166	167	168	169	170	171	172	173	174	175	176	177	178	179	180	181	182	183	184	185	186	187	188	189	190	191	192	193	194	195	196	197	198	199	200	201	202	203	204	205	206	207	208	209	210	211	212	213	214	215	216	217	218	219	220	221	222	223	224	225	226	227	228	229	230	231	232	233	234	235	236	237	238	239	240	241	242	243	244	245	246	247	248	249	250	251	252	253	254	255	256	257	258	259	260	261	262	263	264	265	266	267	268	269	270	271	272	273	274	275	276	277	278	279	280	281	282	283	284	285	286	287	288	289	290	291	292	293	294	295	296	297	298	299	300	301	302	303	304	305	306	307	308	309	310	311	312	313	314	315	316	317	318	319	320	321	322	323	324	325	326	327	328	329	330	331	332	333	334	335	336	337	338	339	340	341	342	343	344	345	346	347	348	349	350	351	352	353	354	355	356	357	358	359	360	361	362	363	364	365	366	367	368	369	370	371	372	373	374	375	376	377	378	379	380	381	382	383	384	385	386	387	388	389	390	391	392	393	394	395	396	397	398	399	400	401	402	403	404	405	406	407	408	409	410	411	412	413	414	415	416	417	418	419	420	421	422	423	424	425	426	427	428	429	430	431	432	433	434	435	436	437	438	439	440	441	442	443	444	445	446	447	448	449	450	451	452	453	454	455	456	457	458	459	460	461	462	463	464	465	466	467	468	469	470	471	472	473	474	475	476	477	478	479	480	481	482	483	484	485	486	487	488	489	490	491	492	493	494	495	496	497	498	499	500	501	502	503	504	505	506	507	508	509	510	511	512	513	514	515	516	517	518	519	520	521	522	523	524	525	526	527	528	529	530	531	532	533	534	535	536	537	538	539	540	541	542	543	544	545	546	547	548	549	550	551	552	553	554	555	556	557	558	559	560	561	562	563	564	565	566	567	568	569	570	571	572	573	574	575	576	577	578	579	580	581	582	583	584	585	586	587	588	589	590	591	592	593	594	595	596	597	598	599	600	601	602	603	604	605	606	607	608	609	610	611	612	613	614	615	616	617	618	619	620	621	622	623	624	625	626	627	628	629	630	631	632	633	634	635	636	637	638	639	640	641	642	643	644	645	646	647	648	649	650	651	652	653	654	655	656	657	658	659	660	661	662	663	664	665	666	667	668	669	670	671	672	673	674	675	676	677	678	679	680	681	682	683	684	685	686	687	688	689	690	691	692	693	694	695	696	697	698	699	700	701	702	703	704	705	706	707	708	709	710	711	712	713	714	715	716	717	718	719	720	721	722	723	724	725	726	727	728	729	730	731	732	733	734	735	736	737	738	739	740	741	742	743	744	745	746	747	748	749	750	751	752	753	754	755	756	757	758	759	760	761	762	763	764	765	766	767	768	769	770	771	772	773	774	775	776	777	778	779	780	781	782	783	784	785	786	787	788	789	790	791	792	793	794	795	796	797	798	799	800	801	802	803	804	805	806	807	808	809	810	811	812	813	814	815	816	817	818	819	820	821	822	823	824	825	826	827	828	829	830	831	832	833	834	835	836	837	838	839	840	841	842	843	844	845	846	847	848	849	850	851	852	853	854	855	856	857	858	859	860	861	862	863	864	865	866	867	868	869	870	871	872	873	874	875	876	877	878	879	880	881	882	883	884	885	886	887	888	889	890	891	892	893	894	895	896	897	898	899	900	901	902	903	904	905	906	907	908	909	910	911	912	913	914	915	916	917	918	919	920	921	922	923	924	925	926	927	928	929	930	931	932	933	934	935	936	937	938	939	940	941	942	943	944	945	946	947	948	949	950	951	952	953	954	955	956	957	958	959	960	961	962	963	964	965	966	967	968	969	970	971	972	973	974	975	976	977	978	979	980	981	982	983	984	985	986	987	988	989	990	991	992	993	994	995	996	997	998	999	1000	1001	1002	1003	1004	1005	1006	1007	1008	1009	1010	1011	1012	1013	1014	1015	1016	1017	1018	1019	1020	1021	1022	1023	1024	1025	1026	1027	1028	1029	1030	1031	1032	1033	1034	1035	1036	1037	1038	1039	1040	1041	1042	1043	1044	1045	1046	1047	1048	1049	1050	1051	1052	1053	1054	1055	1056	1057	1058	1059	1060	1061	1062	1063	1064	1065	1066	1067	1068	1069	1070	1071	1072	1073	1074	1075	1076	1077	1078	1079	1080	1081	1082	1083	1084	1085	1086	1087	1088	1089	1090	1091	1092	1093	1094	1095	1096	1097	1098	1099	1100	1101	1102	1103	1104	1105	1106	1107	1108	1109	1110	1111	1112	1113	1114	1115	1116	1117	1118	1119	1120	1121	1122	1123	1124	1125	1126	1127	1128	1129	1130	1131	1132	1133	1134	1135	1136	1137	1138	1139	1140	1141	1142	1143	1144	1145	1146	1147	1148	1149	1150	1151	1152	1153	1154	1155	1156	1157	1158	1159	1160	1161	1162	1163	1164	1165	1166	1167	1168	1169	1170	1171	1172	1173	1174	1175	1176	1177	1178	1179	1180	1181	1182	1183	1184	1185	1186	1187	1188	1189	1190	1191	1192	1193	1194	1195	1196	1197	1198	1199	1200	1201	1202	1203	1204	1205	1206	1207	1208	1209	1210	1211	1212	1213	1214	1215	1216	1217	1218	1219	1220	1221	1222	1223	1224	1225	1226	1227	1228	1229	1230	1231	1232	1233	1234	1235	1236	1237	1238	1239	1240	1241	1242	1243	1244	1245	1246	1247	1248	1249	1250	1251	1252	1253	1254	1255	1256	1257	1258	1259	1260	1261	1262	1263	1264	1265	1266	1267	1268	1269	1270	1271	1272	1273	1274	1275	1276	1277	1278	1279	1280	1281	1282	1283	1284	1285	1286	1287	1288	1289	1290	1291	1292	1293	1294	1295	1296	1297	1298	1299	1300	1301	1302	1303	1304	1305	1306	1307	1308	1309	1310	1311	1312	1313	1314	1315	1316	1317	1318	1319	1320	1321	1322	1323	1324	1325	1326	1327	1328	1329	1330	1331	1332	1333	1334	1335	1336	1337	1338	1339	1340	1341	1342	1343	1344	1345	1346	1347	1348	1349	1350	1351	1352	1353	1354	1355	1356	1357	1358	1359	1360	1361	1362	1363	1364	1365	1366	1367	1368	1369	1370	1371	1372	1373	1374	1375	1376	1377	1378	1379	1380	1381	1382	1383	1384	1385	1386	1387	1388	1389	1390	1391	1392	1393	1394	1395	1396	1397	1398	1399	1400	1401	1402	1403	1404	1405	1406	1407	1408	1409	1410	1411	1412	1413	1414	1415	1416	1417	1418	1419	1420	1421	1422	1423	1424	1425	1426	1427	1428	1429	1430	1431	1432	1433	1434	1435	1436	1437	1438	1439	1440	1441	1442	1443	1444	1445	1446	1447	1448	1449	1450	1451	1452	1453	1454	1455	1456	1457	1458	1459	1460	1461	1462	1463	1464	1465	1466	1467	1468	1469	1470	1471	1472	1473	1474	1475	1476	1477
--------------	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------

Dryden richness = 21
 Shannon-Wiener index = 2.897(0.108)
 Simpson index = 5.04(0.555)
 Berger-Parker Dominance index = 0.246(0.379)
 Diversity = 1.159 per seq. m.
 Species Value index = 3.006+/-3.753
 Biomass index = 5.016/0.559

Apocrypha: P4b:1000 = 28
 Chronicon-Matthew Index = 2, 204 (P4b)
 Deuterium Index = 16, 448 (P4b)
 Genesis-Exodus Chronological Index = 0, 206 (P4b)
 Corollary = 0, 231 per sq. m.
 Synoptic Matrix Index = 2, 7082-4, 0, 0069
 Revelation Index = 0, 0

