Supplementary Materials: Long-Term Post-Disturbance Forest Recovery in the Greater Yellowstone Ecosystem Analyzed Using Landsat Time Series Stack

Feng R. Zhao, Ran Meng, Chengquan Huang, Maosheng Zhao, Feng A. Zhao, Peng Gong, Le Yu and Zhiliang Zhu

Table S1. Number of validation points for post-fire forest recovery in the study region, stratified by forest species, burn severity, and recovery status.

		Lodgepole Pine	Whitebark Pine	Douglas Fir	Engelmann Spruce/Subalpine Fir
I any approximity	Recovered	50	0 a	50	7 ^b
Low severity	Non-recovered	50	23 ь	50	0 a
Ma damata aaraaita	Recovered	50	2 ^b	6 ^b	30
Moderate severity	Non-recovered	50	50	50	50
Lich corrority	Recovered	50	50	50	50
High severity	Non-recovered	50	50	50	50

^a no available pixel; ^b including all available pixels.

Table S2. Number of sampling points and accuracy assessment for validating VCT post-fire and postharvest recovery products for all forest species in the GYE. Map refers to the VCT predicted disturbance class.

		Post-Fire Recovery V	alidation			
	Reference					
		Recovered	Non-Recovered	Row	User's	
		(Tree Cover > 10%)	(Tree Cover ≤ 10%)	Total	Accuracy	
	Recovered	249	85	334	0.75	
	Non-recovered	95	445	540	0.82	
Map	Column total	344	530	874		
	Producer's Accuracy	0.59	0.90			
	Overall Accuracy		0.80			
		Post-Harvest Recovery	Validation			
	Reference					
		Recovered	Non-Recovered	Row	User's	
		(Tree Cover > 10%)	(Tree Cover ≤ 10%)	Total	Accuracy	
	Recovered	97	3	100	0.97	
	Non-recovered	42	58	100	0.58	
Map	Column total	139	61	200		
-	Producer's Accuracy	0.85	0.89			
	Overall Accuracy		0.86			

Table S3. Number of sampling points and validation accuracy of the VCT post-fire forest regrowth product for the four major forest species in YNP. Map refer to VCT predicted recovery class for each forest type.

		Lodgepole Pine (7	2% of Area)		
		Refe	rence		
		Recovered	Non-Recovered	Row Total	User's
		Cover > 10%	Cover ≤ 10%	Kow Total	Accuracy
	Recovered	138	9	147	0.94
Мар	Non-recovered	36	131	167	0.78
	Column total	174	140	314	
	Producer's Accuracy	0.65	0.97		
	Overall Accuracy		0.83		
		Whitebark Pine (1	5% of Area)		
		Refe	rence		
		Recovered	Non-Recovered	Row Total	User's
		Cover > 10%	Cover ≤ 10%	Kow Total	Accuracy
	Recovered	9	42	51	0.18
	Non-recovered	10	111	121	0.92
Map	Column total	19	153	172	
I	Producer's Accuracy	0.11	0.95		
	Overall Accuracy		0.88		
		Douglas-fir (7.1%	% of Area)		
		Refe	rence		
Recovered Cover		Non-Recovered	Row Total	User's	
		> 10%	Cover ≤ 10%	Kow Total	Accurac
	Recovered	39	18	57	0.80
	Non-recovered	23	124	147	0.75
Map	Column total	62	142	204	
	Producer's Accuracy	0.47	0.93		
	Overall Accuracy		0.76		
	Engelma	ann Spruce and Subal	pine Fir (5.9% of Are	a)	
		Refe	rence		
		Recovered	Non-Recovered	Row Total	User's
		Cover > 10%	Cover ≤ 10%	ROW I Utdl	Accuracy
	Recovered	63	16	79	0.68
Map	Non-recovered	26	79	105	0.84
	Column total	89	95	184	
	Producer's Accuracy	0.18	0.98		
	Overall Accuracy		0.84		

Table S4. Maximum IFI (Integrated Forest Index) values and minimum NDVI (Normalized Difference of Vegetation Index) values used to determine forest recovery in GYE.

Path-Row	Maximum IFI	Minimum NDVI
p037r029	12.649	0.231
p037r030	9.759	0.206
p038r028	6.823	0.271
p038r029	7.00	0.357
p038r030	3.909	0.327
p038r031	4.967	0.205
p039r028	6.218	0.119
p039r029	6.218	0.119



© 2016 by the authors; licensee MDPI, Basel, Switzerland. This article is an open access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons by Attribution (CC-BY) license (http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/).