

Interactive comment on “Wetlands inform how climate extremes influence surface water expansion and contraction” by Melanie K. Vanderhoof et al.

Melanie K. Vanderhoof et al.

mvanderhoof@usgs.gov

Received and published: 13 February 2018

Reviewer # 2

General Comments: The authors attempted to analyze the spatiotemporal variations of surface-water expansion and contraction across the Prairie Pothole Region (PPR) and the adjacent Northern Prairie (NP) of the United States using time-series Landsat images (1985- 2015). By delineating the time-series surface-water extent, the authors investigated how landscape characteristics (infiltration capacity, surface storage capacity, stream density, etc.) influenced the relationships between climate inputs and surface-water dynamics differently in the PPR and NP. Overall, the manuscript is well

[Printer-friendly version](#)

[Discussion paper](#)



written and it is a welcome contribution to the field of wetland hydrology in the Prairie Pothole Region I have a few minor comments that might help improve the quality of the manuscript. Response: Thank you for your thoughtful comments which are addressed below.

Specific Comments: Comment: One of the major undertakings of this paper is mapping surface-water extent by classifying 157 Landsat images, which is a huge amount of effort. The authors stated that the image classification algorithm is trained on a water spectral signature, which was derived from open-water polygons manually selected within each path/row, resulting in a water signature specific to each image (see Lines 217-219). To make the research reproducible, I suggest the authors elaborate the manual delineation of open-water polygons for deriving water spectral signature. For example, what's the minimum size of polygons? On average, how many polygons were manually delineated for each Landsat image? Did the Landsat images with the same path/row use the same openwater polygons? Response: Additional text has been added to expand on the selection of training polygons. "Three to four polygons (minimum size of 1 ha per polygon, total training area per path/row was approximately 20 ha) per path/row were selected. The same open-water polygons were used to train the time series for each path/row."

Comment: It seems the authors did not mention the minimum wetland/surface-water size they were trying to map. To my knowledge, the median size of PPR wetlands is less than 2000 m², which is approximately equal to the size of two Landsat pixels. On the one hand, image objects with only a few pixels might not be reliable classification results. On the other hand, small wetlands (< 2 pixels) might be more sensitive to climate change. How would the minimum size of wetlands influence the regression results? Response: We agree that the small median size of PPR wetlands truly presents a challenge for remotely sensed analysis at a landscape scale. We have added a new analysis to the validation section in which we randomly selected 400 NWI wetlands (from <0.1 ha to 1.0 ha) visibly inundated in the NAIP imagery. Wetlands larger than

[Printer-friendly version](#)

[Discussion paper](#)



0.2 ha were reliably detected (73%), which is better than most efforts using Landsat imagery (minimum wetlands size is typically 0.8 to 1.0 ha). We have also added text to the Discussion section explaining this source of uncertainty.

Lines 291-293: How about p31r29? This Landsat scene also lies across both PPR and NP. Response: The NP and PPR portions of p31r29 were analyzed separately. We have added this text to the Methods section.

Table 2 shows that the overall accuracy for p33r28 is 85.5%, which is significantly lower than other Landsat images (90–97%). I think this deserves some explanation. Response: The higher commission error in p33r28 can be attributed to confusion with bare rock which is abundant in the northwest portion of the path/row as well as uncertainty across agricultural fields. We added the following text, “Errors of commission were higher for p33r28 which can be attributed to confusion in agricultural fields and with bare rock formations.”

Appendix Table 1: It would make more sense to me if the Landsat images of each path/row are listed in a chronological order of image acquisition dates. I would also suggest adding a dashed line to separate different path/row (e.g., between p26r30 and p26r32), which can make this long table a bit easier to read. I also noticed that the PHDI for p36r28-1994-142 is missing. Why? Response: We have made all changes to the Appendix Table 1 as recommended.

Comment: It would increase the impact of this paper and benefit the community if the authors can make the surface-water mapping products available to the public. Response: We agree, supporting USGS Data Policies, the Landsat surface-water maps will be published in ScienceBase (<https://www.sciencebase.gov/catalog/>), following the article’s publication.

Technical Corrections: Lines 226/338: National Wetland Inventory -> National Wetlands Inventory Line 227: "Select images"? Response: Changed as recommended.

Printer-friendly version

Discussion paper



Lines 892/897: National Agricultural Imaging Program -> National Agricultural Imagery Program Response: Changed as recommended.

Interactive comment on Hydrol. Earth Syst. Sci. Discuss., <https://doi.org/10.5194/hess-2017-581>, 2017.

HESD

Interactive
comment

Printer-friendly version

Discussion paper

