



Assessing Species Habitat Using Google Street View: A Case Study of Cliff-Nesting Vultures

Pedro P. Olea¹, Patricia Mateo-Tomás²

Abstract

The assessment of a species' habitat is a crucial issue in ecology and conservation. While the collection of habitat data using remote sensing technologies, certain habitat types have yet to be collected through costly, on-ground surveys, limited accessibility provides habitat for a rich biodiversity, especially raptors. Because of their principally vertical structure, however, these habitats pose a challenge for many researchers and managers working with cliff-related biodiversity. We used Google Street View, an available on-line tool, to remotely identify and assess the nesting habitat of two cliff-nesting vultures (the griffon and the Egyptian vulture) in northwestern Spain. Two main uses of Google Street View to ecologists and conservation biologists are i) identifying potential nesting habitat and ii) extracting fine-scale habitat information. Google Street View imagery covered 49% (1,907 km²) of the study area, while visibility covered by on-ground surveys was significantly greater (mean: 97.4%) than that of Google Street View. Using Google Street View, the vulture's habitat survey would save, on average, 36% in time and 49.5% in funds with respect to the on-ground survey. Google Street View outperformed the classification maps derived from digital elevation models (DEM) in identifying cliffs (overall accuracy = 100%). DEM maps may be useful to compensate Google Street View coverage limitations. Through Google Street View, we identified 148 existing cliffs in the study area ($n = 148$): 64% from griffon vultures and 65% from Egyptian vultures. It also allowed us to assess the World Wide Web-based methodology may be a useful, complementary tool to remotely map and assess the geographic areas, saving survey-related costs.

Citation: Olea PP, Mateo-Tomás P (2013) Assessing Species Habitat Using Google Street View: A Case Study. *PLOS ONE* 8(2): e54582. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0054582

Editor: Yan Ropert-Coudert, Institut Pluridisciplinaire Hubert Curien, France

Received: March 11, 2012; **Accepted:** December 14, 2012; **Published:** January 23, 2013

Copyright: © 2013 Olea, Mateo-Tomás. This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License, which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original author and source are credited.

Funding: PMT was supported by a postdoctoral grant funded by Junta de Comunidades de Castilla-La Mancha. The funders had no role in study design, data collection and analysis, decision to publish, or preparation of the manuscript.

Competing interests: The authors have declared that no competing interests exist.

Introduction

Habitat – any part of the biosphere where a particular species can live [1]– determines the occurrence, abundance and monitoring habitat of organisms is a crucial task in ecology, management and conservation (the most serious drivers of extinction of species worldwide [3]. Consequently, the assessment of habitat across biodiversity conservation [e.g. [4].

The measurement of the quantity and quality of a species' habitat is often a costly and time-consuming labor-intensive field-based surveys over large spatial extents [5]. Fortunately, recent advances in remotely sensed imagery and geographic information systems (GIS), have reduced costs and limitations associated with the collection and analysis by remote sensing include the characterization of habitat and biodiversity over large spatial extents in a context. However, these advances, some habitat types or habitat features have yet to be partially or completely collected on ground study over large areas.

Cliffs are steep faces that create abrupt discontinuities in the landscape, shaping inaccessible habitats and influencing biodiversity (from ancient communities of plants to threatened raptors; [9], [10], [11]). For example, 20 (44%) of the cliffs are for nesting obligatorily (17.7%) or facultatively (26.7%) (authors' unpublished data; [12]). Because of the difficulty to identify and assess by remote sensing technologies, which are based on a bird-eye perspective (Figure 1, see below), this drawback has posed a challenge to adequately deal with cliff habitat for many researchers and managers who recently launched could however assist in remotely collecting cliff habitat information, reducing survey-related costs. Therefore, new methods for biodiversity monitoring and conservation is necessary, as funds available for these activities are limited.




Figure 1. Illustrative examples of a same cliff viewed from different sources.

(a) a topographical map (data source: Instituto Geográfico Nacional de España), (b) an aerial photograph (data source: Instituto Geográfico Nacional de España), and (c) a picture taken *in situ* (Autor: PMT). Red arrows indicate the location of the cliff. Similar data sources include Google Maps™ (<http://goo.gl/maps/xQ4e8>; Accessed: 2012-11-29), and Google Street View (Google Maps™, © 2012-11-29).

doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0054582.g001

Google Street View is a freely available tool incorporated in Google Maps and Google Earth® that provides a virtual view of the world (http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Google_Street_View). It was launched in May 2007 in the United States and now covers a wide net of cities and rural areas worldwide. This application allows users free viewing of georeferenced images along most of the roads from a pedestrian level. Accordingly, it may be a useful tool to remotely identify and assess habitat features that are not shown so far (Figure 1). Despite its potential for the evaluation of diverse environments, as far as we know, few works have been developed in the categories of health science research. Most works so far using Google Street View have been developed in the categories of health science research.

has been conducted in life sciences (as assessed from a search on Scopus from 1960 to 21st February 201 “abstracts, titles and keywords”).

In this paper we explore the feasibility of Google Street View as a useful tool to identify and assess the nest vulture *Gyps fulvus* and the globally endangered Egyptian vulture *Neophron percnopterus*. We evaluated two conservation biologists: i) remotely identifying a species’ potential habitat to assist in the subsequent use of habitat data for potential use in habitat selection studies (or species’ distribution models, SDMs). Both tasks were performed by researchers and managers.

Methods

Study Area

The study area covers 7,000 km² on the south slope of the Cantabrian Mountains, in north-western Spain (It is covered by 3,905 km of paved roads and has a complex topography, with elevations ranging between 340–1,000 m). Griffon vultures are abundant all over the study area [14].




Figure 2. Location of the study area in north-western Spain.

Sixty five percent of the study area was potentially visible (bright grey) from the paved roads covered by cliffs used by griffon and Egyptian vultures for nesting is also shown. The dotted line indicates the northern limit of the study area (see the inset).

doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0054582.g002

Study Species

The two study species are obligated cliff-nesters. The Egyptian vulture is a medium-sized territorial scavenger widely distributed from the Mediterranean to South Africa. This species is classified as *Endangered* by the IUCN [15]. Spain holds the most important breeding population [15], [16]. In Spain, the species occupy very different habitats, from plains to middle and high mountains. They breed in the mountains and winter grounds in Africa in early March and remain in the territories until mid-September. Nesting cliffs are generally built in caves, and more rarely on ledges or crevices. In the study area, Egyptian vultures prefer to nest in caves.

The griffon vulture is a colonial cliff-nesting scavenging raptor widely distributed from the Mediterranean to North Africa [20]. The species is classified as of *Least Concern* by the IUCN [20], but it is locally threatened in some areas [21]. The species use caves, ledges and crevices to install their nests. Nests can be close to each other (i.e. that range from a few to hundreds of pairs [17]. In our study area, colony size ranged from 2 to 20 breeding pairs taken into account.

Procedure

In Google Maps or Google Earth an orange “pegman” icon appears (Figure 3). By dragging it onto a location imagery using the Street View feature (see <http://maps.google.es/support/bin/answer.py?answer=144358> for Google Street View imagery searching for cliffs. Dates of the imagery provided by Google Street View were




Figure 3. Nesting cliffs used by the griffon and the Egyptian vultures in the study area.

Caves and white drops are highlighted with red arrows or expanded by zooming. All the four images are can be remotely observed by using Google Street View (Google Maps™, © Google) [Figure 3a: <http://gc> Figure 3c: <http://goo.gl/maps/b3ROu>; Figure 3d: <http://goo.gl/maps/bKNZT>; All the images accessed: 20/03/2013; doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0054582.g003

Remote identification of potential habitat.

To assess the usefulness of Google Street View to assist in the initial design of species censuses (usefulness of 10×10-km UTM squares entirely located within the study area. Four observers inspected each of these seven squares and noted the time spent on this task for each square. The four observers were: one expert on vulture censusing but not familiar with the study area; and two non-experts in censusing vultures also unfamiliar with the study area. The distribution of paved roads covered by Google Street View was obtained from roads covered by Google Street View within each 10×10-km UTM square by using the Viewshed utility (Inc., Redlands, California, US). The distribution of paved roads covered by Google Street View was obtained from [streetview/learn/where-is-street-view.html](http://www.viewshed.com/streetview/learn/where-is-street-view.html) and implemented in a GIS.

At the same time, we estimated the virtual time spent looking for cliff habitat in the same seven squares studied entirely performed by car. On-ground survey by car would cover all the paved and unpaved roads in each square and calculated the final area surveyed by using the Viewshed utility described above. The distribution of paved roads and aerial photographs, and implemented in a GIS. Monetary cost was assumed a mean consumption of 0.19 euro km⁻¹ (Real Decreto 462/2002) [22]. We compared the time spent using Google Street View by applying pair-wise comparisons of Wilcoxon signed rank paired tests; we used the same for cliffs using Google Street View and virtual on-ground surveys.

Digital Elevation Model (DEM) vs Google Street View.

Cliffs can be located through the conventional analysis of the slope of the terrain in GIS (Figure 1) [14]. We compared that of Google Street View. We used a high resolution (i.e. 5 m pixel) DEM to obtain the slope values for the terrain above which classify a location as a cliff, we considered the slope of all the vulture breeding cliffs recorded in the study area [14]. On this distribution of slopes, we selected three different thresholds [14]: the minimum slope value (0.3°), the 25th percentile (S25th) and the 50th percentile (S50th), respectively) of potential cliffs.

To assess accuracy in the identification of cliffs, we randomly assigned a total of 100 points (i.e. field test sample) in the 10×10-km UTM squares previously selected (see above; 14–15 points per square). These points were local

View (see above). This allowed a better comparison between methods (i.e. DEM maps and Google Street View field surveys). Overall accuracy, producer and user accuracy, omission and commission error rates, and Cohen's Kappa coefficient were calculated for the DEM maps (Smin, S25th and S50th) and Google Street View. Overall accuracy is the division of the total number of points; producer's accuracy is the percentage of field points of a category which are correctly classified as such; user's accuracy is the percentage of points of a category derived from the method (or map) which are really in that category; omission errors are false negative predictions, while commission errors are false positive predictions. The Cohen's Kappa coefficient indicates the agreement between the predicted and the on-ground (reference) points. Cohen's Kappa coefficients were performed with the *irr* package [24].

Obtaining fine-scale habitat characteristics.

In order to assess the usefulness of Google Street View to obtain fine-scale habitat characteristics (usefulness was assessed as the percentage of nesting cliffs known to be used by griffon and Egyptian vultures that we were able to unequivocally identify), we used the data obtained from previous studies [14], [16], [19], [20], and a detailed description of the census methodology of both species, see, for example, [34] for the Egyptian vulture nesting cliffs, one observer experienced in censusing vultures and knowledgeable of the study area searched for these cliffs using Google Street View and assessed whether or not he/she was able to unequivocally see at least 80% of the cliff previously identified through field surveys; see Figure 3 for examples). If, after visual inspection, the observer noted whether or not he/she could also see caves, vegetation (i.e. shrubs and trees), and other characteristics, which can indicate a higher probability of occupancy of those cliffs by the study species, we extracted fine-scale habitat information (Figure 3). The observer also noted the type of substrate (i.e. limestone or sandstone) from Google Street View. Distances from nesting cliffs to the nearest road covered by Street View were calculated.

Results

Of the 3,905 km of paved roads existing in the study area, 49% (i.e. 1,907 km) were covered by Google Street View. The percentage of the study area covered by Google Street View was 65% (4,550 km²) of the whole study area. The visibility ranged between 20.6 and 76.4% per 10×10-km square with a mean of 48.1±7.6% (SE) (Table 1). At the potential visibility covered by car was significantly greater (mean: 97.4±0.98% per 10×10-km square, rare earth test, $t = -6.30$, $p = 0.0007$). Time spent looking for cliffs using Google Street View was not significantly different from time spent looking for cliffs using on-ground surveys (signed rank paired test, $V = 12-18$, $p = 0.21-0.94$). Time spent looking for cliffs was significantly lower using Google Street View (mean: 0.91±0.08 min km⁻² of surveyed area, range: 0.24–1.70 min km⁻²) than using on-ground surveys by car (mean: 1.97±0.11 min km⁻², range: 0.82–10.46 min km⁻²; Wilcoxon signed rank paired test, $V = 0$, $p = 0.016$). The cost of looking for cliffs on-ground was of 0.38±0.11 euro km⁻² of surveyed area, range: 0.17–0.80 euro km⁻² (Table 1). The surveyed area using Google Street View encompassed 49.5±7.8% (range: 21–76%) of that covered by both methods. If the whole surveyed area could be covered by Google Street View instead of by on-ground survey by car, it would save 12,262±6726 min (204.4 hours) and 1,447±657 euro for the whole study area, saving 36.1±7.9% in time and cost of surveys by car only.

	On-ground mean ± SE (range)	Google Street View mean ± SE (range)	Combined mean ± SE (range)
Viewshed (%)	97.4±0.98 (95.4–99.0)	48.1±7.6 (20.6–76.4)	97.4±0.98 (95.4–99.0)
Time (min km ⁻²)	1.97±0.11 (0.82–10.46)	0.91±0.08 (0.24–1.70)	2.15±0.30 (0.77–3.12)
Cost (euro km ⁻²)	0.38±0.11 (0.17–0.80)	0.00	0.17±0.07 (0.06–0.29)

Values were calculated from a sample of seven 10×10-km squares randomly located within the study area. The percentage of square surface projected with each method is also shown (Viewshed). Time costs for Google Street View are mean values obtained from four different observers (see text for further explanations). doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0054582.t001

Table 1. Mean time and monetary cost per km⁻² of surveyed area (viewshed) looking for suitable methods.

doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0054582.t001

Google Street View had an overall accuracy in classifying cliffs of 100% (Cohen's Kappa = 1) (Table 2). For Kappa = 0.89) of the ground points, S25th correctly classified 79% (Cohen's Kappa = 0.65), and overall acci 2).

Ground points	Results of classification	SV	Smin	S25th	S50th
Cliffs (n = 50)	Correct (Incorrect)	50 (0)	49 (1)	29 (21)	22 (28)
No-cliff (n = 50)	Correct (Incorrect)	50 (0)	45 (5)	50 (0)	50 (0)
	Overall accuracy (%)	100	94	79	72
	Producer's accuracy (%)	100	98	58	44
	User's accuracy (%)	100	90	100	100
	Omission error rate	0	0.02	0.42	0.56
	Commission error rate	0	0.10	0	0
	Cohen's Kappa coefficient	1	0.89	0.65	0.56

One hundred points were randomly chosen within the study area (50 cliffs and 50 non-cliff, i.e. ground truthing) against which the results of the classification of each method were compared: Google Street View (SV) and three DEM-based maps with different thresholds of slope (Smin, S25th and S50th, see text for more details). The table shows also overall accuracy, producer and user accuracy, omission and commission error rates and Cohen's Kappa coefficients for each method.

doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0054582.t002

Table 2. Results of the accuracy assessment of different methods.

doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0054582.t002

In the study area there are 148 nesting cliffs known to be occupied by vultures: 58 (39%) by griffon and 104 both species. From these 148 nesting cliffs, we observed 97 (66%) cliffs through the Google Street View im: 68 (65%) out of 104 of Egyptian vulture (the between-species difference in the number of detected cliffs was

	No. cliffs	Identified in Google Street View
Total	148	97 (66%)
Griffon vulture	58	37 (64%)
Egyptian vulture	104	68 (65%)
Both species	14	8 (57%)
Cliffs with white spots	114	46 (40%)
Cliffs with caves	88	25 (28%)
Cliffs with vegetation	123	80 (65%)

doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0054582.t003

Table 3. Number of cliffs used for breeding by griffon and Egyptian vultures which were identified

doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0054582.t003

The nesting cliffs observed through Google Street View laid to a significantly shorter mean distance to the n 955±67 m, range: 43–3,729 m, $n = 97$) than that of the unobserved cliffs (2,170±210 m, range: 310–8,782 m vulture identified with Google Street View were observed at a larger average distance from the nearest road those of the Egyptian vulture (839±86 m, $n = 60$; although non-significant: $t = 1.87$, $P = 0.065$; same cliffs us between-species difference in cliff identification was not due to the cliffs used by griffon vulture being farther

Egyptian vulture (mean for griffon vulture cliffs: $1,432 \pm 141$ m, $n = 44$ vs Egyptian vulture: $1,336 \pm 140$ m, $n =$ were excluded from the analysis).

We determined correctly the type of substrate in 100% ($n = 97$) of the nesting cliffs detected via Google Street View (caves in 26% ($n = 25$) and vegetation in 65% ($n = 80$). Field surveys showed that white spots were of vegetation in 76% ($n = 123$) of the nesting cliffs. Therefore, using Google Street View we detected white spots respectively, of the subset of cliffs with caves, white spots and vegetation registered in the field surveys (Table 2).

Discussion

Ecosystem study and management require the collection of spatially-explicit detailed information for mapping but this information is usually difficult and costly to gather through field-based techniques [35], [36]. Remote sensing has contributed to addressing this need [35]. Yet, certain attributes of the landscape and fine-scale habitat elements are largely dependent on field-based data for their characterization and thus greatly limiting the spatial extent to which they can be studied [10], whose identification and assessment in a landscape through remote sensing or DEM maps is not straightforward. Studying cliff biota has had to be generally conducted by costly on-ground surveys (e.g. [9], [10], [11], [14], [15]), although the conventional method which used digital elevation models (DEMs) provided good results regarding cliff biota [10]. In our study, Google Street View outperformed the DEMs in accuracy (Table 2). All of this suggests that Google Street View can be a useful tool for the study of cliff-related biodiversity, reducing also survey-related costs (e.g. transportation time and mileage) associated with (habitat) data collection is essential in the worldwide context of limited resources for biodiversity research. A web-based tool can be quite useful on a landscape scale. It would enable the design of more efficient fieldwork by focusing and prioritizing on more suitable areas and/or cliffs or in remote areas away from paved roads (without cliffs), thus saving both time and money. In our study, Google Street View only allowed covering between 28% and 100% of the nesting cliffs. It is obligated combining the use of this web-based tool with other method(s) to completely survey the square. In conjunction with high-performance DEMs (e.g. Smin) could be highly useful as a first coarse-scale approach. Nonetheless, on-ground data (e.g. surveys by car) should be collected in the area uncovered by Google Street View (variable percentage of locations (Table 2)). The incorporation of Google Street View to this study would save the car on-ground survey only. Note that we did not take into account costs of travel from the point of origin to the study area. Google Street View would be greater. Although these particular figures are site-specific, they illustrate the usefulness of this tool.

Once the nesting sites are known—which can only be reliably attained by on-ground surveys in our study—spatially explicit data can be obtained by researchers and managers who can also remotely obtain fine-scale features of used and available cliffs to increase the added advantage of Google Street View that is not currently provided by other remote-sensing techniques. Integrating occurrence data with georeferencing records in digital databases (e.g. Global Biodiversity Information Facility) can be used in habitat selection models or SDMs [38], [39] for which Google Street View may aid to remotely extract occurrence sites (Figure 3). Our study adds to the small but increasing body of evidence proving the usefulness of remote sensing surveys on species ecology and conservation (e.g. [40], [41], [42], [43]). Google Street View offers an inexpensive and easy-to-use information for large geographic areas, and allows similar advantages to those provided by other remote sensing techniques ([7], [8]).

Nonetheless, neither all the study area could be surveyed (65%) nor all the nesting cliffs known to be occupied (i.e. 66%). This spatially uneven coverage establishes a difference between Google Street View and other remote sensing techniques in a spatially complete manner ([7], [8]). Moreover, only a fraction of the nesting-cliffs could be evaluated for some features (e.g. bird depositions, 40%; vegetation, 65%). Therefore, Google Street View is not currently a substitute for cliff biota surveys (see above). It is expected, however, that the usefulness of this tool will increase in the future if the coverage of the study area increases (e.g. only the 48.8% of the paved roads in our study area is currently covered), and especially if it includes unpaved roads (e.g. <http://maps.google.com/intl/en/help/maps/streetview/technology/cars-trikes.html>). This expansion into dirt roads would work: i.e. the impossibility of assessing those cliffs located far away from the paved roads. In fact, our results show that the roads covered by Street View was a limiting factor to study cliffs with this technology, as these distances

In our study area, this distance limit to which cliffs become unidentifiable could be around 1 km from the road. Most of the identified cliffs lay within around that distance; median: 800 m; 75th percentile = 1,173 m). Although it affects variation in the distance within which the cliffs can be identified with Street View (e.g. vegetation structure is important). This idea is supported by our results showing that the species that use larger nesting cliffs (i.e. those that registered a greater mean distance from the road to the identified cliff). Other limitations of this method were fog, cloudy, backlighting) under which Street View imagery were taken, which prevented us from adequately imposing restrictions on the use of Street View images (<http://support.google.com/maps/bin/static.py?hl=en&> shared in publications via direct links (see Fig. 1 and 3) or through an application programming interface (API). Therefore, Google Street View images that are shared via direct links in published studies may not be permanent by Google or subject to change in the access site).

We have tried to keep the assessment of cliff features simple, but other cliff features can also be assessed (e.g. crevices). In fact, we think that measures of height and width as well as surface of the cliffs or parts of them. The recent development of techniques for measuring objects such as building facades from Street View imagery provide a valuable tool to the standard assessment of cliff size, as it is currently a very difficult and inaccurate task. This will increase the quality of the information on cliff habitat improving the studies on selection of habitat for cliff-dependent species.

Cliffs are expected to change little over time and so they are a type of habitat adequate to study with online updated as other remote sensing technologies (e.g. airborne and satellite imagery) [5]. This web tool has the elements of cliff ecosystems such as plants or ancient trees, [9], [10], [11] as well as other types and features. The structure and composition of the vegetation along the roads, detection of nesting sites occupied by conspicuous species (e.g. the rook *Corvus frugilegus*; authors, pers. obs.). It could also have potential to be applied in other fields such as [46], or in environmentally friendly cliff road construction [47].

Acknowledgments

We thank J.C. del Moral for accessing to the 2nd Spanish Survey of Egyptian Vultures and F. Jubete and J. Palencia. Kike Osorio, Juana Tomás and Lucía Otero looked for cliffs using Google Street View. Two anonymous reviewers. Manuscript. Editors of PLoS ONE for assistance about copyright permissions.

Author Contributions

Conceived and designed the experiments: PPO. Performed the experiments: PPO PMT. Analyzed the data: PPO PMT. Wrote the paper: PPO PMT.

References

1. Krebs CJ (2001) Ecology: The Experimental Analysis of Distribution and Abundance. 5^a ed. San Francisco: W. H. Freeman & Co. 819 p.
2. Sinclair ARE, Fryxell JM, Caughley G (2006) Wildlife Ecology, Conservation and Management. 2nd ed. Cambridge University Press.
3. Laurance WF (2010) Habitat destruction: death by a thousand cuts. In: Sodhi NS, Ehrlich PR, editor. *Habitat Destruction and Biodiversity Loss*. University Press Inc. 73–87.
4. Lengyel S, Déri E, Varga Z, Horváth R, Tóthmérész B, et al. (2008) Habitat monitoring in Europe: a review. *Conservation Biology* 17: 3327–3339 doi:10.1007/s10531-008-9395-3.
5. Turner W, Spector S, Gardiner N, Fladeland M, Sterling E, et al. (2003) Remote sensing for biodiversity conservation. *Ecological Applications* 13: 306–314 doi:10.1890/1051-0761(2003)013[0306:RSFB]2.0.CO;2.
6. Rushton SP, Ormerod SJ, Kerby G (2004) New paradigms for modelling species distributions? *Journal of the Royal Society Interface* 1: 1111–1121 doi:10.1098/rsif.2004.00903.x. Find this article online
7. Duro DC, Coops NC, Wulder MA, Han T (2007) Development of a large area biodiversity monitoring system. *Geography* 31: 235–260. doi: 10.1177/0309133307079054. Find this article online

8. Gillespie TW, Foody GM, Rocchini D, Giorgi AP, Saatchi S (2008) Measuring and modelling biodiversity. doi: 10.1177/0309133308093606. Find this article online
9. Camp RJ, Knight RL (1998) Effects of rock climbing on cliff plant communities at Joshua Tree National Monument. Find this article online
10. Krajick K (1999) Scientists—and Climbers—Discover Cliff Ecosystems. *Science* 283: 1623–1625 doi: 10.1126/science.1199999
11. McMillan MA, Larson DW (2002) Effects of rock climbing on the vegetation of the Niagara Escarpment. *Conservation Biology* 16: 389–398. doi: 10.1046/j.1523-1739.2002.00377.x. Find this article online
12. Svensson L, Mullarney K, Zetterström D, Grant PJ (2010) Collins Bird Guide. Second edition. London: Collins.
13. Wilson KA, Underwood EC, Morrison SA, Klausmeyer KR, Murdoch WW, et al. (2007) Conserving Endangered Species. *PLoS Biology* 5: e223 doi:10.1371/journal.pbio.0050223.
14. Mateo-Tomás P, Olea PP (2011) The importance of social information in breeding site selection in *Gyps fulvus*. *Ibis* 153: 832–845. doi: 10.1111/j.1474-919X.2011.01154.x. Find this article online
15. BirdLife International (2008) *Neophron percnopterus*. IUCN 2011 IUCN Red List of Threatened Species. Accessed 8 March 2012.
16. Del Moral JC, editor (2009) El alimoche común en España. Población reproductora en 2008 y método de censo. Madrid: MITECO.
17. Donazar JA (1993) Los buitres ibéricos. Biología y conservación. Madrid: Reyero JM. 256 p.
18. Ceballos O, Donazar JA (1988) Selección del lugar de nidificación por el Alimoche (*Neophron percnopterus*). *Ardeola* 35: 1–10. Find this article online
19. Mateo-Tomás P, Olea PP (2009) Combining scales in habitat models to improve conservation planning. *PLoS ONE* 4: e489–498. doi: 10.1016/j.actao.2009.03.004. Find this article online
20. BirdLife International (2008) *Gyps fulvus*. IUCN 2011 IUCN Red List of Threatened Species Version 2012.
21. Mateo-Tomás P, Olea PP (2010) Anticipating Knowledge to Inform Species Management: Predicting the Spread of *Gyps fulvus*. *PLoS ONE* 5: e12374 doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0012374.
22. BOE (2002) Real Decreto 462/2002, de 24 de mayo, sobre indemnizaciones por razón del servicio. *Boletín Oficial del Estado* 35: 15045–15046.
23. Congalton RG, Green K (1998) Assessing the Accuracy of Remotely Sensed Data: Principles and Practices. *Photogrammetric Engineering and Remote Sensing* 64: 397–414.
24. Gamer M, Lemon J, Fellows I, Singh P (2012) irr: Various Coefficients of Interrater Reliability and Agreement. <http://CRAN.R-project.org/package=irr>.
25. R Development Core Team (2012) R: A language and environment for statistical computing. R Foundation for Statistical Computing, Vienna, Austria. ISBN 3-900051-07-0. Available: URL <http://www.R-project.org/>.
26. SEO (1981) Primer censo de buitreras (1979). *Ardeola* 26–27: 165–312. Find this article online
27. Arroyo B, Ferreiro E, Garza V (1990) II Censo nacional de buitre leonado (*Gyps fulvus*): población, distribución y estado de conservación. *Ardeola* 37: 1–10.
28. Jubete F (1997) Atlas de las aves nidificantes de la provincia de Palencia. Asociación de Naturalistas de Palencia.
29. Olea PP, García J, Falagán J (1999) Expansión del buitre leonado *Gyps fulvus*: tamaño de la población y colonización. *Ardeola* 46: 81–88. Find this article online
30. Del Moral JC, Martí R, editors (2001) El buitre leonado en la Península Ibérica. III Censo Nacional de Buitres. Madrid: MITECO.
31. Del Moral JC, Martí R, editors (2002) El alimoche común en España y Portugal. I Censo Coordinado de Alimoches. Madrid: MITECO.
32. Del Moral JC, editor (2009) El buitre leonado en España. Población en 2008 y método de censo. Madrid: MITECO.
33. Mateo-Tomás P, Olea PP, Fombellida I (2010) Status of the Endangered Egyptian vulture *Neophron percnopterus*: assessment of threats. *Oryx* 44: 434–440. doi: 10.1017/S0030605310000505. Find this article online
34. Olea PP, Mateo-Tomás P (2011) Spatially explicit estimation of occupancy, detection probability and diversity in *Gyps fulvus*. *Diversity and Distributions* 17: 714–724. doi: 10.1111/j.1472-4642.2011.00777.x. Find this article online
35. Kerr JT, Ostrovsky M (2003) From space to species: ecological applications for remote sensing. *Trends in Ecology & Evolution* 18: 10–15. doi:10.1016/S0169-5347(03)00071-5.
36. Wulder MA, Hall RJ, Coops NC, Franklin SE (2004) High spatial resolution remotely sensed data for land cover classification. *Remote Sensing of the Environment* 92: 150–162. doi:10.1641/0006-3568(2004)054[0511:HSRRSD]2.0.CO;2. Find this article online
37. Pearce JM, Johnson SJ, Grant GB (2007) 3D-mapping optimization of embodied energy of transport. *Energy* 32: 1010–1019. doi: 10.1016/j.resconrec.2006.10.010. Find this article online
38. Graham C, Ferrier S, Huettman F, Moritz C, Peterson A (2004) New developments in museum-based distribution data. *Trends in Ecology & Evolution* 19: 497–503 doi:10.1016/j.tree.2004.07.006.
39. Franklin J (2009) Mapping Species Distributions: Spatial Inference and Prediction. New York: Cambridge University Press.
40. Butler D (2006) Virtual globes: The web-wide world. *Nature* 439: 776–778. doi: 10.1038/439776a. Find this article online

41. Guralnick RP, Hill AW, Lane M (2007) Towards a collaborative, global infrastructure for biodiversity e 10.1111/j.1461-0248.2007.01063.x. Find this article online
42. Mawdsley JR (2007) Use of simple remote sensing tools to expedite surveys for rare tiger beetles (I 689–693 doi:10.1007/s10841-007-9113-6.
43. Benham PM, Beckman EJ, DuBay SG, Flores LM, Johnson AB, et al. (2011) Satellite imagery reveals high Andes of Peru. *Endang Species Res* 13: 145–157 doi:10.3354/esr00323.
44. Devaux A, Paparoditis N (2010) Increasing interactivity in street view web navigation systems. *Proc* 903–906.
45. Ozuag E, Gullu MK, Urhan O, Erturk S (2011) Metric measurement from street view sequences with frame selection. *Machine Learning for Signal Processing (MLSP)*, 2011 IEEE International Worksho
46. Stock GM, Martel SJ, Collins BD, Harp EL (2012) Progressive failure of sheeted rock slopes: the 20 California, USA. *Earth Surface Processes and Landforms* 37: 546–561 doi:10.1002/esp.3192.
47. Cao S, Ye H, Zhan Y (2010) Cliff roads: An ecological conservation technique for road construction *Planning* 94: 228–233 doi:10.1016/j.landurbplan.2009.10.007.