

Report 0-6972-1 Project 0-6972

# Assessing Traffic Threats for Amphibian and Reptile Species of Greatest Conservation Need on Texas Roadways: Final Report

**Research Report** 

D.K. Walkup, K.L. Skow, T.J. Hibbitts, W.A. Ryberg, and R.R. Lopez

May 31, 2019; published October 2022

Texas A&M Natural Resources Institute

### TECHNICAL REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE

1. Report No.	2. Government Accession No.	3. Recipient's Catalog No.							
FHWA/TX-21/0-6972-1									
4. Title and Subtitle		5. Report Date							
Assessing Traffic Threats for Amphibian and Conservation Need on Texas Roadways: Fin	Submitted: May 2019 Published: October 2022								
	6. Performing Organization Code								
<b>7. Author(s)</b> Danielle K. Walkup, PhD. <u>https://orcid.org/0000-0001-</u> PhD. <u>https://orcid.org/0000-0001-7126-6891</u> ; Wade A. orcid.org/0000-0003-2548-8113; Roel R. Lopez, PhD.	<b>8. Performing Organization Report No.</b> 0-6972-1								
9. Performing Organization Name and Ad	10. Work Unit No.								
Texas A&M University		11. Contract or Grant No.							
Natural Resources Institute		0-6972							
578 John Kimbrough Blvd. 2260 TAMU									
College Station, TX 77840-2260									
12. Sponsoring Agency Name and Address	5	13. Type of Report and Period Covered							
Texas Department of Transportation		Technical Report							
Research and Technology Implementation I	Division	May 2018–May 2019							
125 E. 11th Street		14. Sponsoring Agency Code							
Austin, TX 78701									
15. Supplementary Notes									
Project performed in cooperation with the Texas Department of Transportation and the Federal Highway Administration.									
16. Abstract									

Many environmental impacts involve state and federally listed threatened and endangered (TE) species. Wildlife-vehicle collision (WVC) data can improve environmental impact assessments for TE species. Accurate WVC data has been collected for amphibian and reptile species on Texas roadways since 2012, in the form of observations in the "Herps of Texas" project on the citizen science platform iNaturalist. These data were used to create a database of species of greatest conservation need (SGCN) recorded and verified in the state that was joined with Texas road traffic data from the Texas Department of Transportation (TxDOT) and used to evaluate SGCN species presence and mortality on and near roads. As of 3 April 2018, there were 11,527 Research Grade quality records of 62 SGCN species downloaded from the iNaturalist "Herps of Texas" project. Maps distinguishing live and dead SGCN Reptiles and Amphibians observations >100 m away from and 100 m within either side of 2,333 control sections across Texas are found in Appendix A of this report. There were 1,474 records of 44 SGCN near control sections with associated traffic data. We found shorter distances to roads, higher traffic volumes, latitude and longitude were important predictors of mortality in all SGCN observations together. With respect to environmental impacts involving state and federally listed TE species, we found that some amphibian and reptile species groups were more likely to complicate transportation project planning than others and for different reasons.

17. Key Words	18. Distribution Statement					
amphibian, reptile, species of greatest conservation nee	No restrictions. This document is available to the public					
and endangered, traffic mortality, wildlife-vehicle colli	through the National Technical Information Service,					
environmental impact	Alexandria, Virginia 22312, https://www.ntis.gov/.					
19. Security Classif. (of this report)	20. Security (	Classif. (of this page)	21. No. of Pages	22. Price		
Unclassified	Unclassified		626			

Form DOT F 1700.7 (8-72)

Reproduction of completed page authorized

Project 0-6972: Assessing Traffic Threats for Amphibian and Reptile Species of Greater Conservation Need on Texas Roadways

# Assessing Traffic Threats for Amphibian and Reptile Species of Greatest Conservation Need on Texas Roadways: Final Report

Research Report 0-6972-1

D.K. Walkup, K.L. Skow, T.J. Hibbitts, W.A. Ryberg, and R.R. Lopez

Performing Agency: Texas A&M University Natural Resources Institute 578 John Kimbrough Blvd. 2260 TAMU College Station, TX 77840-2260 Phone: 979-845-1851 Fax: 979-845-0662

Sponsoring Agency: Texas Department of Transportation

Performed in cooperation with the Texas Department of Transportation and the Federal Highway Administration

May 2019; Published October 2022

### **Disclaimer**

The contents of this report reflect the views of the authors, who are responsible for the facts and accuracy of the data presented herein. The contents do not necessarily reflect the official view or policies of the Texas Department of Transportation (TxDOT). This report does not constitute a standard, specification, or regulation. The United States Government and the State of Texas do not endorse products or manufactures. Trade or manufactures' names appear herein solely because they are considered essential to the object of this report. The researcher in charge of this project was Wade Ryberg.

### **Acknowledgments**

The authors would like to thank the individuals that were instrumental in the success of this project. Thanks to Texas Department of Transportation employees John Moravec, John Young Jr, Mark Fisher, and Chris Glancy for their generous advice and support throughout this project. Additionally, collaborations among many administrators, researchers, students, and staff at the Texas A&M Natural Resources Institute helped make this project a success. Finally, thanks to the volunteers of the iNaturalist community for their contributions to biodiversity research through citizen science.

# **Table of Contents**

Pro	ject Sui	mmary	ix
1	Intro	oduction	1
	1.1	Purpose and Need	1
	1.2	Objectives	3
2	Meth	nods	4
	2.1	Database	4
	2.2	Mapping	5
	2.3 T	Fraffic Analyses	6
3	Resu	ults and Conclusions	7
	3.1	Database	7
		3.1.1 Amphibians – Frogs and Toads	15
		3.1.2 Amphibians – Salamanders	15
		3.1.3 Reptiles – Lizards	16
		3.1.4 Reptiles – Snakes	16
		3.1.5 Reptiles – Turtles	17
	3.2	Mapping	18
	3.3	Traffic Analyses	19
		3.3.1 Species of Greatest Conservation Need - SGCN	19
		3.3.2 Western Diamondback Rattlesnake	22
		3.3.3 Red-eared sliders	25
		3.3.4 Texas Horned Lizard	30
	3.4	Data Set Biases	
Ref	erences	S	
Арр	endix /	۹	A-1
	A1.	Amphibians – Frogs and Toads	A-2
	A2.	Amphibians – Salamanders	A-83
	A3.	Reptiles – Lizards	A-149

	A-370
A5. Reptiles – Turtles	
Appendix B	B-1
B1. Amphibians – Frogs and Toads	B-2
B2. Amphibians – Salamanders	B-11
B3. Reptiles – Lizards	B-25
B4. Reptiles – Snakes	B-33
B5. Reptiles – Turtles	B-50

# **List of Figures**

Figure 1. All statewide observations of Amphibian and Reptile Species of Greatest Conservation Need in the "Herps of Texas" project on iNaturalist
Figure 2. All statewide observations of dead and alive Amphibian and Reptile Species of Greatest Conservation Need in the "Herps of Texas" project on iNaturalist9
Figure 3. Statewide observations of all Amphibian and Reptile Species of Greatest Conservation need in the "Herps of Texas" project on iNaturalist per control section
Figure 4. Statewide observations of all dead Amphibian and Reptile Species of Greatest Conservation need in the "Herps of Texas" project on iNaturalist per control section
Figure 5. Variable importance for the random forest analysis
Figure 6. Partial dependence plot with outliers removed for dead observations based on distance to road and 2016 AADT20
Figure 7. Partial dependence plot for dead SGCN observations based on latitude and longitude in Texas
Figure 8. Pruned classification tree using the full SGCN herpetofauna traffic database; terminal nodes contain minimum of 5% of the data
Figure 9. Variable importance for the random forest analysis for the western diamondback rattlesnakes ( <i>Crotalus atrox</i> )
Figure 10. Partial dependence plot with outliers removed for dead observations of western diamondback rattlesnakes ( <i>Crotalus atrox</i> ) based on distance to road and 2016 AADT
Figure 11. Partial dependence plot for dead observations of western diamondback rattlesnakes ( <i>Crotalus atrox</i> ) based on latitude and longitude in Texas
Figure 12. Pruned classification tree using all western diamondback rattlesnake ( <i>Crotalus atrox</i> ) observations
Figure 13. Variable importance for the random forest analysis for the red-eared slider ( <i>Trachemys scripta</i> )

Figure 14. Pruned classification tree using all red-eared slider ( <i>Trachemys scripta</i> ) traffic observations	.26
Figure 15. Partial dependence plot for dead observations of red-eared sliders ( <i>Trachemys scripta</i> ) based on latitude and longitude in Texas	.27
Figure 16. Variable importance for the random forest analysis for the Texas horned lizard ( <i>Phrynosoma cornutum</i> )	. 28
Figure 17. Partial dependence plot with outliers removed for dead observations of Texas horned lizards ( <i>Phrynosoma cornutum</i> ) based on distance to road and 2016 AADT	s d . 28
Figure 18. Partial dependence plot for dead observations of Texas horned lizar ( <i>Phrynosoma cornutum</i> ) based on latitude and longitude in Texas	rds . 29
Figure 19. Pruned classification tree using all Texas horned lizard ( <i>Phrynosom cornutum</i> ) traffic observations	a . 29

# **List of Tables**

Table 1. Summary of observations of Amphibian and Reptiles Species of Greatest Conservation Need included in the "Herps of Texas" project on	
iNaturalist	. 12
Table 2. Number of SGCN Amphibian and Reptile observations within 100 m of the road on the different road types	of . 19

### **Project Summary**

Transportation planning is complicated by natural resource and environmental issues. Project planning and delivery are more efficient when environmental impacts are known early. Many environmental impacts involve state and federally listed threatened and endangered (TE) species. GIS-based habitat models can overestimate TE species' occurrence in environmental impact assessments. Overestimated TE species' occurrence can lead to ineffective prioritization and allocation of resources. Wildlife-vehicle collision (WVC) data can improve environmental impact assessments for TE species. Accurate WVC data has been collected for amphibian and reptile species on Texas roadways since 2012, in the form of observations in the "Herps of Texas" project on the citizen science platform iNaturalist. These data were used to create a database of species of greatest conservation need (SGCN) recorded and verified in the state that was joined with Texas road traffic data from the Texas Department of Transportation (TxDOT) and used to evaluate SGCN species presence and mortality on and near roads.

As of 3 April 2018, there were 11,527 Research Grade quality records of 62 SGCN species downloaded from the iNaturalist "Herps of Texas" project. Of those records, 7,178 observations of 59 SGCN species were located within the 200 m buffer of Texas road control sections (1,737 dead, 5,392 alive, and 49 unknown). Maps distinguishing live and dead SGCN Reptiles and Amphibians observations >100 m away from and 100 m within either side of 2,333 control sections across Texas are found in Appendix A of this report. The majority of these control sections (2,244) had 10 or fewer observations of SGCN species. There were 1,474 records of 44 SGCN near control sections with associated traffic data. Of those records, 976 observations of 36 SGCN were located within the 200 m buffer of Texas road control sections. These records were used to characterize the importance of traffic volume in predicting mortality of all SGCN on or near roads, and also the mortality of western diamondback rattlesnakes (*Crotalus atrox*), red-eared sliders (*Trachemys scripta*), and Texas horned lizards (*Phrynosoma cornutum*).

We found shorter distances to roads, higher traffic volumes, latitude and longitude were important predictors of mortality in all SGCN observations together, and in observations of western diamondback rattlesnakes and Texas horned lizards. Traffic volume was a less important predictor of mortality for red-eared sliders. South and west Texas appeared to be hotspots of mortality for SGCN overall and for western diamondback rattlesnakes and Texas horned lizards, while south and east Texas were hotspots for red-eared sliders. With respect to environmental impacts involving state and federally listed threatened and endangered (TE) species, we found that some amphibian and reptile species groups were more likely to complicate transportation project planning than others and for different reasons. Below we summarize a "watch-list" for each of these species groups.

Salamander occurrences were lower than any other species group in our database. Additionally, the fact that most Texas salamanders are aquatic makes road mortalities in this group rare. However, almost all of the central Texas spring and aquifer salamanders are SGCN species and many of these are federally endangered. While threats from vehicular collisions are not a worry, these species can occur in creeks and springs that are in road right-of-ways and should be protected from disturbances and pollutants.

Frog and toad occurrences were greater than salamanders in our database, but still far lower than the reptile species groups. Most frog and toad species cross roads near wetlands in which they breed, which occurs seasonally during narrow windows of optimal weather conditions. Road mortality events in this group can have large population consequences, because most individuals on roads during these conditions are breeding adults. Two species to watch in this group are the federally endangered Houston Toad (*Anaxyrus houstonensis*) and the Crawfish Frog (*Lithobates areolatus*), which has been shown to be declining rapidly throughout its range.

Lizard occurrences were lower than any other reptile group in our database. Many species of lizards prefer open habitats and are commonly seen on roads. This is especially true for the state threatened Texas Horned Lizard (*Phrynosoma cornutum*), which regularly basks and forages on roads. Their use of crypsis as a defense and their slow running speed make them susceptible to road mortality. Another lizard species susceptible to road mortality is the Spot-tailed Earless Lizard (*Holbrookia lacerata*), which is currently awaiting a federal listing determination in 2020.

Snake occurrences were almost as high as turtles in our database. Like lizards, nearly all species of snakes are susceptible to road mortality, because they regularly bask on roads. Unlike lizards, however, a snake's long body and sometimes slow crawling speed make them even more susceptible to road mortality. The federally threatened Louisiana Pinesnake (*Pituophis ruthveni*) has been seen less than 10 times in East Texas in the last 20 years. Unfortunately one of those sightings was a road mortality. Another snake species susceptible to road mortality, especially in north central Texas prairies, is the Western Massasauga (*Sistrurus tergeminus*), which is also currently awaiting a federal listing determination in 2020.

Turtle occurrences in our database were greater than any other species group. Many of those occurrences were from aquatic turtle species, which is counterintuitive because most of those species rarely leave their aquatic habitat. Unfortunately, those turtle species are most often encountered out of water when females are searching for nesting sites. When those nesting sites are selected near roads, then those turtles are more susceptible to road mortality. Three turtle species to watch are the Rio Grande Cooter (*Pseudemys gorzugi*), Western Chicken Turtle (*Deirochelys reticularia miaria*), and Alligator Snapping Turtle (*Macrochelys temminckii*), which are each awaiting a federal listing determination in 2023, 2022, and 2020, respectively. The state threatened Texas Tortoise (*Gopherus berlandieri*) is also susceptible to road mortality in South Texas. This endemic terrestrial species ranges over a wide area with most individuals encountering several roads in their lifetime.

### **1** Introduction

### 1.1 Purpose and Need

Developing transportation infrastructure is a long process involving planning, funding, and implementation cycles that can take more than a decade for certain projects (Lederman and Wachs 2014). Environmental studies and mitigation are frequently planned and implemented near the end of this process and on a project-by-project basis. Each project may require a different environmental focus, as each state's resource agencies and Department of Transportation (DOT) may emphasize different natural resource issues. For very large states like Texas with extremely different natural ecosystems, the environmental focus or natural resource issue for projects may vary within and among different regions and districts further complicating planning efforts.

In an attempt to simplify planning, recent federal legislation, rules, and initiatives (e.g., Eco-Logical, Green Infrastructure) encourage and sometimes require state DOTs to increase levels of coordination with local, state, and federal agencies in linking natural resource issues with transportation planning (Lederman and Wachs 2014). At the same time, DOTs face increasing demands for time and cost-reductions associated with project environmental reviews and permitting. Difficulties achieving greater environmental planning efficiency have been linked to: 1) duplicated efforts gathering and accessing environmental data by DOT, local planning agencies, and environmental resource agencies, 2) environmental impact considerations arising late in project planning or delivery leading to unexpected costs and schedule delays, 3) selection of project alternatives that require costly and time consuming environmental studies and mitigation efforts to correct for negative impacts on wildlife and ecosystems that could have been avoided if considered earlier in the planning process, and 4) frequent revisions of environmental documents and delays in study and permit approvals (Lederman and Wachs 2014).

As part of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) process, transportation planners must be responsive to both state and federal Departments of Fish and Wildlife when making determinations about potential impacts on threatened and endangered species. Since much of this determination hinges on habitat impacts associated with particular species, a better understanding of TE species' habitat requirements and distribution should assist transportation planners in avoiding obvious environmental impacts early in the planning process (Blandford et al. 2013). A common approach used to characterize TE species' habitat requirements and distribution involves species distribution modeling with GIS data. These models have been used to identify potential "hotspots" of transportation, mainly road, impacts on TE species and their habitats (Patrick et al. 2009).

As with all models, reliability of output depends on quality and accuracy of data used in development (Blandford et al. 2013). Sources of error in model development can be traced to: 1) gaps in understanding of ecology of rare TE species, 2) lack of data on TE species within range of transportation project, 3) resolution of available remote sensing data (or other GIS data) is too coarse to reflect habitat variables being selected by TE species (or data not available), and 4) dynamic habitat requirements of TE species (e.g., ephemeral wetlands) may not be captured in model if remote sensing data (or other GIS data) are collected at the wrong times. These represent just a few of the more common sources of error. Importantly, many models suffer from more than one of these sources of error, and just one source of error can lead to situations where predicted occurrence is actually non-occurrence (Patrick et al. 2009). Finally, even near-perfect models suffer from the implicit assumption that TE species' populations would be located wherever modeled suitable habitat is predicted to occur. This assumption has led to an overestimation of TE species' occurrence in many regions (Patrick et al. 2009).

Potential overestimation of TE species' occurrence misinforms transportation planners and generates opportunity costs for DOTs, because limited financial resources and overburdened personnel are prioritized and deployed ineffectively. This problem can be exacerbated in multi- jurisdictional projects where a number of different agencies, each with different capacities for deploying mitigation and other mandates given to them, are responsible for managing roads (Patrick et al. 2009). In addition, overestimation of TE species' occurrence can create situations where mitigation may never produce a viable population, because the starting point of no roads may have already been a nonviable population (Roedenbeck et al. 2007). In such cases, transportation and related agencies can be mistakenly blamed for ineffective mitigation. Too frequently, too little research has been done to differentiate between potential transportation impacts and other factors determining occurrence and persistence of TE species. Ultimately, if transportation impacts are not the limiting factor, or even a major contributor, to TE species imperilment, then mitigation of such impacts is wasteful and ineffective. Overestimation of TE species' occurrence can contribute to this waste and ineffectiveness.

For obvious safety reasons, WVCs are a growing concern among DOTs and the driving public (Bissonnette et al. 2008). In addition, conservation organizations and agencies are concerned about TE species' mortality (Fahrig and Rytwinski 2009). As such, predicting and prioritizing places for mitigation of impacts to wildlife and drivers is an important

step in reducing WVCs regardless of target species. One approach is to use previous collisions to find "hotspots" or seasonal collisions to find "hot moments" of conflict. These predictions can improve accuracy and effectiveness of transportation environmental impact assessments and mitigation for TE species over species distribution modeling approaches, because they are based on evidence that the species was actually present and struck (i.e., imperiled) by a vehicle. To inform these types of predictions and corresponding mitigation at large scales, it becomes necessary to collect accurate WVC data (Shilling et al. 2013).

### 1.2 Objectives

In Texas, citizen scientists participating in the "Herps of Texas" project on iNaturalist have voluntarily posted observations of amphibians and reptiles, or herpetofauna, since 2012. Currently over 60,000 observations have been recorded state-wide, including TE species (e.g., species of greatest conservation need, SGCN). Most of these observations occur on Texas roadways, which potentially makes them an important source of WVC information. All research grade observations include a photo of the animal to confirm species identification, and this photo can also be used to determine mortality of the individual.

These data can be used to identify which species, where species, and when species are found on roads (e.g., "hot species", "hotspots", "hot moments"), and also whether they survived the road encounter. Such information can be used to better understand the causes of WVCs and therefore create more accurate and effective environmental impact assessments and mitigation strategies for TE amphibians and reptiles in Texas at relevant spatial scales (e.g., project area, district-level, regional-scale, state-wide).

Our goal was to provide TxDOT with these data and information by accomplishing the following objectives:

- Use 60,000 observation dataset to create a road crossing database for all SGCN, which can produce "heat" maps pinpointing TxDOT control sections (i.e., road segments) where the greatest frequency of crossings occur for all SGCN and by species throughout Texas.
- 2) Use the same dataset to produce "heat" maps pinpointing TxDOT control sections where the greatest frequency of dead-on-road (DOR) SGCN observations occur.
- Test whether traffic volume, based on Annual Average Daily Traffic (AADT) data, in areas with frequent road crossings can explain the frequency of DOR observations of SGCN in the database.

### 2 Methods

### 2.1 Database

iNaturalist is an application, online community, and database that stores and preserves records of observations of species contributed by scientists and citizen scientists. Participants in iNaturalist upload photographs of specimens along with their geographic coordinates and proposed species' identification. iNaturalist species' identifications must be confirmed by at least one other member of the online community to be catalogued as research grade. Research grade data can be downloaded for free at the iNaturalist website; however, many of the localities are obscured from the public. Taxonomic curators have permission to view and use these obscured records, and one of our principal investigators, Dr. Toby J. Hibbitts, is a taxonomic curator of amphibians and reptiles of Texas for iNaturalist. With this permission, we downloaded the research grade dataset from iNaturalist, which included the complete records of all amphibians and reptiles that were observed in Texas and uploaded to the project called "Herps of Texas". This project is continually growing and included 60,000+ observations on 31 January 2018. All of these observations were included in our primary database. From the iNaturalist "Herps of Texas" project, we downloaded records that had photographs or calls, contained no captive individuals, and were of research grade (indicating that the original identification was verified by at least one other person and in most cases a taxonomic curator).

With the downloaded database, we then went through and removed all observations where the location accuracy was greater than 1 km, leaving us with a database of 53,601 observations of all herpetofauna. The pictures associated with each observation were evaluated to determine if the animal was dead or alive, and the background of the observation was classified as natural, paved road, unpaved road, anthropogenic (e.g. fences), or other (e.g. in hand, in vehicle). Any research grade observations that included a call instead of a picture were included and assumed to be alive at the time of the observation, and the background classified as N/A.

In order to create the herpetofauna road crossing database, we used ArcGIS to combine TxDOT road data with the "Herps of Texas" project data from iNaturalist. First, we identified and labeled those species classified as SGCN by TPWD and also those currently under review for federal listing in this new herpetofauna road crossing database. Then we used a near analysis in ArcGIS to link the localities of all amphibian and reptiles

SGCN observations to the nearest control section from the TxDOT database (accessed 20 December 2018). The near analysis also allowed us to search and recall observations from the road crossing database that were at different distances from control sections.

We also created a herpetofauna traffic database, by using ArcGIS to combine the TxDOT Average Annual Daily Traffic (AADT) with the control section database. There was no unique identifier for the roads to associate them with the AADT data in the publicly available database, thus we used a near analysis to link the AADT data with the nearest control section. We populated our traffic database with the most recent traffic volume information available (i.e., F2016 traffic column; accessed January 2019 at <a href="https://gis-txdot.opendata.arcgis.com/datasets/4480ddc1608a4ca1a6ca4da25f9fbf1b\_0">https://gis-txdot.opendata.arcgis.com/datasets/4480ddc1608a4ca1a6ca4da25f9fbf1b\_0</a>). We averaged the traffic estimates for any control section with more than 1 traffic count. We then merged the AADT data with the herpetofauna database using the control sections as the unique identifier and kept only observations near control sections that had associated AADT data. The final herpetofauna traffic database had 6,699 observations of all herpetofauna.

### 2.2 Mapping

Once the initial herpetofauna road crossing database was created, we were able to map the frequency of all amphibian and reptile observations near the TxDOT control sections. We selected observations located within 200 m of a control section (i.e. 100 m on either side of the road). Because roads are georeferenced by midline in this database, we selected a large buffer size to ensure that species' observations from the largest roads and right of ways were included in subsequent analyses. We conducted a frequency analysis in ArcGIS to determine the frequency of amphibian and reptile SGCN observations at each control section. This frequency analysis was conducted for all amphibian and reptile SGCN observations combined and then for each SGCN species individually. Finally, we joined the frequencies of observations back to the appropriate control sections and projected the values as heat maps throughout Texas. To generate heat maps of DOR SGCN observations, we repeated this process for all observations of dead SGCN throughout Texas.

For each SGCN species, we created between two and 18 maps: one Texas-wide point map that includes all records of the species near and off roads; one Texas-wide point map that includes all records of dead and alive observations of the species within the 200 m road buffer; one to four point maps that include all records of the species near and off roads in each of the four TxDOT geographic regions (i.e. North, South, East, and West) the species was found in; one to four point maps that include dead and alive observations of the species within the 200 m road buffer in each of the four TxDOT geographic regions the species was found in; zero to four heat maps that include the observations per

control section (for observations within the 200 m road buffer) for each of the four TxDOT geographic regions in which the species was found; and zero to four heat maps that include the dead observations per control section (within the 200 m road buffer) for each of the four TxDOT geographic regions in which the species was found (Appendix A).

### 2.3 Traffic Analyses

To test whether traffic volume, based on AADT data, could help explain the frequency of DOR observations of SGCN in the database, we performed binomial logistic regressions in R v 3.5.2 (R Core Team, 2018). For the analyses, the dependent variable was the binomial Dead or Alive, determined from the research grade SGCN observations. Predictor variables included latitude, longitude, month, route type (e.g. county road, state highway), taxonomic group (i.e. anuran, lizard, salamander, snake, and turtle), distance to road (m), and AADT data described above. In general, the pseudo-R<sup>2</sup> value for each analysis was low (< 20%) indicating that the predictor variables were unable to explain much of the variation in the dependent variable when constrained by the linear relationships imposed by the logistic regressions. For this reason, we sought analytical approaches with fewer statistical assumptions, namely classification tree analyses.

We performed recursive partitioning analyses with classification trees using package rpart (Therneau and Atkinson, 2018) and random forest classification, which combines many classification trees for more accurate classifications, using package randomForest (Liaw and Atkinson, 2002). Classification trees use recursive partitioning to predict what outcome (e.g. dead/alive) an observation will have based on the associated predictor variable. Ideally, classification trees end in homogenous (i.e. all dead or all alive) terminal nodes. Classification trees presented below were pruned using a complexity parameter and the terminal nodes were limited to include 5% or more observations to minimize overfitting. However, because classification trees can be dependent on the observations included in the data set, we also used random forest analyses, where hundreds of trees are combined to create the classification. We used the same dependent and predictor variables for the classification trees and the random forests as for the binomial logistic regressions above. We also repeated the analyses for those individual SGCN with enough data (> 100 observations; Table 1): western diamondback rattlesnakes (Crotalus atrox), red-eared sliders (Trachemys scripta), and Texas horned lizards (*Phrynosoma cornutum*). For the random forest analyses, we divided each data set into an 80% training and 20% testing set by randomly assigning each observation to one or the other set. Out of bag errors for the training and testing sets are reported below.

### **3 Results and Conclusions**

### 3.1 Database

As of 3 April 2018, there were 11,527 Research Grade quality records of 62 SGCN species downloaded from the iNaturalist "Herps of Texas" project (Fig. 1; Table 1). Of those records, 7,178 observations of 59 SGCN species were located within the 200 m buffer of Texas road control sections (Fig. 1; Fig. 3; Table 1). There were 1,474 records of 44 SGCN near control sections with associated traffic data. Of those records, 976 observations of 36 SGCN were located within the 200 m buffer of Texas road control sections.

Of the 7,178 SGCN observations in the 200 m road buffer, 1,737 were dead and 5,392 were alive, and 49 were unknown (e.g., the pictures were removed from iNaturalist) (Fig. 2; Fig. 4).

Maps for each species are provided in Appendix A. Notable information for the major taxonomic groups is provided below.



Fig. 1. All statewide observations of Amphibian and Reptile Species of Greatest Conservation Need in the "Herps of Texas" project on iNaturalist. Near-road points are points <100 m from the road midline.



Fig. 2. All statewide observations of dead and alive Amphibian and Reptile Species of Greatest Conservation Need in the "Herps of Texas" project on iNaturalist.



Fig. 3. Statewide observations of all Amphibian and Reptile Species of Greatest Conservation need in the "Herps of Texas" project on iNaturalist per control section.



Fig. 4. Statewide observations of all dead Amphibian and Reptile Species of Greatest Conservation need in the "Herps of Texas" project on iNaturalist per control section.

Table 1. Summary of observations of Amphibian and Reptiles Species of Greatest Conservation Need included in the "Herps of Texas" project on iNaturalist. "All" includes all observations of each species, both on and off roads. "Road" includes all the observations found within 100 m of a control section. "Traffic" includes all the SGCN observations with associated traffic data. "Maps" lists the pages in the appendix with the maps for the corresponding species.

CLASS	GROUP	COMMON NAME	SCIENTIFIC NAME	ALL	ROAD	TRAFFIC	MAPS
Amphibians	Frogs/Toads	Houston Toad	Anaxyrus (Bufo) houstonensis	7	5	-	A2 – A7
Amphibians	Frogs/Toads	Woodhouse's Toad	Anaxyrus (Bufo) woodhousii	144	97	23	A8 – A25
Amphibians	Frogs/Toads	Sheep Frog	Hypopachus variolosus	73	61	21	A26 - A31
Amphibians	Frogs/Toads	White-lipped Frog	Leptodactylus fragilis	11	9	10	A32 - A36
Amphibians	Frogs/Toads	Crawfish Frog	Lithobates (Rana) areolatus	94	84	18	A37 – A50
Amphibians	Frogs/Toads	Cajun Chorus Frog	Pseudacris fouquettei	95	68	20	A51 - A61
Amphibians	Frogs/Toads	Strecker's Chorus Frog	Pseudacris streckeri	151	85	6	A62 - A74
Amphibians	Frogs/Toads	Mexican Burrowing Toad	Rhinophrynus dorsalis	20	15	8	A75 - A80
Amphibians	Frogs/Toads	Mexican Smilisca	Smilisca baudinii	21	9	2	A81 - A85
Amphibians	Salamanders	Southern Dusky Salamander*	Desmognathus auriculatus*	9	2	1	A86 - A90
Amphibians	Salamanders	Salado Springs Salamander	Eurycea chisholmensis	4	-	-	A91 – A93
Amphibians	Salamanders	Cascade Caverns Salamander	Eurycea latitans	9	1	-	A94 - A98
Amphibians	Salamanders	San Marcos Salamander	Eurycea nana	5	1	-	A99 – A103
Amphibians	Salamanders	Georgetown Salamander	Eurycea naufragia	11	8	-	A104 - A108
Amphibians	Salamanders	Texas Salamander	Eurycea neotenes	17	10	2	A109 - A113
Amphibians	Salamanders	Fern Bank Salamander	Eurycea pterophila	14	-	-	A114 – A115
Amphibians	Salamanders	Texas Blind Salamander	Eurycea rathbuni	7	2	5	A116 - A120
Amphibians	Salamanders	Blanco Blind Salamander	Eurycea robusta	NA	NA	NA	NA
Amphibians	Salamanders	Barton Springs Salamander	Eurycea sosorum	7	4	1	A121 – A125
Amphibians	Salamanders	Jollyville Plateau Salamander	Eurycea tonkawae	11	2	-	A126 - A130
Amphibians	Salamanders	Comal Blind Salamander	Eurycea tridentifera	4	-	-	A131 - A132

CLASS	GROUP	COMMON NAME	SCIENTIFIC NAME	ALL	ROAD	TRAFFIC	MAPS
Amphibians	Salamanders	Austin Blind Salamander	Eurycea waterlooensis	2	2	-	A133 – A137
Amphibians	Salamanders	Black-spotted Newt	Notophthalmus meridionalis	17	9	-	A138 - A142
Amphibians	Salamanders	Rio Grande Siren (large form) <sup><math>\dagger</math></sup>	Siren sp.†	6	2	-	A143 - A147
Reptiles	Lizards	Dixon's Whiptail <sup>‡</sup>	Aspidoscelis dixoni‡	NA	NA	NA	NA
Reptiles	Lizards	Reticulated Gecko	Coleonyx reticulatus	33	32	6	A148 - A152
Reptiles	Lizards	Reticulate Collared Lizard	Crotaphytus reticulatus	25	9	3	A153 - A158
Reptiles	Lizards	Spot-tailed Earless Lizard	Holbrookia lacerata	219	161	19	A159 - A172
Reptiles	Lizards	Keeled Earless Lizard	Holbrookia propinqua	86	31	2	A173 – A177
Reptiles	Lizards	Western Slender Glass Lizard	Ophisaurus attenuatus	1,065	1,038	9	A178 - A191
Reptiles	Lizards	Texas Horned Lizard	Phrynosoma cornutum	704	426	153	A192 - A209
Reptiles	Lizards	Greater Short-horned Lizard	Phrynosoma hernandesi	41	2	-	A210 - A214
Reptiles	Lizards	Dunes Sagebrush Lizard	Sceloporus arenicolus	19	3	7	A215 - A219
Reptiles	Snakes	Scarlet Snake	Cemophora coccinea	14	4	1	A220 - A228
Reptiles	Snakes	Black-striped Snake	Coniophanes imperialis	18	5	2	A229 - A234
Reptiles	Snakes	Western Diamondback Rattlesnake	Crotalus atrox	2,367	1,902	491	A235 - A252
Reptiles	Snakes	Timber Rattlesnake	Crotalus horridus	159	108	34	A253 - A266
Reptiles	Snakes	Prairie Rattlesnake	Crotalus viridis	173	143	31	A267 - A272
Reptiles	Snakes	Texas Indigo Snake	Drymarchon melanurus	155	89	20	A273 - A282
Reptiles	Snakes	Speckled Racer	Drymobius margaritiferus	19	8	1	A283 - A288
Reptiles	Snakes	Plains Hognose Snake	Heterodon nasicus	84	55	11	A289 - A297
Reptiles	Snakes	Northern Cat-eyed Snake	Leptodeira septentrionalis	11	8	3	A298 - A303
Reptiles	Snakes	Brazos Watersnake	Nerodia harteri	58	7	3	A304 - A308
Reptiles	Snakes	Concho Watersnake	Nerodia paucimaculata	10	7	-	A309 - A313
Reptiles	Snakes	Smooth Green Snake	Opheodrys vernalis	NA	NA	NA	NA

CLASS	GROUP	COMMON NAME	SCIENTIFIC NAME	ALL	ROAD	TRAFFIC	MAPS
Reptiles	Snakes	Louisiana Pine Snake	Pituophis ruthveni	2	2	-	A314 - A318
Reptiles	Snakes	Massasauga**	Sistrurus tergeminus**	112	95	19	A319 - A332
Reptiles	Snakes	Mexican Blackheaded Snake	Tantilla atriceps	1	1	-	A333 - A337
Reptiles	Snakes	Big Bend Blackheaded Snake	Tantilla cucullata	27	22	2	A338 - A347
Reptiles	Snakes	Texas Garter Snake	Thamnophis sirtalis	21	7	-	A348 - A359
Reptiles	Snakes	Texas Lyre Snake	Trimorphodon vilkinsonii	29	21	2	A360 - A365
Reptiles	Turtles	Smooth Softshell Turtle	Apalone mutica	8	2	-	A366 - A373
Reptiles	Turtles	Spiny Softshell Turtle	Apalone spinifera	562	266	50	A374 - A391
Reptiles	Turtles	Common Snapping Turtle	Chelydra serpentina	486	231	45	A392 - A409
Reptiles	Turtles	Texas Tortoise	Gopherus berlandieri	363	113	40	A410 - A415
Reptiles	Turtles	Cagle's Map Turtle	Graptemys caglei	32	19	2	A416 - A420
Reptiles	Turtles	Texas Map Turtle	Graptemys versa	121	56	6	A421 - A432
Reptiles	Turtles	Big Bend Mudturtle	Kinosternon hirtipes	3	2	-	A433 - A437
Reptiles	Turtles	Alligator Snapping Turtle	Macrochelys temminckii	27	11	2	A438 - A447
Reptiles	Turtles	Texas Diamondback Terrapin	Malaclemys terrapin	18	11	1	A448 - A456
Reptiles	Turtles	Rio Grande Cooter	Pseudemys gorzugi	49	18	1	A457 - A463
Reptiles	Turtles	Common Box Turtle	Terrapene carolina	382	185	29	A464 - A477
Reptiles	Turtles	Ornate Box Turtle	Terrapene ornata	307	191	61	A478 - A495
Reptiles	Turtles	Big Bend Slider	Trachemys gaigeae	27	8	2	A496 - A500
Reptiles	Turtles	Red-eared Slider	Trachemys scripta	2,951	1,403	299	A501 - A518

\*Most authorities now consider the dusky salamanders in Texas to be *Desmognathus conanti*.

<sup>†</sup>A large form of *Siren* has been found in the Rio Grande and is recognized in the TPWD TCAP database, but it has not been officially named yet.

\*\*The Massasauga is listed as *Sistrurus catenatus* in the TPWD TCAP database, but the current nomenclature used on iNaturalist is *S. tergiminus*.

<sup>‡</sup>This species is now considered a pattern variant of *Aspidoscelis tesselatus*, and is no longer recognized by most authorities.

#### 3.1.1 Amphibians – Frogs and Toads

Of the 44 species of frogs and toads found in Texas, 9 are considered SGCN, and all nine of these species had records in the database. The number of records of each species was highly variable, ranging from 7 to 144. Some of the species recognized as SGCN are wide ranging in Texas but with noticeable declines in parts of their distributions, while others have localized distributions and only short seasonal activity periods.

The Houston Toad (*Anaxyrus houstonensis*) has very few records in our database. Existing records maintained by USFWS give a much better representation of what roads may be affected by Houston Toads.

The Woodhouse's Toad (*Anaxyrus woodhousii*), Crawfish Frog (*Lithobates areolatus*), Cajun Chorus Frog (*Pseudacris fouquettei*), and Strecker's Chorus Frog (*Pseudacris streckeri*) are all species that are included on the SGCN list due to declines observed in parts of their distributions in Texas. The state can monitor their current distributions and population status to determine if future listing by the state is warranted.

The Sheep Frog (*Hypopachus variolosus*), Mexican Burrowing Toad (*Rhinophrynus dorsalis*), Mexican Smilisca (*Smilisca baudini*), and Mexican White-lipped Frog (*Leptodactylus fragilis*) are primarily restricted to the Rio Grande Valley. Their restricted distribution in Texas makes them more susceptible to habitat alterations. Also breeding sites often include roadside ditches that may increase road mortality during the breeding season.

#### 3.1.2 Amphibians – Salamanders

Of the 27 species of salamanders found in Texas, 15 are considered SGCN, and 14 of these species had records in the database. The number of individuals of each species found near roads was low, ranging between 2 and 17. Only the Ambystomatid salamanders are known to make migrations to breeding sites; therefore, they are the only group frequently encountered on roads in Texas. The fact that most Texas salamanders are aquatic makes road mortalities of this group rare.

Almost all of the central Texas spring and aquifer salamanders (*Eurycea chisholmensis*, *E. latitans*, *E. nana*, *E. naufragia*, *E. neotenes*, *E. pterophila*, *E. rathbuni E. robusta*, *E. sosorum*, *E. tonkawae*, *E. tridentifera*, and *E. waterlooensis*) are SGCN species and many of these are federally endangered. These salamanders are all aquatic so mortality from vehicular collisions is not a worry. They can occur in creeks and springs that are in road right-of-ways; these sites that do occur near roads should be protected from disturbance as much as possible.

The Rio Grande Siren (*Siren* sp.) and Sirens in general are a group that have been going through taxonomic revision for years. A large form has been identified in the lower Rio Grande valley, but it has not been officially named. This form is found south of the sand sheet in South Texas. Sirens are strictly aquatic and only suffer road mortality in flood conditions. Impacts to Sirens are similar to those described for Texas spring salamanders.

### 3.1.3 Reptiles – Lizards

Of the 45 native species of lizards found in Texas, 9 are considered SGCN, and all but one of these species had records in the database. The number of records of each species was highly variable, ranging from 19 to 1,065. Most of the extreme variation in this group is accounted for by one species (see below).

Many of the SGCN lizard species have restricted Texas distributions (*Coleonyx reticulatus, Crotaphytus reticulatus, Phrynosoma hernandesi, and Sceloporus arenicolus*). Those with broader distributions have mostly suffered population declines (e.g. *Holbrookia lacerata, Phrynosoma cornutum*) in parts of their range and road mortality in the areas that these species are still present may be substantial.

Our most frequently observed lizard in Texas was the Western Slender Glass Lizard (*Ophisaurus attenuatus*). They can be abundant especially in coastal prairies and barrier islands. Over 95% of the records of this species are from the roads on Padre Island. This lizard is considered an SGCN species because inland populations occur in much lower densities and are patchily distributed. They also seem to be declining due to conversion of prairies into agriculture and the invasion of woody plants into prairie habitat.

### 3.1.4 Reptiles – Snakes

Of the 79 species of snakes in Texas, 18 are considered SGCN, and all but one of these species had records in the database. The number of records of each species was highly variable, ranging from 1 to 2,367. Species with few records are usually those that are very rare and restricted to small areas in the state, while the high numbers for other species are due to common, widespread species being considered SGCN as a result of harvesting.

Harvested species include the Western Diamondback and Prairie Rattlesnakes (*Crotalus atrox* and *C. viridis*). These species are collected for rattlesnake roundups and are considered SGCN so the state can monitor trends of take through time. Both of these species are common and frequently encountered on roads.

Ten of the SGCN species have small distributions within Texas, and most of these are uncommon within their restricted ranges. These include our two endemic snake species the Brazos River Water Snake (*Nerodia harteri*) and the Concho River Water Snake (*N. paucimaculata*), although they rarely cross roads.

The other SGCN snake species are more wide ranging but deal with other pressures to their populations such as habitat loss (*Thamnophis sirtalis* and *Sistrurus tergeminus*), human persecution (*Crotalus horridus*), and collection pressure (*Drymarchon melanurus*).

The Western Hognose Snake (*Heterodon nasicus*) is uncommon over most of its distribution in Texas but has seemingly disappeared from the eastern half of the state due to unknown circumstances. Taxonomic changes within this group have recently moved the Mexican Hognose Snake into its own full species (*Heterodon kennerlyi*). We did not include a map for this species because it was not originally listed in the TCAP, and because Mexican Hognose Snake populations seem to be stable throughout Texas.

### 3.1.5 Reptiles – Turtles

Of the 25 species of turtles in Texas (not including sea turtles), 14 are considered SGCN, and all of these species had records in the database. The number of records of each species was highly variable, ranging from 3 to 2,951. The most common species in the state, Red-eared Slider (*Trachemys scripta*), is included on the SGCN list so that TPWD can gather information about harvest numbers of other turtle species. The least common species, Big Bend Mudturtle (*Kinosternon hirtipes*), is known only from one small creek drainage in far west Texas.

Several common species, specifically the Red-eared Slider mentioned above, Spiny Softshell (*Apalone spinifera*), and Common Snapping Turtle (*Chelydra serpentina*), are included in the SGCN list to help TPWD monitor the level of harvest of other turtle species and to help fund research on the status of their populations. These common species may soon be removed from the SGCN list due to a recent ban on the collection of all turtles in Texas for commercial purposes.

Both species of Box Turtles (*Terrapene ornata* and *T. carolina*) are included in the SGCN lists largely due to perceived population declines. Some of the potential reasons for these declines include increased predation on hatchlings from mesocarnivores and increased mortality on roads due to larger human population sizes and larger road networks within their habitat.

Many of these turtle species are restricted to aquatic habitats such as lakes or rivers, and they rarely leave that environment. Unfortunately, when they do leave the water, it is usually for reproduction (females laying eggs). These female turtles making nesting movements can become an important source of mortality for some populations, because turtle life history is such that removing reproductive females from populations usually results in steep population declines over time.

### 3.2 Mapping

Species absent from the database may still be present on and near roads. Absences can be the result of multiple factors, including lack of surveys, lack of detection, and lack of available individuals. Because this database represents undirected searching by many individuals, there are some areas that are searched frequently (e.g., highways in west Texas) and some areas that are underrepresented (e.g., panhandle counties). Additionally, there could be bias in detecting individuals on or near the roadways. Typically larger species in these groups are more easily detected than smaller species. Finally, absences could result from a lack of available individuals – when surveys do not align with the times the species are actually moving. Also, there were very few observations on Interstate Highways, which is likely due to safety issues with stopping on these roads.

Reptiles and Amphibians were observed within 100 m of 2,333 control sections across Texas. The majority of control sections (2,244) had 10 or fewer observations of SGCN species; 57 control sections had between 11 and 25 observations; 25 control sections had between 26 and 50 observations; 4 control sections had between 51 and 75 observations; 0 control sections had between 76 and 100 observations; and 3 control sections had more than 100 observations of SGCN individuals.

The highest number of observations was found on control section 10537 (FD 702206; 615 observations). This control section is located in Padre Island National Seashore in Kleberg County and had 607 observations of the Western Slender Glass Lizard from March to May 2017 from a targeted effort by one individual searcher. After that, control section 15551 (FD 704951) is the control section with the highest number of observations of SGCN herpetofauna (178 observations) which had 161 observations of the Western Slender Glass Lizard during 2017 for Park Road 22, still in Padre Island National Seashore. See the information on this species in section 3.1.3 for more information. The next two highest observations of 4 SGCN (western diamondback rattlesnakes, prairie rattlesnakes, Texas horned lizards, and ornate box turtles), and 95709 (FM 170) had 73 observations of 4 species (western diamondback rattlesnakes, Texas lyre snakes, reticulated geckos, and a Big Bend slider).

Within 100 m of a road, snakes and turtles are the most common groups found on the Interstate Highways (IH; 11 and 20, respectively), US Highways (UA and US; 466 and 152 observations, respectively), and State Highways (SH; 480 and 208 observations, respectively) (Table 2). Frogs and toads were commonly found on County Roads (CR; 243 observations) and Farm to Market roads (FM; 98 observations) (Table 2). Although there were few records of salamanders in general, they were mostly found on City Streets (CS; 14 observations), CR (12 observations), and SH (11 observations). Lizards were

most commonly found on FD (863 observations), CR (346 observations) and Park Roads (PR; 157 observations). Snakes were commonly found on both smaller road ways (e.g. CR (574 observations), FM (527 observations)) as well as larger highways (e.g. SH - 480 observations; US - 464 observations). Although turtles were the second most observed group on larger SH and US, they were most commonly found on CS (874 observations), CR (487 observations), and FM (259 observations) roads.

Table 2. Number of SGCN Amphibian and Reptile observations within 100 m of the road on the different road types. BS – Business State Highways; BU – Business US Highways; CR – County Road; CS – City Street; FC – Undefined; FD –

Undefined; FM – Farm to Market Road; IH – Interstate Highway; PR – Park Road; RE – Recreational Road; RM – Ranch to Market Road; SH – State Highway; SL – State Highway Loop; SS – State Highway Spur; UA – US Highway Alternate

roadway; US – US Highway. Bolded columns are those road types included in the SGCN traffic analyses.

Group	BS	BU	CR	CS	FC	FD	FM	IH	PR	RE	RM	SH	SL	SS	UA	US
Frogs and Toads	-	3	243	32	4	9	98	1	4	-	2	25	-	-	-	17
Lizards	-	-	346	42	5	863	104	2	157	-	59	68	-	-	-	56
Salamanders	-	-	12	14	4	-	-	2	-	-	-	11	-	-	-	-
Snakes	-	4	574	74	14	88	527	11	16	-	227	480	3	-	2	464
Turtles	4	-	487	874	290	98	259	20	64	1	28	208	23	3	2	150

### 3.3 Traffic Analyses

#### 3.3.1 Species of Greatest Conservation Need - SGCN

To characterize the relationship between traffic volume and the frequency of dead-onroad (DOR) SGCN observations, we first divided the data set into a training and test set for random forest analysis by randomly assigning 80% of the observations to the training set and the remaining 20% to the test set. We ran the random forest analysis with 500 trees and had an out-of-bag error rate estimate of 17.96% on the training set, but only 11.44% on the test set. This indicated that the random forest was able to correctly predict the dead/alive outcome accurately for almost 90% of the test data set. Satisfied with this level of accuracy, we moved forward with further interpretations of the analyses.



Fig. 5. (A) Variables with larger Mean Decrease in Accuracy are considered more important because removing them reduces accuracy of the model. Similarly, in (B) variables with larger Mean Decrease in Gini are considered more important because removing those increases model misclassifications. Abbreviations are: DistRd – distance to road (m); F2016\_TRAF\_avg – average AADT from 2016; and RTE\_PRFX –road type (e.g., state highway, city road).



Fig. 6. Partial dependence plot with outliers removed for dead observations based on distance to road and 2016 AADT. Yellow colors identify values for distance to road and 2016 AADT that are important predictors of dead SGCN observations.



# Fig. 7. Partial dependence plot for dead SGCN observations based on latitude and longitude in Texas. Projection area constrained by distribution of observations.

We found distance to road, average AADT, latitude and longitude were important predictors of whether SGCN observations were dead individuals or alive based on Mean Decrease in Accuracy (Fig. 5a) and Mean Decrease in Gini (Fig. 5b). Variables with larger Mean Decrease in Accuracy were considered important because removing them from the analysis reduced the accuracy of the model. Similarly, variables with larger Mean Decrease in Gini were considered important because removing them increased the impurity index, which describes misclassifications or heterogeneity at the terminal nodes. These results showed that SGCN observations closer to roads and in areas with higher traffic were predicted to be dead (Fig. 6), which was expected. Interestingly, however, there appeared to be hotspots and coldspots where these relationships were stronger or weaker, respectively, throughout the state (i.e., latitude and longitude were important predictors). These hotspots of dead SGCN observations were found in south and east Texas, coastal prairies, and to a lesser extent in the western part of the state (Fig 7). The panhandle and central Texas were mostly coldspots for dead SGCN observations.



# Fig. 8. Pruned classification tree using the full SGCN herpetofauna traffic database; terminal nodes contain minimum of 5% of the data.

The classification tree above uses all the SGCN herpetofauna traffic database to classify observations into dead or alive categories (Fig. 8). We included it here to illustrate some of the conclusions from Figs. 5-7, but also to caution that results from classification tree analyses, in particular the values at each split along the tree, can be variable depending on the data available. As an example, we see in the tree above that the distance to road and AADT predict the first splits of the data. A distance to road of approximately 33.73 m is suggested in tree above, but that number can change to be higher or lower with a slightly different data set, even if distance to road is still predicted to be important in the analysis. Similarly, the tree indicates that even relatively low amounts of traffic, in this example, 210 AADT, can impact whether individuals are found dead or alive on roads. Again, this splitting value could be higher or lower with a slightly different data set. Variable classification tree results can emerge as part of the random forest analysis, where, in this study, 500 different subsets of the data set were used for training or testing. Or, if the database of SGCN observations grows over time or more AADT data becomes available, we might also expect the results of the classification tree analysis to change.

#### 3.3.2 Western Diamondback Rattlesnake

We repeated the classification tree and random forest analyses described above to investigate the importance of traffic in predicting mortality in the western diamondback rattlesnake, which had 483 complete observations in the database (8 of 491 observations reported in Table 1 had incomplete data and were not included in analyses).



Fig. 9. (A) Variables with larger Mean Decrease in Accuracy are considered more important because removing them reduces accuracy of the model. Similarly, in (B) variables with larger Mean Decrease in Gini are considered more important because removing those increases model misclassifications. Abbreviations are: DistRd – distance to road (m); F2016\_TRAF\_avg – average AADT from 2016; and RTE\_PRFX –road type (e.g., state highway, city road).



Fig. 10. Partial dependence plot with outliers removed for dead observations of western diamondback rattlesnakes (*Crotalus atrox*) based on distance to road and 2016 AADT. Yellow colors identify values for distance to road and 2016 AADT that are important predictors of dead SGCN observations.



# Fig.11. Partial dependence plot for dead observations of western diamondback rattlesnakes (*Crotalus atrox*) based on latitude and longitude in Texas. Projection area constrained by distribution of observations.

For the western diamondback rattlesnake, we used the same randomized subsampling protocol for random forest analysis described above. We observed an estimated out-ofbag error rate of 19.32% on the training set and 20.0% on the test set based on 1,000 trees. This indicates that the random forest was able to correctly predict the dead/alive outcome accurately for 80% of the test data set. Moving forward with interpretations of the results, we again found that AADT, distance to road, and latitude and longitude were important predictors of mortality for western diamondbacks (Fig. 9).We also observed that month may play a larger role in returning homogenous terminal nodes (Fig. 9b) than it did for the full SGCN herpetofauna traffic analyses above. With respect to traffic, we found that values for AADT greater than approximately 200 contributed to higher probabilities of being dead on roads. Additionally, there appeared to be hotspots of dead observations based on location in the state (latitude and longitude). These hotspots of mortality occurred in south, north-central, and west Texas (Fig 11).


# Fig. 12. Pruned classification tree using all western diamondback rattlesnake (*Crotalus atrox*) observations; terminal nodes contain minimum of 5% of the data.

We included the classification tree above to help illustrate some of the conclusions above from Figs. 9-11. This tree shows that latitude and month were important predictors used to classify western diamondback rattlesnake observations into dead or alive categories.

#### 3.3.3 Red-eared sliders

We repeated the classification tree and random forest analyses described above to investigate the importance of traffic in predicting mortality for red-eared sliders (*Trachemys scripta*), which had 277 complete observations in the database (22 of 299 observations reported above in Table 1 had incomplete data and were not included in the analysis).



Fig. 13. (A) Variables with larger Mean Decrease in Accuracy are considered more important because removing them reduces accuracy of the model. Similarly, in (B) variables with larger Mean Decrease in Gini are considered more important because removing those increases model misclassifications. Abbreviations are: DistRd – distance to road (m); F2016\_TRAF\_avg – average AADT from 2016; and RTE\_PRFX –road type (e.g., state highway, city road).



Fig. 14. Pruned classification tree using all red-eared slider (*Trachemys scripta*) traffic observations; terminal nodes contain minimum of 5% of the data.



#### Fig.15. Partial dependence plot for dead observations of red-eared sliders (*Trachemys scripta*) based on latitude and longitude in Texas. Projection area constrained by distribution of observations.

For the red-eared slider random forest analysis, we again created training and test data sets by randomly assigning 80% of observations to a training set with the remaining being assigned to a test set. We ran the random forest analysis with 1000 trees and had an out-of-bag estimate of error rate of 8.33% on the training set, but 13.11% on the test set. This indicated that the random forest analysis was able to correctly predict the dead/alive outcome accurately for 87% of the test data set. Further interpretations of results for red-eared sliders indicated that distance to road was the most important predictor of mortality. Latitude and longitude were also somewhat important predictor variables in the random forest analyses (Fig. 13). We found that red-eared slider observations less than approximately 42.45 m from roads were more likely to be classified as dead, especially in eastern, and to a lesser extent, southern Texas (Figs. 14-15).



Fig. 16. (A) Variables with larger Mean Decrease in Accuracy are considered more important because removing them reduces accuracy of the model. Similarly, in (B) variables with larger Mean Decrease in Gini are considered more important because removing those increases model misclassifications. Abbreviations are: DistRd – distance to road (m); F2016\_TRAF\_avg – average AADT from 2016; and RTE\_PRFX –road type (e.g., state highway, city road).



Fig. 17. Partial dependence plot with outliers removed for dead observations of Texas horned lizards (*Phrynosoma cornutum*) based on distance to road and 2016 AADT. Yellow colors identify values for distance to road and 2016 AADT that are important predictors of dead SGCN observations.



Fig.18. Partial dependence plot for dead observations of Texas horned lizards (*Phrynosoma cornutum*) based on latitude and longitude in Texas. Projection area constrained by distribution of observations.



Fig. 19. Pruned classification tree using all Texas horned lizard (*Phrynosoma cornutum*) traffic observations; terminal node contains minimum of 5% of data.

#### 3.3.4 Texas Horned Lizard

We repeated the classification tree and random forest analyses described above to investigate the importance of traffic in predicting mortality for the Texas horned lizard (*Phrynosoma cornutum*), which had 147 complete observations available (6 of 153 from Table 1 had incomplete data and were not included in the analysis).

For the Texas horned lizard random forest analysis using 1,000 trees, we observed an outof-bag error rate of 15.97% on the training set and 21.43% on the test set. This indicates that the random forest was only able to correctly predict the dead/alive outcome accurately for 79% of the test data set. In this analysis, latitude was the most important predictor of mortality for Texas horned lizards, but distance to road, AADT, and longitude were also important (Fig. 16). We also found that Texas horned lizard observations less than approximately 75 m from roads were more likely to be classified as dead, especially in south and west Texas, and to a lesser extent in central Texas and the western panhandle (Figs. 17-19).

#### 3.4 Data Set Biases

There are a number of biases in the observational citizen science database we used that can impact analyses (Dickinson et al., 2010), and indeed restricted the use of more common analyses like the binomial logistic regression in this study. One commonly encountered problem is data quality or accuracy. In the case of the "Herps of Texas" iNaturalist project, this is generally not a problem because experienced herpetologists volunteer as project coordinators that verify observations. All observations in the database for this study are research grade observations, which means the species identification has at least 2/3rds agreement among coordinators and the observation includes a date, latitude and longitude, and pictures or calls.

Beyond issues with accuracy, there can be observer biases related to volunteer behaviors and experience that influence what is found, what observations they can safely collect, and what they choose to stop for. There are almost certainly biases in species size in our data set, because larger individuals are easier to find than smaller ones. Smaller individuals dead on roads are also generally scavenged quicker than larger individuals, which are generally available to be found for longer periods of time. Because this is an opportunistic data set, data collected also depends on what organisms observers are more likely to stop for. In our experience, rarer or novel herpetofauna are more likely to be stopped for than more common herpetofauna. Additionally, observers have personal preferences in systematic groups and may be more likely to stop for a snake on the road versus an amphibian on the road. Observers may also be more likely to stop for something alive on the road (e.g. to move turtles to safety) than dead on the roads. Finally, there are safety issues with observations collected on roads. We had many fewer observations on interstate highways than other types of roads, most likely for safety reasons.

Observers also have biases about where they go to make observations. Most observations are made near a person's residence (where they travel everyday) and most people live in cities, therefore biasing observations to be made near cities. Amateur herpetologists also like to travel to areas with high species diversity or areas with unique and interesting species. Many herpetologists travel to the Big Bend region of Texas and to the lower Rio Grande Valley to look for pretty, rare, or unique reptile and amphibian species, those areas also have an especially high diversity of reptiles which attracts people.

There were also biases present in the traffic data set, which was designed to capture human activity and did not necessarily align with herpetofauna captures. For example, our final database had 53,601 observations, 11,527 of them were of SGCN herpetofauna. Once those SGCN observations were merged with control sections that had traffic estimates, we had only 1,474 observations for analysis across the state of Texas.

## References

- Bissonette, J.A., Kassar, C.A., and Cook, L.J. 2008. Assessment of costs associated with deer–vehicle collisions: human death and injury, vehicle damage, and deer loss. Human-Wildlife Conflicts, 2(1), pp.17-27.
- Blandford, B.L., Ripy, J., and Grossardt, T.H. 2013. GIS-Based Expert Systems Model for Predicting Habitat Suitability of Blackside Dace in Southeastern Kentucky. Transportation Research Board 92nd Annual Meeting, Washington DC, United States.
- Dickinson, J.L., Zuckerberg, B., and Bonter, D.N. 2010. Citizen science as an ecological research tool: challenges and benefits. Annual Review of Ecology, Evolution, and Systematics 41, pp. 149-72.
- Fahrig, L., and Rytwinski, T. 2009. Effects of roads on animal abundance: an empirical review and synthesis. Ecology and society, 14(1).
- Lederman, J., and Wachs, M. 2014. Habitat conservation plans: Preserving endangered species and delivering transportation projects. Transportation Research Record: Journal of the Transportation Research Board, (2403), pp.9-16.
- Liaw, A., and Wiener, M. 2002. Classification and Regression by randomForest. R News, 2(3), 18-22.
- Patrick, D.A., Gibbs, J.P., Popescu, V.D., and Nelson, D.A. 2012. Multi-scale habitatresistance models for predicting road mortality "hotspots" for turtles and amphibians. Herpetological Conservation and Biology, 7(3), pp.407-426.
- R Core Team. 2018. R: A language and environment for statistical computing. R Foundation for Statistical Computing, Vienna, Austria. URL https://www.Rproject.org/.
- Roedenbeck, I., Fahrig, L., Findlay, C.S., Houlahan, J., Jaeger, J., Klar, N., Kramer-Schadt, S., and van der Grift, E. 2007. The Rauischholzhausen agenda for road ecology. Ecology and society, 12(1).

- Shilling, F.M., Waetjen, D.P., and Charry, B. 2014. Using Volunteer Wildlife Observations to Plan Mitigation on Highways (No. 14-4931).
- Therneau, T., and Atkinson, B. 2018. rpart: Recursive Partitioning and Regression Trees. R package version 4.1-13. https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=rpart

# **Appendix A.**

Maps are arranged by taxonomic group (i.e. Frogs and Toads, Salamanders, Lizards, Snakes, Turtles) and then in alphabetical order by scientific name for all Species of Greatest Conservation Need (SGCN) included in the iNaturalist "Herps of Texas" project. For each species, there are two state-wide maps, between 1 and 8 regional dot maps, and between 0 and 8 regional control section heat maps.

- State-wide maps:
  - Near and off road maps: Blue dots represent points located within 200 m of a TxDOT road section; yellow dots represent points outside the 200 m road buffer.
  - Dead and alive road maps: Red dots represent dead observations located within 200 m of a TxDOT road section; blue dots represent alive observations located within the 200 m road buffer.
- Regional point maps:
  - Near and off road maps: Blue dots represent points located within 200 m of a TxDOT control section; yellow dots represent points outside the 200 m road buffer.
  - Dead and alive road maps: Red dots represent dead observations located within 200 m of a TxDOT road section; blue dots represent alive observations located within the 200 m road buffer.
- Regional heat maps:
  - Near road maps: Number of observations within 100 m of a TxDOT road section for each control section, grouped into 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5+ observations.
  - Near road, Dead only maps: Number of dead observations within 100 m of a TxDOT road section for each control section, grouped into 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5+ observations.

### A1. Amphibians – Frogs and Toads

































































































































































## A2. Amphibians – Salamanders



































































































































## A3. Reptiles – Lizards













































































































































## A4. Reptiles – Snakes







































































































































Speckled Racer







Drymobius margaritiferus































































































































































## A5. Reptiles – Turtles









































































































































































































































































































# **Appendix B.**

Appendix B contains informational tables for each of the Texas Species of Greatest Conservation Need (SGCN) herpetofauna. Each page features one species, with common and scientific name and a representative picture of the species. Also included is a brief description of the species relationship to roads, based on information from the final Research Report, supplemented with expert opinion. Finally, there is a summary table of control sections with the highest number of observations of that species, with the total number of observations on that control section (# Obs) and the total number of dead observations on that control section (# Obs) and the total number of dead observations on that control section (# Dead). Control section names are taken from the TxDOT open GIS data portal (https://gis-txdot.opendata.arcgis.com; last downloaded 20 December 2018), column "CTRL\_SEC\_1". These data correspond with the species maps in Appendix A.Statewide maps:

## **B1.** Amphibians – Frogs and Toads

**Amphibian – Frog/Toad: Houston Toad** (*Anaxyrus houstonensis*)



Brief Description: All toads will cross roads especially when roads are near wetlands in which they breed. Some evidence suggests Houston Toads avoid crossing large areas with open canopy so road width will likely affect toad crossing.

CTRL_SEC _1	# Obs	# Dead
27103	1	0
53001	1	0
AA0180	1	0
AA0190	1	0
AA5219	1	0

Amphibian – Frog/Toad: Woodhouse's Toad (Anaxyrus woodhousei)



Brief Description: All toads will cross roads especially when roads are near wetlands in which they breed.

CTRL_SEC_1	# Obs	# Dead	CTRL_SEC_1	# Obs	# Dead	CTRL_SEC_1	# Obs	# Dead
AA0540	7	0	LC1484	2	0	31302	1	0
AA0732	5	0	LD0337	2	0	332601	1	0
114202	3	0	LG0274	2	0	35202	1	0
237101	3	0	LQ0147	2	0	35602	1	0
AA3420	3	0	124502	1	0	51401	1	1
10504	2	0	128701	1	0	79404	1	0
4320	2	0	13201	1	0	80202	1	0
79402	2	0	241702	1	1	87403	1	0
84403	2	1	25703	1	0	95501	1	0
AA0051	2	0	29801	1	0	AA0132	1	0
AA0279	2	0	31101	1	0	AA0243	1	0
AA0799	2	0	31204	1	0	AA0284	1	0

**Amphibian – Frog/Toad: Sheep Frog** (*Hypopachus variolosus*)



Brief Description: This species can be frequently encountered on roads during and after heavy rains.

CTRL_SEC_1	# Obs	# Dead	CTRL_SEC_1	# Obs	# Dead	CTRL_SEC_1	# Obs	# Dead
111701	5	0	105201	1	1	AA0141	1	0
180701	4	1	155801	1	0	AA0150	1	0
32902	4	0	237303	1	0	AA0182	1	0
44703	4	0	25505	1	0	AA0229	1	0
170301	3	0	3901	1	0	AA0245	1	0
188901	3	1	43305	1	0	AA0258	1	0
AA0134	3	0	51601	1	0	AA0300	1	0
AA0220	3	0	51703	1	0	AA0303	1	0
111703	2	0	AA0103	1	0	AA0308	1	0
32710	2	0	AA0121	1	0	AA0404	1	0
54206	2	0	AA0122	1	0	AA0737	1	1
10212	1	0	AA0127	1	0	AA3524	1	1

Amphibian – Frog/Toad: Mexican White-lipped Frog (Leptodactylus fragilis)



Brief Description: This species is rarely observed on roads but frequently calls from roadside ditches within its limited Texas distribution.

CTRL_SEC _1	# Obs	# Dead
321701	7	0
253001	1	0
32902	1	0

Amphibian – Frog/Toad: Crawfish Frog (*Lithobates areolatus*)



Brief Description: During this species short breeding season they are frequently encountered on roads but after breeding they rarely move from their burrows

CTRL_SEC_1	# Obs	# Dead	CTRL_SEC _1	# Obs	# Dead	CTRL_SEC_1	# Obs	# Dead
AA0240	6	1	AA0004	2	0	A18032	1	0
AA5066	6	5	AA0167	2	0	AA0002	1	0
52302	5	2	AA0309	2	0	AA0003	1	0
AA0518	5	1	AA5025	2	0	AA0005	1	0
AA5067	5	0	AA5055	2	0	AA0008	1	0
AA3708	4	0	AA5062	2	0	AA0096	1	0
AA0009	3	1	11801	1	0	AA0101	1	0
270701	2	2	253801	1	0	AA0195	1	0
294101	2	0	43501	1	0	AA0253	1	0
305101	2	0	64603	1	0	AA0325	1	0
34005	2	2	84005	1	0	AA0397	1	0
93104	2	2	9101	1	1	AA0483	1	0

Amphibian – Frog/Toad: Cajun Chorus Frog (Pseudacris fouquettei)



Brief Description: This species commonly calls from roadside ditches but is rarely encountered on roads.

CTRL_SEC_1	# Obs	# Dead	CTRL_SEC _1	# Obs	# Dead	CTRL_SEC_1	# Obs	# Dead
AA0101	3	0	AA7153	2	0	54303	1	0
AA5025	3	0	107901	1	0	59703	1	0
FD0366	3	0	11802	1	0	AA0003	1	0
111201	2	0	12301	1	0	AA0004	1	0
271501	2	0	140203	1	0	AA0008	1	0
AA0167	2	0	244802	1	0	AA0122	1	0
AA0172	2	0	288001	1	0	AA0165	1	0
AA0227	2	0	320502	1	0	AA0174	1	0
AA0253	2	0	33601	1	0	AA0309	1	0
AA0325	2	0	33602	1	0	AA0316	1	0
AA2412	2	0	33603	1	0	AA0368	1	0
AA3650	2	0	34002	1	0	AA0433	1	0

Amphibian – Frog/Toad: Strecker's Chorus Frog (Pseudacris streckeri)



Brief Description: This species commonly calls from roadside ditches but is rarely encountered on roads.

CTRL_SEC_1	# Obs	# Dead	CTRL_SEC _1	# Obs	# Dead	CTRL_SEC_1	# Obs	# Dead
AA0102	5	0	AA0445	2	0	57102	1	0
AA0081	4	0	AA2240	2	0	AA0033	1	0
AA1590	4	0	AA3028	2	0	AA0039	1	0
LO1898	4	0	AA3340	2	1	AA0063	1	0
AA0078	3	0	AA3820	2	0	AA0065	1	0
AA0983	3	0	AA5067	2	0	AA0082	1	0
21603	2	0	AA5070	2	0	AA0146	1	0
AA0080	2	0	AA9271	2	0	AA0154	1	0
AA0150	2	0	119901	1	0	AA0220	1	0
AA0159	2	0	14406	1	0	AA5068	1	1
AA0433	2	0	15005	1	0	AA5077	1	0
AA0442	2	0	18004	1	0	AA7711	1	1

Amphibian – Frog/Toad: Mexican Burrowing Toad (*Rhinophrynus dorsalis*)



Brief Description: This species can be found on roads after heavy rains within its limited distribution in South Texas.

CTRL_SEC _1	# Obs	# Dead
321701	4	0
32902	4	1
110304	3	0
AA0364	2	0
32901	1	0
AA0124	1	0

Amphibian – Frog/Toad: Mexican Smilisca (Smilisca baudinii)



Brief Description: This species commonly calls from roadside wetlands but is rarely encountered on roads.

CTRL_SEC_1	# Obs	# Dead
32710	2	0
68401	2	0
105703	1	0
180101	1	0
22007	1	0
3910	1	0
S00282	1	0

## **B2.** Amphibians – Salamanders

Amphibian – Salamander: Southern Dusky Salamander (*Desmognathus auriculatus*)



Brief Description: This species is not known to cross roads in Texas but could be found in the right of way at stream crossings.

CTRL_SEC_1	# Obs	# Dead
30405	1	0
AA0110	1	0

Amphibian – Salamander: Salado Salamander (Eurycea chisholmensis)



Brief Description: This aquatic species does not cross roads but could be found in spring fed streams in road right of ways.

## Control sections with the highest number of observations

CTRL\_SEC \_1 # Obs # Dead

none
Amphibian – Salamander: Cascade Caverns Salamander (Eurycea latitans)



Brief Description: This aquatic species does not cross roads but could be found in spring fed streams in road right of ways.

CTRL_SEC _1	# Obs	# Dead
LI1982	1	0

Amphibian – Salamander: San Marcos Salamander (Eurycea nana)



Brief Description: This aquatic species does not cross roads but could be found in spring fed streams in road right of ways.

CTRL_SEC _1	# Obs	# Dead
B01175	1	0

Amphibian – Salamander: Georgetown Salamander (Eurycea naufragia)



Brief Description: This aquatic species does not cross roads but could be found in spring fed streams in road right of ways.

CTRL_SEC _1	# Obs	# Dead
AA0961	7	0
AA0959	1	0

Amphibian – Salamander: Texas Salamander (*Eurycea neotenes*)



Brief Description: This aquatic species does not cross roads but could be found in spring fed streams in road right of ways.

CTRL_SEC_1	# Obs	# Dead
7206	2	0
B00205	2	0
104202	1	0
AA0269	1	0
AA0572	1	0
LR4512	1	0
LR4801	1	0
LR4810	1	0

Amphibian – Salamander: Fern Bank Salamander (Eurycea pterophila)



Brief Description: This aquatic species does not cross roads but could be found in spring fed streams in road right of ways.

# Control sections with the highest number of observations

CTRL\_SEC \_1 # Obs # Dead

none

Amphibian – Salamander: Texas Blind Salamander (Eurycea rathbuni)



Brief Description: This species in strictly aquatic and found in aquifers. Road construction activities and pollutants from road runoff are its only potential dangers.

CTRL_SEC _1	# Obs	# Dead
B01175	1	0
LW0658	1	0

Amphibian – Salamander: Barton Springs Salamander (Eurycea sosorum)



Brief Description: This aquatic species does not cross roads but could be found in spring fed streams in road right of ways.

CTRL_SEC _1	# Obs	# Dead
LC1193	4	0

Amphibian – Salamander: Jollyville Plateau Salamander (*Eurycea tonkawae*)



Brief Description: This aquatic species does not cross roads but could be found in spring fed streams in road right of ways.

CTRL_SEC _1	# Obs	# Dead
LZ4693	2	0

Amphibian – Salamander: Comal Blind Salamander (Eurycea tridentifera)



Brief Description: This species in strictly aquatic and found in aquifers. Road construction activities and pollutants from road runoff are its only potential dangers.

# Control sections with the highest number of observations

CTRL\_SEC \_1 # Obs # Dead

none

Amphibian – Salamander: Austin Blind Salamander (Eurycea waterlooensis)



Brief Description: This species in strictly aquatic and found in aquifers. Road construction activities and pollutants from road runoff are its only potential dangers.

CTRL_SEC _1	# Obs	# Dead
LC1193	2	0

Amphibian – Salamander: Black Spotted Newt (Notophthalmus meridionalis)



Brief Description: This species is semi-aquatic and it spends most of its life in and around ephemeral wetlands. These wetlands may occur in road right of ways but it does not cross roads.

# Control sections with the highest number of observations

CTRL_SEC _1	# Obs	# Dead
43305	7	0
AA3415	1	0
LD3558	1	0

s

**Amphibian – Salamander: Lesser Siren** (*Siren intermedia*)



Brief Description: These large aquatic salamanders are known to cross roads during flooding and use roadside ditches or wetlands that are in road right of ways.

CTRL_SEC _1	# Obs	# Dead
43305	2	0

# **B3.** Reptiles – Lizards

**Reptile – Lizard: Reticulated Gecko** (*Coleonyx reticulatus*)



Brief Description: This species is commonly encountered on cliffs and road cuts but rarely crosses roads within it limited distribution in West Texas.

CTRL_SEC_1	# Obs	# Dead
35805	15	0
95709	8	0
291301	6	0
95710	3	0

**Reptile – Lizard: Reticulate Collared Lizard** (*Crotaphytus reticulatus*)



Brief Description: This species is frequently found basking on roads and right of ways.

CTRL_SEC _1	# Obs	# Dead
194203	1	0
241602	1	1
AA0102	1	0
AA0116	1	0
AA0133	1	0
AA0355	1	0
AA0446	1	0
AA1004	1	0
AA1020	1	0

**Reptile – Lizard: Spot-tailed Earless Lizard** (*Holbrookia lacerata*)



Brief Description: This species prefers open habitats and are commonly seen on roads, both alive and dead.

CTRL_SEC_1	# Obs	# Dead	CTRL_SEC _1	# Obs	# Dead	CTRL_SEC_1	# Obs	# Dead
AA1203	27	14	228002	2	0	237501	1	0
AA1212	24	3	AA0103	2	0	242801	1	0
AA0209	12	2	AA0131	2	0	39603	1	0
AA0408	12	3	AA0246	2	0	55502	1	1
AA0331	7	0	AA0314	2	0	82602	1	0
AA0799	7	5	AA1473	2	0	86902	1	1
AA0078	6	0	AA2002	2	0	87601	1	0
AA1202	6	2	AA6130	2	1	AA0055	1	0
AA0002	5	0	15903	1	1	AA0093	1	1
AA0109	5	0	15905	1	0	AA0140	1	0
AA1810	5	3	20105	1	0	AA0195	1	1
164701	2	0	227801	1	0	AA0236	1	0

**Reptile – Lizard: Keeled Earless Lizard** (*Holbrookia propinqua*)



Brief Description: This species prefers sandy habitat and does not seem to be commonly encountered on the hard surface of roads.

CTRL_SEC _1	# Obs	# Dead	CTRL_SEC _1	# Obs	# Dead
LZ4953	8	0	LF1872	1	0
25504	3	0	LJ8387	1	0
AA0633	3	0	LT9295	1	0
FD4951	3	0	LW7295	1	0
32702	2	0	LW7430	1	0
18004	1	0			
33105	1	0			
3910	1	0			
AA0110	1	0			
AA0217	1	0			
FD2206	1	0			
FD2213	1	0			



**Reptile – Lizard: Slender Glass Lizard (Ophisaurus attenuatus)** 

Brief Description: This species is commonly encountered on roads through their grassland habitat and have high rates of mortality or roadways.

CTRL_SEC_1	# Obs	# Dead	CTRL_SEC_1	# Obs	# Dead	CTRL_SEC_1	# Obs	# Dead
FD2206	613	126	FD2377	3	0	AA0326	1	0
FD4951	165	116	AA0257	2	2	AA0715	1	0
61703	147	97	FD2345	2	0	AA0799	1	0
FD2205	32	25	122701	1	0	AA4140	1	1
FD2203	16	12	185203	1	1	AA4850	1	0
43305	7	7	38601	1	0	AA6335	1	0
AA0120	5	1	44705	1	0	B28945	1	0
FD2351	5	1	51706	1	1	FD0238	1	0
226303	4	4	54303	1	1	FD2329	1	0
FD2210	4	2	80403	1	1	FD2331	1	0
FD2330	3	0	AA0207	1	1	FD2332	1	0
FD2353	3	1	AA0227	1	1	LJ9402	1	1

**Reptile – Lizard: Texas Horned Lizard** (*Phrynosoma cornutum*)



Brief Description: This iconic species is commonly encountered on roads where it seems to bask and forage. Their use of crypsis as a defense and their slow running speed make them susceptible to road mortality.

CTRL_SEC_1	# Obs	# Dead	CTRL_SEC _1	# Obs	# Dead	CTRL_SEC_1	# Obs	# Dead
AA0109	19	1	36001	5	0	AA0037	3	0
229702	14	1	AA5306	5	3	AA0151	3	0
128302	12	2	14007	4	4	AA0350	3	0
87101	11	3	269303	4	4	AA0406	3	2
86608	9	6	27603	4	0	AA0413	3	0
AA0209	9	1	AA0408	4	1	10603	2	0
AA0060	8	1	10502	3	2	10606	2	1
AA0438	8	0	128303	3	1	15904	2	0
115505	7	3	2103	3	1	186601	2	0
AA0002	7	0	242502	3	2	198101	2	0
AA0799	7	3	55606	3	0	2104	2	1
AA0600	6	2	AA0012	3	0	2105	2	0

Reptile – Lizard: Greater Short-horned Lizard (Phrynosoma hernandesi)



Brief Description: This species is rarely encountered on roads in Texas due to its habitat preferences. It is only found above 5000' in several West Texas mountain ranges.

CTRL_SEC _1	# Obs	# Dead
41501	1	0
FD0082	1	0

**Reptile – Lizard: Dunes Sagebrush Lizard** (*Sceloporus arenicolus*)



Brief Description: This species has been shown to avoid even small roads, so there is little risk of road mortality but roads fragment their habitat which contributes to population decline.

CTRL_SEC_1	# Obs	# Dead
118901	1	0
237101	1	0
514	1	0

# **B4. Reptiles – Snakes**

**Reptile – Snake: Scarlet Snake (***Cemophora coccinea***)** 



Brief Description: This rare species is commonly encountered on roads in other parts of the USA indicating that the few Texas road records are due to its overall scarcity.

CTRL_SEC_1	# Obs	# Dead
35004	1	0
AA4094	1	0
FD2344	1	0
LT9410	1	0

**Reptile – Snake: Black-striped Snake** (*Coniophanes imperialis*)



Brief Description: This species is restricted to a small area of South Texas where it seems to be common but not commonly seen on roads.

CTRL_SEC _1	# Obs	# Dead
3910	1	0
43302	1	1
FD2777	1	0
LL1338	1	0
LP7885	1	1

**Reptile – Snake: Western Diamondback Rattlesnake** (*Crotalus atrox*)



Brief Description: This species is common across much of the western 2/3rds of Texas and also is one of the most commonly encountered snakes both live and dead on Texas roadways.

CTRL_SEC_1	# Obs	# Dead	CTRL_SEC_1	# Obs	# Dead	CTRL_SEC_1	# Obs	# Dead
225701	56	6	35802	19	11	AA0060	13	1
95709	56	7	35803	19	5	AA0209	13	4
291301	47	0	AA0101	19	11	128302	12	5
2105	41	9	AA0258	19	7	229702	12	0
10402	34	17	2106	18	7	87101	12	2
86608	31	9	43305	18	11	FD0006	12	4
51703	29	15	86607	18	4	222601	11	0
35801	27	18	2103	17	3	32901	11	8
35805	26	6	2107	17	3	48501	11	3
41503	26	5	AA0037	16	0	122701	10	6
95710	21	6	122704	15	7	143501	10	1
2102	20	10	269401	14	8	55605	10	4



### **Reptile – Snake: Timber Rattlesnake** (*Crotalus horridus*)

Brief Description: This large rattlesnake is uncommonly encountered in the eastern third of Texas. It is also frequently found dead on roads.

CTRL_SEC _1	# Obs	# Dead	CTRL_SEC_1	# Obs	# Dead	CTRL_SEC_1	# Obs	# Dead
123701	4	3	277803	2	1	140902	1	1
35201	4	3	53001	2	2	141201	1	0
AA3336	4	3	81302	2	0	141202	1	1
47507	3	2	AA0055	2	1	150702	1	1
58401	3	0	AA0346	2	0	160602	1	1
AA3424	3	3	AA3225	2	1	18601	1	1
12204	2	2	AA3420	2	0	195401	1	1
170601	2	2	109601	1	1	21112	1	1
170602	2	1	117901	1	1	21306	1	1
194701	2	2	13408	1	1	24402	1	1
208001	2	2	139901	1	0	249002	1	1
21204	2	1	140203	1	1	264101	1	0



# **Reptile – Snake: Prairie Rattlesnake** (*Crotalus viridis*)

Brief Description: Like other rattlesnakes, this species is also frequently found dead on roads in their prairie habitats.

CTRL_SEC_1	# Obs	# Dead	CTRL_SEC_1	# Obs	# Dead	CTRL_SEC_1	# Obs	# Dead
86608	26	6	35406	2	2	136701	1	1
87101	8	4	41503	2	1	137002	1	0
2103	6	2	55706	2	2	152002	1	0
35404	6	2	87405	2	1	16802	1	1
35602	6	4	AA0188	2	0	171805	1	1
AA0037	6	0	AA0485	2	2	188801	1	1
162601	4	2	10502	1	1	2003	1	0
216101	4	0	10505	1	0	2005	1	0
AA5302	3	1	10506	1	0	2006	1	1
10406	2	0	10603	1	0	2007	1	1
218401	2	0	10604	1	1	201102	1	0
237101	2	0	128302	1	0	226201	1	1

**Reptile – Snake: Texas Indigo Snake** (*Drymarchon melanurus*)



Brief Description: This species is of South Texas is commonly found on roads, especially near rivers, creeks, or dry arroyos.

CTRL_SEC_1	# Obs	# Dead	CTRL_SEC_1	# Obs	# Dead	CTRL_SEC_1	# Obs	# Dead
AA0239	4	3	150101	1	0	2405	1	1
AA0609	3	1	170301	1	0	264901	1	1
FD2477	3	0	194101	1	0	269303	1	1
FD2988	3	0	201202	1	1	29908	1	1
3907	2	1	23502	1	1	32704	1	1
43301	2	2	23503	1	1	32705	1	1
AA0035	2	2	23505	1	1	32901	1	0
AA3081	2	2	23603	1	0	32904	1	0
FD2748	2	1	23703	1	0	37104	1	0
LD3558	2	0	237301	1	1	37506	1	0
122902	1	0	2402	1	1	3805	1	1
142601	1	0	2404	1	1	42108	1	1

**Reptile – Snake: Speckled Racer** (*Drymobius margaritiferus*)



Brief Description: This species is restricted to a tiny area of South Texas where it can be encountered on a few roads.

CTRL_SEC _1	# Obs	# Dead
LD3558	7	0
142601	1	1

**Reptile – Snake: Plains Hognose Snake (Heterodon nasicus)** 



Brief Description: This species is commonly encountered on roads in the western half of Texas.

CTRL_SEC _1	# Obs	# Dead	CTRL_SEC_1	# Obs	# Dead	CTRL_SEC_1	# Obs	# Dead
AA0109	5	0	220201	1	0	87003	1	0
AA0131	4	0	29801	1	1	96702	1	1
AA0799	3	1	29802	1	1	AA0232	1	0
104102	2	0	3501	1	1	AA0242	1	0
55810	2	0	36001	1	1	AA0600	1	0
7702	2	0	41203	1	0	AA0615	1	0
AA0078	2	0	45401	1	0	AA0728	1	0
LQ7778	2	0	46104	1	1	AA0828	1	0
128004	1	0	55603	1	0	AA1685	1	1
137002	1	1	55811	1	0	AA2419	1	0
164402	1	1	6805	1	0	AA5011	1	0
201102	1	0	76101	1	0	AA5306	1	0

**Reptile – Snake: Northern Cat-eyed Snake** (*Leptodeira septentrionalis*)



Brief Description: This species is restricted to the southern tip of Texas where it can be found on roads.

CTRL_SEC_1	# Obs	# Dead
66901	3	1
269303	1	1
43301	1	0
43305	1	1
AA1000	1	0
LD3558	1	0

Reptile – Snake: Brazos River Watersnake (Nerodia harteri)



Brief Description: This Texas endemic is semiaquatic and is rarely found away from the Brazos River. They rarely cross roads.

CTRL_SEC _1	# Obs	# Dead
8010	3	0
AA0546	2	0
36204	1	0
73601	1	0

**Reptile – Snake: Concho Watersnake** (*Nerodia paucimaculata*)



Brief Description: This Texas endemic is semiaquatic and is rarely found away from the Concho or Colorado River. They rarely cross roads.

CTRL_SEC _1	# Obs	# Dead
82803	4	0
AA0261	2	0
LR9930	1	0



**Reptile – Snake: Louisiana Pinesnake** (*Pituophis ruthveni*)

Brief Description: This federally threatened species has only been seen less than 10 times in East Texas in the last 20 years. Unfortunately one of those sightings was a road mortality.

CTRL_SEC_1	# Obs	# Dead
AA1510	1	0
FD0236	1	0



**Reptile – Snake: Western Massasauga** (*Sistrurus tergeminus*)

Brief Description: This prairie species is commonly encountered on roads, especially in north central Texas.

CTRL_SEC_1	# Obs	# Dead	CTRL_SEC_1	# Obs	# Dead	CTRL_SEC_1	# Obs	# Dead
36005	7	2	10506	1	0	29202	1	0
AA0209	7	1	10605	1	0	35405	1	1
10604	5	1	10607	1	0	35406	1	0
AA2166	4	2	1104	1	0	36002	1	1
2006	3	3	112702	1	0	36004	1	0
AA0109	3	0	13302	1	1	36101	1	0
10606	2	2	136701	1	0	36501	1	0
122701	2	1	137002	1	0	36502	1	0
332601	2	1	198101	1	0	43705	1	0
41202	2	1	226201	1	1	46002	1	0
55807	2	2	237802	1	0	513	1	1
AA0220	2	0	253302	1	0	65104	1	0

**Reptile – Snake: Mexican Black-headed Snake** (*Tantilla atriceps*)



Brief Description: This species is very rare in Texas but has been found crossing roads in the South Texas brush country.

CTRL_SEC _1	# Obs	# Dead
51703	1	0

**Reptile – Snake: Big Bend Blackhead Snake** (*Tantilla cucullata*)



Brief Description: This West Texas species can be found on roads near its preferred rocky habitats.

CTRL_SEC _1	# Obs	# Dead	CTRL_SEC _1	# Obs	# Dead
41501	4	1	95710	1	0
10402	2	2			
128003	2	0			
2107	2	0			
2201	2	0			
41502	2	0			
55605	2	0			
10403	1	0			
16005	1	0			
22906	1	0			
35803	1	0			
87101	1	0			

**Reptile – Snake: Common Garter Snake (Thamnophis sirtalis)** 



Brief Description: This species can be found crossing roads near prairies in the blackland prairie and coastal praires of Texas.

CTRL_SEC _1	# Obs	# Dead
AA0279	1	1
AA0907	1	0
C00415	1	0
LA3206	1	0
LB9436	1	0
LQ0147	1	0
LY9983	1	0
**Reptile – Snake: Texas Lyre Snake** (*Trimorphodon vilkinsonii*)



Brief Description: This West Texas species can be found on roads near its preferred rocky habitats.

CTRL_SEC _1	# Obs	# Dead
95709	8	0
10408	2	1
35805	2	0
FD0007	2	0
255201	1	0
291301	1	0
35803	1	0
FD0006	1	0
FD0298	1	1
FD0443	1	0
FD0475	1	0

# **B5.** Reptiles – Turtles

**Reptile – Turtle: Smooth Softshell Turtle** (*Apalone mutica*)



Brief Description: This species is highly aquatic and rarely crosses roads. Unfortunately, like most aquatic turtles, females that are searching for nesting sites are most frequently hit on roads.

CTRL_SEC_1	# Obs	# Dead
29001	1	0
FD2846	1	0



**Reptile – Turtle: Spiny Softshell Turtle** (*Apalone spinifera*)

Brief Description: This highly aquatic species is a habitat generalist and females can be found crossing roads in search of nest sites in the eastern 2/3rds of Texas.

CTRL_SEC_1	# Obs	# Dead	CTRL_SEC_1	# Obs	# Dead	CTRL_SEC_1	# Obs	# Dead
62601	14	0	B00950	3	0	AA0799	2	1
44104	11	0	B02905	3	0	AA1008	2	0
B01171	11	0	B23606	3	0	B00002	2	0
B00356	7	0	H01590	3	0	B00380	2	0
LJ0267	7	0	LE6540	3	0	C00174	2	0
11312	5	0	LI7496	3	0	C01716	2	0
902	5	0	105201	2	0	C03901	2	0
AA2076	4	0	106801	2	0	LI7255	2	0
B00846	4	0	AA0093	2	0	LI8616	2	0
LC0635	4	0	AA0136	2	0	LJ0896	2	0
LJ0641	4	0	AA0432	2	0	LJ1767	2	0
AA0413	3	0	AA0475	2	0	LN1396	2	0

**Reptile – Turtle: Common Snapping Turtle** (*Chelydra serpentina*)



Brief Description: This turtle can be encountered crossing roads after heavy rains or when females are searching for nesting sites.

CTRL_SEC _1	# Obs	# Dead	CTRL_SEC_1	# Obs	# Dead	CTRL_SEC_1	# Obs	# Dead
AA0799	10	1	1513	2	0	10606	1	1
LJ0641	7	0	18001	2	2	11707	1	1
LC0635	6	0	9T8960	2	0	120003	1	1
LI9297	6	0	AA0161	2	0	12104	1	0
B01320	5	0	AA4166	2	1	12204	1	1
FD2199	4	0	B01260	2	0	129001	1	0
LN4826	4	0	LC6005	2	0	13610	1	1
54004	3	0	LK0043	2	0	13814	1	0
AA2076	3	0	LN6165	2	2	143301	1	1
LB6833	3	0	LP1249	2	0	145401	1	0
LK2969	3	0	TL0032	2	0	1501	1	0
11312	2	0	100602	1	1	156802	1	0



Brief Description: This terrestrial species ranges over a wide area with most individuals encountering roads in their lifetime. They are commonly found crossing roads in South Texas and are susceptible to road mortality.

# Control sections with the highest number of observations

CTRL_SEC_1	# Obs	# Dead	CTRL_SEC_1	# Obs	# Dead	CTRL_SEC_1	# Obs	# Dead
AA4538	21	0	AA0455	2	1	25504	1	1
AA0336	5	0	104201	1	0	32703	1	1
32901	3	0	120502	1	1	32804	1	0
43305	3	0	142501	1	1	32807	1	1
51709	3	1	179901	1	0	33102	1	1
122701	2	1	194203	1	0	3715	1	1
23604	2	0	194301	1	0	37506	1	1
309901	2	0	22007	1	0	3804	1	0
32904	2	1	2304	1	0	3805	1	0
51706	2	1	23505	1	0	38303	1	1
AA0021	2	0	237302	1	1	43306	1	0
AA0133	2	1	237303	1	1	51701	1	1

# **Reptile – Turtle: Texas Tortoise (Gopherus berlandieri)**

# Reptile – Turtle: Cagle's Map Turtle (Graptemys caglei)



Brief Description: This endemic turtle rarely leaves their riverine habitat and rarely cross roads. Like other turtles the females are most often encountered out of water when they search for nesting sites.

CTRL_SEC_1	# Obs	# Dead
15401	3	0
58401	3	0
LK4285	3	0
15403	2	0
265001	2	0
8805	2	0
84202	1	0
AA1005	1	0
LX9889	1	0
LY0218	1	0

#### **Reptile – Turtle: Texas Map Turtle (***Graptemys versa***)**



Brief Description: This endemic turtle rarely leaves their riverine habitat and rarely cross roads. Like other turtles the females are most often encountered out of water when they search for nesting sites.

CTRL_SEC_1	# Obs	# Dead	CTRL_SEC_1	# Obs	# Dead	CTRL_SEC_1	# Obs	# Dead
26514	4	0	B02905	2	0	AA0011	1	0
26508	3	0	LB5712	2	0	AA0102	1	0
B02788	3	0	LB8176	2	0	AA0113	1	0
LC2678	3	0	LR9930	2	0	B00841	1	0
LU5198	3	0	102903	1	1	B01171	1	0
1513	2	0	175301	1	0	FD2199	1	0
210001	2	0	201004	1	0	LB7637	1	0
26510	2	0	2701	1	0	LJ4319	1	0
3505	2	0	29001	1	0	LN1509	1	0
AA0657	2	0	313601	1	0	LQ2792	1	0
AA0799	2	0	47401	1	0	AA0011	1	0
AA5010	2	0	61501	1	0	AA0102	1	0

**Reptile – Turtle: Chihuahuan Mud Turtle (Kinosternon hirtipes)** 



Brief Description: This species is restricted to one creek system in West Texas where it rarely encounters roads and road mortality is not an issue.

CTRL_SEC _1	# Obs	# Dead
95601	2	0

**Reptile – Turtle: Alligator Snapping Turtle** (*Macrochelys temminckii*)



Brief Description: This large aquatic species rarely leaves the water. Like other turtles the females are most often encountered out of water when they search for nesting sites.

CTRL_SEC_1	# Obs	# Dead
FD2880	3	0
FD2889	2	0
54609	1	1
72504	1	0
AA2403	1	1
AA4817	1	0
FD3435	1	0
LP7252	1	0

**Reptile – Turtle: Diamondback Terrapin** (*Malaclemys terrapin*)



Brief Description: This species rarely leaves its salt marsh habitat and is rarely impacted by roads.

CTRL_SEC _1	# Obs	# Dead
58501	5	0
LJ9402	3	0
LJ8942	2	0
AA0243	1	1



Brief Description: This turtle rarely leaves their riverine habitat and rarely cross roads. Like other turtles the females are most often encountered out of water when they search for nesting sites.

#### Control sections with the highest number of observations

CTRL_SEC_1	# Obs	# Dead
2301	6	0
AA0432	5	0
362101	1	1
AA0002	1	0
AA0117	1	0
AA0195	1	0
AA0524	1	1
LG6144	1	0
LG6159	1	0

# Reptile – Turtle: Rio Grande Cooter (Pseudemys gorzugi)



**Reptile – Turtle: Common Box Turtle (***Terrapene carolina***)** 

Brief Description: This terrestrial species ranges over a wide area with most individuals encountering roads in their lifetime. They are commonly found crossing roads in eastern 2/3rds of Texas and are susceptible to road mortality.

CTRL_SEC_1	# Obs	# Dead	CTRL_SEC _1	# Obs	# Dead	CTRL_SEC_1	# Obs	# Dead
54004	6	2	C00550	2	0	11601	1	1
LI6651	5	0	C00823	2	0	123701	1	0
B00630	4	0	FD1678	2	0	145401	1	0
54005	3	1	FD2899	2	0	145502	1	0
LQ2431	3	0	LD5445	2	0	15302	1	1
188101	2	0	LL8904	2	0	181001	1	0
24401	2	1	LM7713	2	0	18603	1	0
AA0158	2	0	LY9506	2	0	19002	1	0
AA0346	2	0	101401	1	1	192001	1	0
AA0428	2	0	101703	1	0	20008	1	0
AA0632	2	0	109902	1	0	20303	1	1
AA0869	2	0	110601	1	0	204101	1	0



## **Reptile – Turtle: Ornate Box Turtle** (*Terrapene ornata*)

Brief Description: This terrestrial species ranges over a wide area with most individuals encountering roads in their lifetime. They are commonly found crossing roads in western 2/3rds of Texas and are susceptible to road mortality.

CTRL_SEC_1	# Obs	# Dead	CTRL_SEC _1	# Obs	# Dead	CTRL_SEC_1	# Obs	# Dead
128302	10	0	10403	2	0	53401	2	1
86608	8	3	201102	2	0	55803	2	0
2102	7	2	2105	2	0	86607	2	0
2008	5	3	269401	2	0	AA0199	2	1
10406	4	0	29303	2	0	AA0799	2	2
2103	4	0	29502	2	0	AA3420	2	0
AA0600	4	0	29801	2	1	LQ7778	2	0
AA0728	4	0	35202	2	2	10405	1	0
237101	3	0	40901	2	2	10502	1	1
332601	3	0	41501	2	0	10504	1	0
35803	3	0	46105	2	0	10604	1	1
LJ8108	3	0	48501	2	0	111501	1	0



**Reptile – Turtle: Big Bend Slider** (*Trachemys gaigeae*)

Brief Description: This turtle rarely leaves their riverine habitat and rarely cross roads. Like other turtles the females are most often encountered out of water when they search for nesting sites.

CTRL_SEC_1	# Obs	# Dead
FD0436	7	0
95709	1	0



# **Reptile – Turtle: Pond Slider** (*Trachemys scripta*)

Brief Description: This turtle is commonly seen crossing roads and commonly moves across land between water bodies throughout the state. They are frequently found live and dead on roads.

CTRL_SEC_1	# Obs	# Dead	CTRL_SEC _1	# Obs	# Dead	CTRL_SEC_1	# Obs	# Dead
LI7496	44	1	FD4862	10	0	AA0120	7	0
LT1648	27	0	LC0017	10	0	AA0326	7	0
LP7252	24	0	LJ2310	10	0	LI8824	7	0
LJ0641	19	0	ZB1235	10	0	LI9917	7	0
AA0413	16	0	FD4951	9	2	LJ1795	7	0
LI8616	16	1	LE6540	9	0	LT5491	7	0
902	13	0	LJ8403	9	0	LZ4953	7	0
115701	12	1	54004	8	6	100602	6	6
62601	12	0	LC0635	8	0	AA0799	6	1
LF8782	12	1	52302	7	7	FD2353	6	0
B00356	11	0	54301	7	6	LI2649	6	0
C00595	10	0	9T8960	7	0	LJ1105	6	0