



Figure 1: Number of lake watersheds per county where lakes are limited to those with high agricultural land-use cover (greater than 40 percent) and water quality data in LAGOS from at least 3 sampling events between 2000 and 2010.




Figure 2: Quantile map of lake nutrients.




Figure 3: Quantile map of lake nutrients.




Figure 4: Comparison between NLCD (2011) derived and CDL (2010) derived total watershed ag and watershed pasture cover. Line is 1:1 not regression.




Figure 5: Comparison between NLCD (2011) ag and pasture against CDL (2010) specific crops.





Figure 6: Stream buffer versus IWS hulc.

7026



6992




Figure 7: Stream buffer Ag compared to IWS Ag.




Figure 8: Exploratory dotplots showing absolute value correlation coefficients.




Figure 9: Heatmap showing absolute value correlation coefficients.




Figure 10: A) Global (dashed line) and regional (solid lines) fits to the relationship between lake phosphorus and IWS Ag. land use cover from the 2011 NLCD. A hierarchical model would weight these relationships by sample size (darker lines = higher sample size). B) Number of lakes per region.




Figure 11: A) gSSURGO wetland potential versus National Wetlands Inventory cover. B) Locations of lakes where these number differ by more than 30 percent.


Ilid: 2745



Viewport LULC



Lake buffer LULC



Stream buffer LULC




Figure 12: Landuse cover in stream buffers.



Figure 13: CDL landuse cover in example IWS.