Prioritizing management goals for stream biological integrity within the context of landscape constraints
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Here’s some text with reference to my table 1.

*Table 1: (#tab:reltot) Here’s the caption*

|  | expected | | over scoring | | under scoring | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Region | CSCI | n (%) | CSCI | n (%) | CSCI | n (%) |
| CH | 0.77 (0.25) | 625 (95) | 1.2 (0.07) | 12 (2) | 0.35 (0.18) | 23 (3) |
| CV | 0.51 (0.18) | 142 (98) | - | 0 (0) | 0.26 (0.06) | 3 (2) |
| DM | 0.88 (0.19) | 104 (95) | 1.2 (0.07) | 3 (3) | 0.47 (0.19) | 3 (3) |
| NC | 0.92 (0.18) | 259 (96) | 1.17 (0.05) | 8 (3) | 0.62 (0.16) | 4 (1) |
| SC | 0.79 (0.23) | 772 (95) | 1.11 (0.17) | 22 (3) | 0.45 (0.2) | 15 (2) |
| SN | 0.97 (0.16) | 344 (94) | 1.22 (0.04) | 15 (4) | 0.64 (0.16) | 8 (2) |