Assessment of mangrove vegetation based on remote sensing and ground-truth measurements at Tumpat, Kelantan Delta, East Coast of Peninsular Malaysia
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The lower reaches of River Kelantan form a vast delta (1200 ha) consisting of bay, mangrove and estuary on the northeast coast of Peninsular Malaysia. The present study was conducted to assess the mangrove vegetation at Tumpat based on ground-truth and remote sensing measurements. The mangroves are composed of several species including Nypa fruticans, Sonneratia caseolaris, Avicennia alba, Rhizophora apiculata, R. mucronata and Bruguiera gymnorrhiza, in order of dominance. The point-centred quarter method (PCQM) was used to estimate the stem density (number of stems/0.1 ha) and basal area (m²/0.1 ha) at selected sites on the ground. Recent high-resolution multispectral satellite data (QuickBird 2006, 2.4 m spatial resolution of the multispectral image) were used to produce land-use/cover classification and Normalized Difference Vegetation Index (NDVI) mapping for the delta. The area statistics reveal that mangroves occupy 339.6 ha, while coconut plantation dominates the vegetation (715.2 ha), followed by settlements (621.6 ha), sandbar (148.4 ha), agriculture (89 ha) and aquaculture (42.7 ha). Although the relationship between the spectral indices and dendrometric parameters was weak, we found a very high significance between the (mean) NDVI and stem density ($p = 1.3 \times 10^{-8}$). The sites with young/growing and also mature trees with lush green cover showed greater NDVI values (0.40–0.68) indicating healthy vegetation, while mature forests under environmental stress due to sand deposition and/or poor tidal inundation showed low NDVI values (0.38–0.47) and an unhealthy situation. Overall, a combination of ground survey and remote sensing provided valuable information for the assessment of mangrove vegetation types (i.e. young/growing or mature forest) and their health in Tumpat, Kelantan Delta.
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1. Introduction

Mangroves are highly productive ecosystems with a rich diversity of flora and fauna in the intertidal zones of tropical and subtropical coastlines (Abeyesinghe et al. 2000, Jennerjahn and Ittekkot 2002, Twilley and Rivera-Monroy 2005, FAO 2007). They are considered of great ecological importance in shoreline stabilization, reduction of coastal erosion, sediment and nutrient retention, storm protection, flood and flow control, and water quality (Dahdouh-Guebas et al. 2005b, Giri et al. 2007, Alongi 2008, Bahuguna et al. 2008), besides their regular economic benefit through various forest products (Kathiresan and Rajendran 2006, Zhang et al. 2006, Gilman et al. 2008, Walters et al. 2008). During the past decades, however, the situation with regard to the mangrove forests has been deteriorating because of increased demand for land to be allocated to food and industrial production and rural and/or urban settlements (Blasco et al. 2001, Dahdouh-Guebas et al. 2005b, Duke et al. 2007, FAO 2007). It has been estimated that loss of the mangroves may reach 60% by 2030 (Valiela et al. 2001, Alongi 2002, UNEP 2006, Simard et al. 2008). The changes in the mangrove forests therefore need continuous monitoring through research on spatial–temporal dynamism in the coastal land-use/cover patterns (Souza Filho et al. 2006, Chauhan and Dwivedi 2008).

Satellite remote sensing is an efficient tool that has been adopted increasingly for the detection, description, quantification and monitoring of the Earth’s natural resources (Green et al. 2000, Kovacs et al. 2004, 2005, Chauhan and Dwivedi 2008). It provides timely and cost-effective data over inaccessible areas (Everitt et al. 1991, Green et al. 1996, Mumby et al. 1999), complementing field surveys, which are of higher information content but are more difficult to carry out, especially in the case of mangroves (Green et al. 1997, Satyanarayana et al. 2001, Kovacs et al. 2004, Giri et al. 2007). In this context, a combination of remote sensing and ground-truth measurements, analysed within a geographic information systems (GIS) platform, is found to be highly advantageous (Dahdouh-Guebas et al. 2005a,b, Souza Filho et al. 2006, Satyanarayana 2007). Several authors have used aerial and (optical) satellite images to study the mangrove ecosystems (e.g. Dahdouh-Guebas et al. 2000, Satyanarayana et al. 2001, Lucas et al. 2002, Fromard et al. 2004, Satyanarayana 2007), while others have used synthetic aperture radar (SAR) to examine the terrain’s physical (macrotopography, slope, roughness) and electrical properties (Proisy et al. 2000, Souza Filho and Paradella 2002, Souza Filho et al. 2003, 2006, Simard et al. 2008). The selection of remotely sensed images (from different sensors and at different resolutions) differs according to the purpose/requirement of the user, and may involve, for example, species-level classification, biomass, understory events and land-use/cover (Chauhan and Dwivedi 2008). The use of high-resolution satellite images such as those collected by the QuickBird Satellite sensor for mapping mangrove forestation and to provide a baseline database for their future monitoring has been discussed by Wang et al. (2004), Saleh (2007) and Neukermans et al. (2008).

In remote sensing analysis, vegetation indices (e.g. the Normalized Differential Vegetation Index, NDVI) are often used to highlight wetlands (Ozesmi and Bauer 2002). Ramsey and Jensen (1996) explained the relationship between the NDVI and leaf area index (LAI) for the mangroves at southwest Florida. Green et al. (1997) and Kovacs et al. (2004, 2005) have also worked on similar aspects in the Turks and Caicos Islands (British West Indies) and Agua Brava Lagoon (Mexico), respectively. Bartholy and Pongracz (2005) used the NDVI to represent climate variability and vegetation productivity for the Atlantic-European region and the Carpathian Basin. More recently,
Giri et al. (2007) used the NDVI to represent mangrove canopy closure and patterns of change in the forest’s density/condition at Sundarbans, covering India and Bangladesh. The NDVI also stands as proxy for the above-ground biomass, primary productivity and vegetation health (Seto et al. 2004, Jiang et al. 2006, Walters et al. 2008, Anaya et al. 2009, Zomer et al. 2009). Overall, a positive relationship between NDVI and ground-based measurements has been established by previous investigations.

Although Malaysia possesses the second largest mangrove cover (about 11.7%) in Southeast Asia (FAO 2007), studies using remote sensing in mangrove forests remain scarce in the scientific literature. In Kelantan Delta, a few closely guarded interior (inaccessible) areas support some luxuriant mangrove vegetation. Sulong et al. (2001) were perhaps the first to describe the Kelantan mangroves using aerial photographs. Later, Kasawani (2003), Sulong et al. (2005) and Kasawani et al. (2006) focused on satellite images to develop maps for mangrove species distribution and forest types. Mohd-Suffian et al. (2004) and Karthigeyan (2008) worked on the coastal morphology and shoreline changes in this region.

The current study aimed primarily to assess the mangrove vegetation at Tumpat (Kelantan Delta), based on remote sensing and ground-truth observations. The specific objectives were to map and quantify the current status of the mangrove and adjacent land-use categories (i.e. area statistics), and to evaluate the potential relationship between vegetation indices (e.g. NDVI) derived from satellite imagery and mangrove dendrometric (e.g. tree density and basal area) parameters estimated on the ground.

2. Materials and methods

2.1 Study area

The mangroves at Tumpat are located in the River Kelantan Delta on the northeast coast of Peninsular Malaysia (6° 11’ to 6° 13’ N; 102° 9’ to 102° 14’ E) (figure 1). This rich but fragile ecosystem has undergone serious alterations largely induced by human activities. The current study aimed to assess and quantify the current status of the mangrove vegetation at Tumpat based on remote sensing and ground-truth observations. The specific objectives were to map and quantify the current status of the mangrove and adjacent land-use categories (i.e. area statistics), and to evaluate the potential relationship between vegetation indices (e.g. NDVI) derived from satellite imagery and mangrove dendrometric parameters estimated on the ground.

Figure 1. River Kelantan Delta showing Tumpat mangroves on the northeast coast of Peninsular Malaysia (sampling sites: 1–21) (background: QuickBird satellite imagery dated 29 April 2006).
activity in recent years. Besides its wide catchment area (7456 km²), the delta possesses prominent features such as a bay, mangrove and estuarine environments separated by sandbar and other physical gradients. The delta covers approximately 1200 ha (Shamsudin and Nasir 2005), and the mangroves are represented by *Avicennia alba* Bl., *Bruguiera gymnorrhiza* Lamk., *Nypa fruticans* (Thunb.) Wurmb., *Rhizophora apiculata* Bl., *R. mucronata* Lamk. and *Sonneratia caseolaris* (L.) Engler (classification based on Tomlinson (1994)). Mangrove associates such as *Acanthus ilicifolius* L., *Acrostichum aureum* L. and *Derris trifoliata* Lour. are also found in this locality.

The climate of Kelantan and its surrounding environs is strongly influenced by their location in the tropics, with a mean annual temperature of 26.8°C and high humidity (unpublished data). Altogether, 21 stations based on a predetermined grid (at 1-km intervals) were selected for the ground-truth and floristic inventory (figure 1). The sampling sites were reached with the help of a global positioning system (GPS Garmin 45, Garmin International, Lenexa, KS, USA), and in some cases (i.e. inaccessible sites) were approached up to their nearest accessible location. Of the total 21 sites, only seven represented mangroves proper (sites C6, G6, G9, J5, K4, N6 and O4), and the rest agriculture, aquaculture, terrestrial/coconut vegetation and rural settlements (table 1). In addition to the grid-based locations, another 194 sites (randomly selected) were visited for ground-check in the mangrove and non-mangrove areas. Both *N. fruticans* and *S. caseolaris* were abundant and distributed throughout the forest, while *A. alba* and *R. mucronata* were exclusive to the bay–mangrove periphery (sites C6 and G6). *B. gymnorrhiza* and *R. apiculata* were observed in the forest interior, away from the main flooding channel/bay waters.

### 2.2 Ground data collection

The fieldwork in Kelantan Delta was conducted in October 2007. The point-centred quarter method (PCQM; Cottam and Curtis 1956, Cintron and Schaeffer Novelli 1984, Dahdouh-Guebas and Koedam 2006) was used at each mangrove site to estimate the stem density (number of stems/0.1 ha) and basal area (m²/0.1 ha) as parameters. In this context, a maximum distance of 100 m transect was covered at each location to measure tree height (m), stem diameter $D_{130}$ (cm) (term according to Brokaw and Thompson (2000) to represent the diameter at breast height, DBH), and the distance (m) between the transect line and the nearest tree in each quadrant at 10-m intervals. This procedure allows an understanding of the mean stem diameter of each mangrove species and their relative importance in structuring the mangrove forest at Tumpat. Moreover, the PCQM can be used as a ground-truth method for remote sensing studies in a combinatory investigation (see Dahdouh-Guebas and Koedam (2006)). However, there are only seven sites in the delta that represent mangrove vegetation (mentioned earlier) and for suitability of PCQM (figure 1). The data on the mangrove associates and other terrestrial vegetation in the vicinity were recorded from non-mangrove sites. At each point, the coordinates were obtained from GPS and those features were photographed. All these findings (ground inventory) were used to develop a final land-use/cover map for Kelantan Delta.

### 2.3 Satellite data analysis

Very high-resolution (2.4 m) multispectral satellite data (QuickBird dated 29 April 2006) represented largely by the mangrove vegetation/sampled area in Kelantan Delta...
Table 1. Ground-truth observations (at 1 km grid intervals) in Kelantan Delta.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Site no.</th>
<th>Latitude (N)</th>
<th>Longitude (E)</th>
<th>Vegetation</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>C6</td>
<td>6° 12' 50&quot;</td>
<td>102° 09' 51&quot;</td>
<td><em>Avicennia alba</em>, <em>Nypa fruticans</em>, <em>Rhizophora mucronata</em> and <em>Sonneratia caseolaris</em></td>
<td>Mangrove site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>F7</td>
<td>6° 12' 25&quot;</td>
<td>102° 10' 32&quot;</td>
<td><em>A. alba</em>, <em>N. fruticans</em>, <em>R. mucronata</em>, <em>Bruguiera gymnorrhiza</em> and <em>S. caseolaris</em></td>
<td>Mixed mangrove plantation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>G6</td>
<td>6° 12' 50&quot;</td>
<td>102° 10' 42&quot;</td>
<td><em>A. alba</em></td>
<td>Mangrove site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>G7</td>
<td>6° 12' 28&quot;</td>
<td>102° 10' 53&quot;</td>
<td><em>Acrostichum aureum</em>, <em>N. fruticans</em> and <em>S. caseolaris</em></td>
<td>Abandoned aquacultural ponds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>G9</td>
<td>6° 12' 01&quot;</td>
<td>102° 10' 50&quot;</td>
<td><em>N. fruticans</em></td>
<td>Mangrove site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>J5</td>
<td>6° 13' 03&quot;</td>
<td>102° 11' 30&quot;</td>
<td><em>N. fruticans</em> and <em>S. caseolaris</em></td>
<td>Mangrove site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>J7</td>
<td>6° 12' 22&quot;</td>
<td>102° 11' 30&quot;</td>
<td>Coconut</td>
<td>Non-mangrove site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>K4</td>
<td>6° 13' 13&quot;</td>
<td>102° 11' 41&quot;</td>
<td><em>N. fruticans</em> and <em>S. caseolaris</em></td>
<td>Mangrove site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>K9</td>
<td>6° 12' 06&quot;</td>
<td>102° 11' 39&quot;</td>
<td>Terrestrial/elevated ground</td>
<td>Non-mangrove site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>L4</td>
<td>6° 13' 10&quot;</td>
<td>102° 11' 55&quot;</td>
<td><em>Ac. aureum</em>, <em>Acanthus ilicifolius</em> and <em>Derris trifoliata</em></td>
<td>Non-mangrove site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>L7</td>
<td>6° 12' 33&quot;</td>
<td>102° 12' 05&quot;</td>
<td>Terrestrial/elevated ground</td>
<td>Non-mangrove site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>L8</td>
<td>6° 12' 07&quot;</td>
<td>102° 12' 03&quot;</td>
<td>Terrestrial/elevated ground</td>
<td>Non-mangrove site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>M8</td>
<td>6° 12' 07&quot;</td>
<td>102° 12' 16&quot;</td>
<td>Coconut</td>
<td>Non-mangrove site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>N6</td>
<td>6° 12' 45&quot;</td>
<td>102° 12' 28&quot;</td>
<td><em>N. fruticans</em> and <em>S. caseolaris</em></td>
<td>Mangrove site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>N9</td>
<td>6° 11' 59&quot;</td>
<td>102° 12' 32&quot;</td>
<td>Banana/coconut</td>
<td>Non-mangrove site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>O4</td>
<td>6° 13' 09&quot;</td>
<td>102° 12' 36&quot;</td>
<td><em>N. fruticans</em> and <em>S. caseolaris</em></td>
<td>Mangrove site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>O7</td>
<td>6° 12' 36&quot;</td>
<td>102° 12' 49&quot;</td>
<td>Terrestrial/elevated ground</td>
<td>Non-mangrove site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>Q5</td>
<td>6° 13' 00&quot;</td>
<td>102° 13' 18&quot;</td>
<td>Coconut</td>
<td>Non-mangrove site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>Q8</td>
<td>6° 12' 14&quot;</td>
<td>102° 13' 12&quot;</td>
<td>Coconut</td>
<td>Non-mangrove site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>Q9</td>
<td>6° 12' 05&quot;</td>
<td>102° 13' 20&quot;</td>
<td>Coconut</td>
<td>Non-mangrove site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.</td>
<td>R7</td>
<td>6° 12' 30&quot;</td>
<td>102° 13' 29&quot;</td>
<td>Coconut</td>
<td>Non-mangrove site</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(6° 11′ 70″ to 6° 13′ 50″ N; 102° 09′ to 102° 14′ E) were selected for the present study (figure 1). This image was pre-processed by applying radiometric and geometric corrections at the Malaysian Remote Sensing Agency (formerly known as MACRES, Kuala Lumpur). The land-use/cover map of Kelantan Delta (including mangroves) was produced by supervised maximum likelihood classification (using ERDAS Imagine version 8.5, ERDAS, Inc., Norcross, GA, USA), the most commonly used technique for mapping wetlands (Ozesmi and Bauer 2002). Each class (e.g. mangrove, aquaculture, settlements, etc.) was determined through training sets, that is the selection of pixels with the same pattern. In total, 10 classes were assigned, including two areas of densely populated mangrove species, namely A. alba and S. caseolaris + N. fruticans. The other classes were represented by coconut plantations, terrestrial vegetation, agricultural fields, aquacultural ponds, settlement areas, exposed mud banks, sandbars and water. To evaluate the accuracy of the land-use/cover map, a confusion matrix (e.g. Congalton 1991) was produced using a minimum of 50 reference (ground-check) points for each major class (Jensen 1996).

The NDVI, one of the commonly used vegetation indices derived from satellite images, has been shown to represent the amount of greenness or biomass of mangroves, which in turn can reflect their health or photosynthetic activity (Bartholy and Pongracz 2005, Kovacs et al. 2005, LeMarie et al. 2006, Seto and Fragkias 2007). Values of this index are calculated from the reflected solar radiation in the near-infrared (NIR) (760–900 nm) and red (R) (630–690 nm) bands using the formula NDVI = [(NIR) − R]/[(NIR) + R], which usually varies between −1 and 1. A value close to zero represents no vegetation and a value close to +1 indicates a high density of green leaves (Jensen et al. 1991, Jensen 1996, 2000, Bartholy and Pongracz 2005, Seto and Fragkias 2007).

The mangrove locations were entered into a spatial database (using ArcView GIS 3.2, ESRI, Inc., Redlands, CA, USA) as rectangles of roughly 100 m × 10 m, which corresponds to the actual dimensions of our PCQM transect (1000 m² or 0.1 ha). The mean value of the area covered by each transect (rectangle) was extracted from the NDVI image, and then compared with the mangrove tree density and basal area through the analysis of simple linear regression. This hypothesis was interpreted using the coefficient of determination ($R^2$) with a significance at $p < 0.05$.

3. Results and discussion

3.1 Mangrove structural attributes

The study of forest structure or the management of a forest for silvicultural purposes requires plant structural parameters such as density, basal area and biomass (Saenger 2002, Dahdouh-Guebas and Koedam 2006). The results based on PCQM (table 2)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>C6</th>
<th>G6</th>
<th>G9</th>
<th>J5</th>
<th>K4</th>
<th>N6</th>
<th>O4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total tree density (stems/0.1 ha)</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total basal area (m²/0.1 ha)</td>
<td>1.72</td>
<td>1.82</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>4.90</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>2.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean NDVI</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>0.68</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
indicated that the total mangrove tree density at Tumpat varied between 79 and 136 stems/0.1 ha (sites G6 and O4), while the basal area varied from 0.14 to 4.9 m²/0.1 ha (sites G9 and J5). In general, tree density and basal area are the important variables used to assess the 'young/growing' or 'mature' nature of the vegetation (i.e. stem densities in general correlated negatively with stand biomass or wood volume) (Satyanarayana et al. 2002, Satyanarayana 2005). Among others, site G9 (solely consisting of N. fruticans) represented a growing forest (density 132 stems/0.1 ha; basal area 0.14 m²/0.1 ha), while J5 (dominated by S. caseolaris) a mature stand (density 112 stems/0.1 ha; basal area 4.9 m²/0.1 ha). Sites C6 (89 stems; basal area 1.72 m²/0.1 ha), G6 (79 stems; basal area 1.82 m²/0.1 ha) and N6 (129 stems; basal area 2.25 m²/0.1 ha) had relatively low stem densities and high basal areas, indicating their mature nature. Site K4 (125 stems; basal area 0.35 m²/0.1 ha), located at the bay–mangrove periphery, represented a young/growing lush green forest. The high basal area at site O4 (2.87 m²/0.1 ha) is due to its inaccessibility and distance from major transportation channels.

3.2 Supervised classification

Figure 2 shows the land-use/cover map of Kelantan Delta. All (10) classes (different land-use/cover patterns) were well demarcated, in agreement with the ground-truth observations. Kasawani et al. (2006) previously reported 10 mangrove forest types in this region, including Avicennia–Sonneratia, Acanthus–Sonneratia, Acanthus–Nypa, Hibiscus–Acrostichum, mixed Acanthus, mixed Acrostichum and mixed Sonneratia. However, in the present study, only the most abundant and true mangrove species (i.e. A. alba, N. fruticans and S. caseolaris) (Tomlinson 1994) were considered for mapping. The introgressive species, Acrostichum, was considered as a mangrove associate because of its ill affects on the original biodiversity and functionality of the mangrove ecosystems (Dahdouh-Guebas et al. 2005a,b,c).
Mangrove areas are commonly characterized by rapid anthropogenic events (e.g. conversion into aquacultural ponds, agriculture and industry) and the occurrence of certain natural events (e.g. accretion of new land area and erosion along the coast and rivers) (Kovacs et al. 2001, Ramasubramanian et al. 2006). The area statistics indicate that the mangroves at Tumpat occupied only 339.6 ha in 2006 despite having a large deltaic area (1200 ha). More recently, Mohd-Azhar (2008) estimated area calculations for this region (Kelantan Delta) with the aid of Landsat Thematic Mapper (TM) satellite images and reported that the mangroves occupied nearly 354.1 ha in the year 2000. In this case, the loss of mangrove cover was 14.5 ha in 6 years. Between 1988 and 2000, the depletion of mangroves was 139.3 ha due to aquaculture, sediment accretion and human settlements (Kasawani et al. 2006). Figure 3 shows the changes in the mangrove cover between 1988 and 2006.

In Kelantan Delta, coastal erosion is also responsible for the loss of mangrove cover. In particular, mangroves at the border facing the South China Sea (e.g. A. alba, N. fruticans and S. caseolaris) (sites C6, G6 and J5) are submitted to high-impact current/waves and sand deposition, causing the death of several mature trees (figure 4).

![Figure 3. Changes in the extent of mangrove cover at Tumpat, Kelantan Delta.](image_url)

![Figure 4. Photographs showing the impact of strong current/waves from the South China Sea on the bordering mangrove vegetation in Kelantan Delta. (a) Death of Sonneratia caseolaris trees (height 10–15 m) due to sand deposition over muddy substratum and above their pneumatophores. (b) Coastal erosion and uprooted S. caseolaris. (c) Sand deposition at the patch of Nypa fruticans adjacent to S. caseolaris.](image_url)
Table 3. Confusion matrix based on supervised classification and ground-truth data.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ground truth</th>
<th>Agricultural field</th>
<th>Aquacultural ponds</th>
<th>Terrestrial vegetation</th>
<th>Coconut plantation</th>
<th>Mangrove vegetation</th>
<th>Settlement area</th>
<th>Mud bank</th>
<th>Sandbar</th>
<th>Water</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Accuracy (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agricultural field</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aquacultural ponds</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terrestrial vegetation</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coconut plantation</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mangrove vegetation</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Settlement area</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mud bank</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandbar</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>214</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accuracy (%)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Similar erosion effects have also been observed in the deforested mangrove sites in Kenya (Dahdouh-Guebas et al. 2004). Terrados et al. (1997) reported adverse effects of increased sediment accretion on the growth and survival of mangroves with reference to R. apiculata. The local Forestry Department of Kelantan (in association with other governmental and non-governmental organizations) is, however, carrying out mangrove afforestation works with some promising results (personal observation).

Among the other land-use/cover classes, coconut vegetation ranked first with 715.2 ha, followed by settlements (621.6 ha), sandbar (148.4 ha), other terrestrial vegetation (99.7 ha), agriculture (89 ha), aquaculture (42.7 ha), and mud bank (23.3 ha). The confusion matrix (table 3) indicates that the ‘mangrove’ category (i.e. A. alba, and N. fruticans + S. caseolaris) was well classified, with an estimated accuracy of 100%. In addition, terrestrial vegetation including coconut and settlement areas could be distinguished with 79–86% accuracy. The overall accuracy of the supervised classification was 88.3%.

3.3 The NDVI and its relationship with dendrometric parameters

Figure 5 shows the NDVI map of Kelantan Delta. Within the vegetation cover, a portion of dark green indicates higher NDVI (0.5–0.8), bright green indicates moderate NDVI (0.2–0.5) and light green lower NDVI (0.1–0.2). The mean NDVI values at the seven mangrove sites sampled ranged between 0.38 and 0.68 (table 2 and figure 5). The simple linear regression analysis between (mean) NDVI and density and between NDVI and basal area suggests that the relationship, although relatively weak, was particularly significant and meaningful between NDVI and density ($R^2 = 0.2096, p = 1.3 \times 10^{-8}$) (figure 6). Density-wise mapping of mangroves based on NDVI has previously been carried out by Giri et al. (2007) and Thu and Populus (2007). The sites having young/growing and also mature trees with lush green cover (e.g. sites G9, K4 and N6 and O4) reflected greater NDVI (0.40–0.68) (implying healthy vegetation), while matured forest (sites C6, G6 and J5) under the environmental stress due to sand deposition and/or poor tidal inundation indicated lower NDVI (0.38–0.47) (unhealthy vegetation). Similarly, Nayak et al. (2001), Kovacs et al. (2005), and Lee and Yeh (2009) used NDVI to represent the health of mangroves.
in their studies. Another notable observation is that mature trees (usually with large stem diameter and height) may not necessarily show greater biomass in the remote sensing analysis, unless they are found to be growing in the most suitable and distress-free environments in terms of hydrological, anthropogenic and natural climate change scenarios (Townsend et al. 1991, Simard et al. 2008).

4. Conclusion

In summary, the delineation of mangrove and non-mangrove areas and even species-level classification is best achieved with high-resolution multispectral satellite imageries such as QuickBird. Although higher resolution may complicate the process of image classification (Mironga 2004, Dahdouh-Guebas et al. 2005c), it is still advantageous for species identification/mapping (Wang et al. 2004, Saleh 2007, Neukermans et al. 2008). The land-use/cover map thus produced for Tumpat should be able to assist in better monitoring and management practices in the delta. The relationship between the spectral indices and dendrometric parameters indicated that lush green mangroves with high green leaf density (both young and mature trees) represent healthy vegetation (high NDVI), while mature forest under environmental stress show an unhealthy situation (low NDVI). It should be noted that the empirical relationship could have been very strong if the number of mangrove sites (i.e. sample size) was comparatively

Figure 6. Illustration of simple linear regression between (a) mean NDVI and density and (b) mean NDVI and basal area.
high. A combination of ground-survey and remote sensing data was very useful for the assessment of mangrove vegetation types (i.e. young/growing or mature forest) as well as their health at Tumpat, Kelantan Delta.
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