Forest Health Monitoring 2011 National Technical Report

DRAFT





Editors:

Kevin M. Potter

Barbara L. Conkling

Front cover map: Ecoregion provinces and ecoregion sections for the conterminous United States (Cleland and others 2007) and for Alaska (Nowacki and Brock 1995).

Forest Health Monitoring 2011 National Technical Report

Editors:

Kevin M. Potter**,** Research Assistant Professor, North Carolina State University, Department of Forestry and Environmental Resources, Raleigh, NC 27695

Barbara L. Conkling, Research Assistant Professor, North Carolina State University, Department of Forestry and Environmental Resources, Raleigh, NC 27695

Abstract

The Forest Health Monitoring (FHM) program's annual national technical report has three objectives: (1) to present forest health status and trends from a national or multi-state regional perspective using a variety of sources, (2) to introduce new techniques for analyzing forest health data, and (3) to summarize results of recently completed Evaluation Monitoring projects funded through the FHM national program. In this eleventh edition in the annual series of FHM national technical reports, aerial survey data are used to identify geographic patterns of insect and disease activity. Satellite data are employed to detect geographic patterns of forest fire occurrence. A standardized drought indexing approach was used to map drought conditions at a fine scale. Forest Inventory and Analysis (FIA) data are employed to detect regional differences in tree mortality. The fragmentation status of forest types in the eastern United States is evaluated and the area of intact forest by forest type is estimated. The presence and abundance of introduced plant species in the northeastern United States were examined to determine what broad-scale factors might predict their distribution. Results from 16 years of ozone damage biomonitoring are presented, demonstrating overall declines in damage over time. Three recently completed Evaluation Monitoring projects are summarized, addressing forest health concerns at smaller scales. These projects collected process-level ecosystem indicators from restored and degraded central Iowa oak savannas for long-term monitoring; assessed the distribution of the bacterium that causes bacterial leaf scorch in shade trees; and tested whether FIA Phase 3 data detect distinct fuel complexes in the southern Appalachians.

Keywords—drought, evaluation monitoring, fire, forest health, forest insects and disease, Forest Inventory and Analysis, forest type; fragmentation, non-native plants, ozone damage, pests and pathogens, tree mortality

Table of Contents

List of Figures vii
List of Tables xi
Executive Summary xii
Chapter 1. Introduction 1
Data Sources 5
The Forest Health Monitoring Program 6
Literature Cited 7
Section I. Analyses of Short-Term Forest Health Data 10
Chapter 2. Large-Scale Patterns of Insect and Disease Activity in the Conterminous United States and Alaska from the National Aerial Detection Survey Database, 2010 10
Introduction 10
Methods 10
Results and Discussion 12
Literature Cited 21
Chapter 3. Large-Scale Patterns of Forest Fire Occurrence in the Conterminous United States and Alaska, 2010 22
Introduction 22
Methods 22
Results and Discussion 23
Literature Cited 31
Chapter 4. Recent Drought Conditions in the Conterminous United States 33
Introduction 33
Methods 34
Results and Discussion 40
Literature Cited 45
Chapter 5. Tree Mortality 47
Introduction 47
Data 47
Methods 49
Results and Discussion 50
Literature Cited 53
Section II. Analyses of Long-Term Forest Health Trends and Presentations of New Techniques 55
Chapter 6. Fragmentation of Eastern United States Forest Types 55
Introduction 55
Methods 55
Results 56
Discussion 59
Literature Cited 59
Chapter 7. Regional Distribution of Introduced Plant Species in the Forests of the Northeastern United States 61
Introduction/Background 61
Methods 62
Results 63
Discussion 77
Conclusion 78
Literature Cited 79
Appendix 7.1 – Introduced species recorded on 1,302 plots in Northeastern United States, in order of number of plots where recorded. 81
Chapter 8. National Trends in Ozone Injury to Forest Plants: 16 Years of Biomonitoring 88
Abstract 88
Introduction 88
Methods 89
Results and Discussion 90
Summary and Conclusions 98
Literature Cited 98
Section III. Evaluation Monitoring Project Summaries 100

Chapter 9. Oak Savanna Restoration in Central Iowa: Assessing Indicators of Forest Health for Ecological Monitoring (project NC-F-04-02) 101
Introduction 101
Methods, Results and Discussion 101
Literature Cited 107
Chapter 10. Bacterial Leaf Scorch Distribution and Isothermal Lines (project NC-EM-08-02) 108
Introduction 108
Methods 109
Results 110
Discussion 113
Conclusions 114
Literature Cited 114
Chapter 11. A Test of FIA's Down Woody Material Indicator for Regional Fuel Estimation in the Southern Appalachian Mountains (project SO-F-06-01) 116
Introduction 116
Objectives 116
Methods 117
Results and Discussion 117
Conclusions 117
Literature Cited 119
Acknowledgments 120

List of Figures

Figure 1.1– Ecoregion provinces and sections for the conterminous United States (Cleland and others 2007) and Alaska (Nowacki and Brock 1995). Ecoregion sections within each ecoregion province are shown in the same color.

Figure 1.2 – The Forest Inventory and Analysis mapped plot design. Subplot 1 is the center of the cluster with subplots 2, 3, and 4 located 120 feet away at azimuths of 360°, 120°, and 240°, respectively (Forest Inventory and Analysis 2009).

Figure 1.3 – The design of the Forest Health Monitoring Program (Forest Health Monitoring 2003b). A fifth component, Analysis and Reporting of results, draws from the four FHM components shown here and provides information to help support land management policies and decisions.

Figure 2.1 – The extent of aerial surveys for insect and disease activity conducted in the conterminous United States and Alaska in 2010. The black lines delineate Forest Health Monitoring regions. (Data source: U.S. Department of Agriculture Forest Service, Forest Health Protection.)

Figure 2.2 – Hotspots of exposure to mortality-causing insects and diseases in 2010. Values are Getis-Ord G_i* scores, with values greater than 2 representing significant clustering of high percentages of forest area exposed to mortality agents. (No areas of significant clustering of low percentages of exposure, -2, were detected). Background forest cover is derived from MODIS imagery by the U.S. Forest Service Remote Sensing Applications Center. (Data source: U.S. Department of Agriculture Forest Service, Forest Health Protection.)

Figure 2.3 – Hotspots of exposure to defoliation-causing insects and diseases in 2010. Values are Getis-Ord G_i* scores, with values greater than 2 representing significant clustering of high percentages of forest area exposed to defoliation agents. (No areas of significant clustering of low percentages of exposure, -2, were detected). Background forest cover is derived from MODIS imagery by the U.S. Forest Service Remote Sensing Applications Center. (Data source: U.S. Department of Agriculture Forest Service, Forest Health Protection.)

Figure 2.4 – Percent of surveyed forest in Alaska ecoregion sections exposed to mortality-causing insects and diseases in 2010. Background forest cover is derived from MODIS imagery by the U.S. Forest Service Remote Sensing Applications Center. (Data source: U.S. Department of Agriculture Forest Service, Forest Health Protection.)

Figure 2.5 – Percent of surveyed forest in Alaska ecoregion sections exposed to defoliation-causing insects and diseases in 2010. Background forest cover is derived from MODIS imagery by the U.S. Forest Service Remote Sensing Applications Center. (Data source: U.S. Department of Agriculture Forest Service, Forest Health Protection.)

Figure 3.1 – Forest fire occurrences detected by MODIS from 2001 to 2010, for the conterminous United States, Alaska, and the two regions combined. (Data source: U.S. Department of Agriculture Forest Service, Remote Sensing Application Center.)

Figure 3.2 – The number of forest fire occurrences, per 100 km^2 (10,000 hectares) of forested area, by ecoregion section within the conterminous 48 states, for 2010. Forest cover is derived from MODIS imagery by the U.S. Forest Service Remote Sensing Applications Center. (Source of fire data: U.S. Department of Agriculture Forest Service, Remote Sensing Application Center.)

Figure 3.3 – The number of forest fire occurrences, per 100 km^2 (10,000 hectares) of forested area, by ecoregion section within Alaska, for 2010. Forest cover is derived from MODIS imagery by the U.S. Forest Service Remote Sensing Applications Center. (Source of fire data: U.S. Department of Agriculture Forest Service, Remote Sensing Application Center.)

Figure 3.4 – Mean number of forest fire occurrences, per 100 km^2 (10,000 hectares) of forested area from 2001 to 2010, by ecoregion section within the conterminous 48 states, for 2010. Forest cover is derived from MODIS

imagery by the U.S. Forest Service Remote Sensing Applications Center. (Source of fire data: U.S. Department of Agriculture Forest Service, Remote Sensing Application Center.)

Figure 3.5 – Mean number of forest fire occurrences, per 100 km^2 (10,000 hectares) of forested area for 2001 to 2010, by ecoregion section within Alaska, for 2010. Forest cover is derived from MODIS imagery by the U.S. Forest Service Remote Sensing Applications Center. (Source of fire data: U.S. Department of Agriculture Forest Service, Remote Sensing Application Center).

Figure 3.6 – Hotspots of fire occurrence across the conterminous United States for 2010. Values are Getis-Ord G_i* scores, with values greater than 2 representing significant clustering of high numbers of fire occurrences. (No areas of significant clustering of low numbers of fire occurrences, -2, were detected). Background forest cover is derived from MODIS imagery by the U.S. Forest Service Remote Sensing Applications Center. (Source of fire data: U.S. Department of Agriculture Forest Service, Remote Sensing Application Center.)

Figure 4. 1 – The 100-year (1911-2010) mean annual moisture index, or MI_1', for the conterminous United States. Ecoregion section (Cleland and others 2007) boundaries and labels are included for reference. Forest cover data (overlaid green hatching) derived from Moderate Resolution Imaging Spectroradiometer (MODIS) imagery by the U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Remote Sensing Applications Center. Data source: PRISM Group, Oregon State University.

Figure 4.2 – The 2010 annual (i.e., one-year) moisture difference z-score, or *MDZ*, for the conterminous United States. Ecoregion section (Cleland and others 2007) boundaries and labels are included for reference. Forest cover data (overlaid green hatching) derived from MODIS imagery by the U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Remote Sensing Applications Center. Data source: PRISM Group, Oregon State University.

Figure 4.3 – The 2008-2010 (i.e., three-year) moisture difference z-score, or *MDZ*, for the conterminous United States. Ecoregion section (Cleland and others 2007) boundaries are included for reference. Forest cover data (overlaid green hatching) derived from MODIS imagery by the U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Remote Sensing Applications Center. Data source: PRISM Group, Oregon State University.

Figure 4.4 – The 2006-2010 (i.e., five-year) moisture difference z-score, or *MDZ,* for the conterminous United States. Ecoregion section (Cleland and others 2007) boundaries are included for reference. Forest cover data (overlaid green hatching) derived from MODIS imagery by the U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Remote Sensing Applications Center. Data source: PRISM Group, Oregon State University.

Figure 4.5 – Three analysis zones, each corresponding to a particular three-month time window used when calculating late spring-early summer drought conditions for the associated areas of the conterminous United States. Ecoregion section (Cleland and others 2007) boundaries and labels are included for reference. Zones were developed from data describing frost-free period. Data source: The Climate Source, LLC, Corvallis, Oregon.

Figure 4.6 – (A) Over a 100-year period (1911-2010), the frequency of two consecutive years of moderate to extreme drought conditions during the late spring-early summer for the conterminous United States; (B) the frequency of three consecutive years of moderate to extreme drought during late-spring early summer; (C) the frequency of four consecutive years of moderate to extreme drought during late spring-early summer; (D) the frequency of five consecutive years of moderate to extreme drought during late spring-early summer. Ecoregion section (Cleland and others 2007) boundaries are included for reference. Data source: PRISM Group, Oregon State University.

Figure 5.1 – Forest cover in the States where mortality was analyzed. Forest cover was derived from Advanced Very High Resolution Radiometer satellite imagery (Zhu and Evans 1994).

Figure 5.2 – Tree mortality expressed as the ratio of annual mortality of woody biomass to gross annual growth in woody biomass (MRATIO) by ecoregion section (Cleland and others 2005). (Data source: U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service Forest Inventory and Analysis Program).

Figure 6.1 – The study area includes 31 eastern States.

Figure 6.2 – The percentage of total forest type area in each of seven forest area density (Pf) classes, sorted descending by percentage in the intact area density class. Forest type nomenclature is from Appendix F of USDA Forest Service (2010).

Figure 6.3 – Estimated total area of intact forest land cover, by forest type, sorted descending by area. Note the scale change between (a) and (b). Forest type nomenclature is from Appendix F of USDA Forest Service (2010).

Figure 7.1 – Average percentage of introduced species and relative cover by condition type for plots with introduced species. Error bars represent plus and minus one standard error.

Figure 7.2 – Average species richness for Quadrats, Subplots, and Plots of 100-percent forested by ecological province. Error bars represent plus and minus one standard error.

Figure 7.3 – Occupancy of introduced species by ecological province. Error bars represent plus and minus one standard error.

Figure 7.4 – Relationship between PPWI and proportion of forest edge plots (a.) and average plot species richness (b.) across ecological provinces.

Figure 7.5 – Constancy of selected species by condition type.

Figure 7.6 – Distribution of selected forb species. Plot locations are approximate.

Figure 7.7 – Distribution of selected grass species. Plot locations are approximate.

Figure 7.8 – Distribution of selected introduced non-tree woody plants. Plot locations are approximate.

Figure 7.9 – Distribution of multiflora rose, the most commonly reported introduced species in the Region. Plot locations are approximate.

Figure 7.10 – Distribution of selected introduced tree species. In some areas buckthorn is more of a shrub than a small tree. Plot locations are approximate.

Figure 8.1 – Forest Inventory and Analysis ozone biomonitoring grid developed from the Environmental Monitoring and Assessment Program (EMAP) base grid (White and others 1992). The grid has four sampling intensities based on sensitive species and ambient ozone concentrations.

Figure 8.2 – Ozone injury to forest plants in the United States by FIA Region: Percent injured plots by year, 1994 to 2010.

Figure 8.3 – Trends in ozone-induced foliar injury (BI) and ozone exposure (SUM06 and N100) in the FIA Northern Region from 1994 to 2009.

Figure 8.4 – Trends in ozone-induced foliar injury (BI) in the FIA-Southern Research Station and FIA-Pacific Northwest Regions from 1997 to 2009.

Figure 9.1 – Effects of restoration (mechanical woody encroachment removal; conducted during 2002-2004) on oak savanna stand structure: density of (a) woody species seedlings, (b) saplings, and (c) overstory trees. Data were collected using four FIA Phase 2 plots/site (n=2 sites/treatment). Replication was too low to statistically resolve patterns. Values are mean ±SE.

Figure 9.2 – Effects of restoration (mechanical woody encroachment removal; conducted during 2002-2004) on oak savanna stand structure: density of (a) woody species seedlings, (b) saplings, and (c) overstory trees. Data were collected using four FIA Phase 2 plots/site (n=4 sites/treatment). This level of replication was sufficient for resolving differences between treatment groups for all strata in 2008 ($p<0.05$). Values are mean ±SE.

Figure 10.1 – USDA Plant hardiness zone map from 1990 with the dashed horizontal lines (isotherms) illustrating the boundaries of growth zones 3-7 of expected average annual minimum temperatures: Zone 3 = -35 to -40˚C [-30 to -40˚F], zone 4 = -29 to -35˚C [-20 to -30˚F], zone 5 = -23 to -29˚C [-10 to -20˚F], and zone 6 = -18 to -23˚C [0 to -10˚F]. Zones are constructed from records of lowest winter temperatures or the area in the preceding fifteen years (approximately). The locations of our scorch samples are represented as circular push pins for BLS-negative trees and X-marks for BLS-positive trees. The geographical regions of the collections are shown, with Plain States (darker shading) and North Central States (lighter shading).

Figure 10.2 – Newest USDA plant hardiness zone map from 2006 with solid horizontal lines (isotherms) illustrating the boundaries of growth zones 3-7 of expected average annual minimum temperatures (zone 7 = -10 to 0˚F [-12 to -23˚C]). Lowest winter temperatures are warming since the 1990 map, for example, the 1990 isotherms place the lower half of Michigan in zone 5, while the 2006 isotherms place the lower half in zone 6. This is a change of approximately 5˚C warmer. We hypothesize that BLS incidence will be increasing northward with the warming climate.

Figure 11.1 – Five common fuel complexes in Southern Appalachians: A = undisturbed stands; B = burned stand; C = harvested stand; D = southern pine beetle damaged stand; E = wind damaged stands. (Photo Credit: U.S. Forest Service.)

Figure 11.2 – The changes in mean DWM weight (y-axes) with increasing number of sampling plots (x-axes) in each national forest/park (A) (diamond = Chattahooche National Forest; square = Nantahala National Forest; triangle = Sumter National Forest; cross = Great Smoky National Park) or four areas combined (B).

List of Tables

Table 2.1 – Mortality agents and complexes affecting more than 5,000 ha in the conterminous United States in 2010. The sum of the individual agents is not equal to the total for all agents because of overlapping damage polygons.

Table 2.2 – Beetle taxa included in the "western bark beetle"group.

Table 2.3 – Defoliation agents and complexes affecting more than 5,000 ha in the conterminous United States in 2010. The sum of the individual agents is not equal to the total for all agents because of overlapping damage polygons.

Table 2.4 – The three mortality agents detected in Alaska in 2010. The sum of the individual agents does not equal to the total for all agents because of overlapping damage polygons.

Table 2.5 – The five leading defoliation agents detected in Alaska in 2010.

Table 4.1 – Moisture difference z-score (*MDZ*) value ranges for nine wetness and drought categories, along with each category's approximate theoretical frequency of occurrence.

Table 5.1 – States from which repeated Forest Inventory and Analysis Phase 2 measurements were available, the time period spanned by the data, and the number of panels of data available. Each panel represents approximately 1/5th of the plots in a State.

Table 5.2 –Tree species responsible for at least ten percent of the mortality (in terms of biomass) for ecoregions where the MRATIO was 0.60 or greater.

Table 5.3 – Dead diameter live diameter (DDLD) ratios for ecoregion sections where the MRATIO was 0.60 or greater.

Table 7.1 – Proportion of plots with at least one introduced species (PPWI) and the number of plots in each condition type by ecological province.

Table 7.2 – The five most common introduced species per ecological province.

Table 7.3 – Percentage of native and introduced species by growth habit and results of chi-squared test of independence (degrees of freedom =3) to determine if species origin and growth habits were independent within each ecological province. Significant differences are greater for larger chi-square values and indicate species origin and growth habit are dependent, that is, native and introduced species have different distributions across growth habits.

Table 7.4 – Constancy of selected introduced species for the region and by ecological province.

Table 8.1 – Number of years of biomonitoring, number of years with ozone injury, and year biomonitoring was started by region and state for the years 1994 to 2010.

Table 8.2 – Number of evaluated biostates by year and by Forest Inventory and Analysis region.

Table 8.3 – Regional differences in maximum and mean ozone exposure data for 1994-2005.

Table 10.1–2008-2009 Collections of plants with leaf scorch symptoms assayed by real-time qPCR.

Table 11.1 – A comparison of the down woody material (DWM) estimates derived from the FIA P3 plots and the intensive sampling plots.

Executive Summary

Healthy ecosystems are those that are stable and sustainable, able to maintain their organization and autonomy over time while remaining resilient to stress (Costanza 1992). The Forest Health Monitoring Program (FHM) of the U.S. Forest Service, with cooperating researchers within and outside the Forest Service and with state partners, quantifies the health of U.S. forests (chapter 1). The analyses and results outlined in Sections I and II of this FHM annual national technical report offer a snapshot of the current condition of U.S. forests from a national or multi-state regional perspective, incorporating baseline investigations of forest ecosystem health, examinations of change over time in forest health metrics, and assessments of developing threats to forest stability and sustainability. For datasets collected on an annual basis, analyses are presented from 2010 data. For datasets collected over several years, analyses are presented at a longer temporal scale. Chapters describe new techniques for analyzing forest health data as well as new applications of established techniques. Finally, Section III of this report presents summaries of results from recently completed Evaluation Monitoring (EM) projects that have been funded through the FHM national program to determine the extent, severity and/or causes of specific forest health problems (Forest Health Monitoring 2010).

Monitoring the occurrence of forest pest and pathogen outbreaks is important at regional scales because of the significant impact insects and disease can have on forest health across landscapes (chapter 2). U.S. Forest Service Forest Health Protection low-altitude survey data from 2010 identified 67 different mortality-causing agents on nearly 3.68 million hectares of forest in the conterminous United States, and 70 defoliating agents on approximately 3.72 million hectares. Significant large geographic hot spots of forest mortality were associated with mountain pine beetle in the West, while a smaller hot spot was associated with *Ips* engraver beetles in the South. Hot spots of defoliation were spread throughout the conterminous States, the largest and most intense associated with pinyon needle scale, western spruce budworm, forest tent caterpillar, and gypsy moth. Spruce beetle was the most important cause of mortality in Alaska, while willow leaf blotchminer and aspen leafminer were the most important defoliating agents.

Forest fire occurrence outside the historic range of frequency and intensity can result in extensive economic and ecological impacts. The detection of regional patterns of fire occurrence can allow for the identification of areas at greatest risk of significant impact and for the selection of locations for more intensive analysis (chapter 3). In 2010, the South Central and Red Bed Plains of Oklahoma experienced the most fires per 100 km^2 of forested area, while ecoregions in Utah, Idaho, and Florida also had high densities of forest fire occurrence. In Alaska, a moderate density of forest fires occurred in the Yukon Flats ecoregion. Geographical hot spots of fire occurrence were detected in eastern Oregon, the Southeastern Coastal Plain, northeastern Oklahoma, and in scattered locations across the West. When looking at the last 10 years of fire occurrence data, ecoregions in southern California and central Idaho had the highest mean number of fires per year relative to forested area.

Most U.S. forests experience droughts, with varying degrees of intensity and duration between and within forest ecosystems. Arguably, the duration of a drought event is more critical than its intensity. A standardized drought indexing approach was applied to monthly climate data from 2010 to map drought conditions across the conterminous United States at a fine scale (chapter 4). Most of the Western United States had more moisture than average in 2010, although there were scattered pockets of moderate to extreme drought; this was a departure from a decade-long trend. In contrast, there were fairly extensive areas of drought in the Eastern United States, including along the central Gulf of Mexico coast and in the western Great Lakes region. A separate analysis mapped, for the 100-year period from 1911 to 2010, the frequency of two, three, four, and five consecutive years of moderate to extreme drought conditions during the late spring-early summer season.

Mortality is a natural process in all forested ecosystems, but high levels of mortality at large scales may indicate that the health of forests is declining. Forest Inventory and Analysis (FIA) phase 2 data offer tree mortality information on a relatively spatially intense basis of approximately 1 plot per 6,000 acres (chapter 5). An analysis of FIA plots from 36 states found that the highest ratios of annual mortality to gross growth occurred in ecoregion sections of the Plains States. Mortality was also high in parts of Florida and eastern Texas. In all ecoregions, the ratio of average dead tree diameter to average surviving live tree diameter indicated that the trees that died were similar in size to the trees that survived. In three ecoregions with the highest mortality relative to growth, the predominant vegetation is grassland, where few forest plots are measured and where tree growth rates are slow.

Fragmentation is a continuing threat to the sustainability of forests in the eastern United States. Currently, however, little detail is available about the degree to which forest types are fragmented. Such information could improve land management and policy by identifying forest types of special concern for conservation or remediation. Land cover data were combined with field plot information from the Forest Inventory and Analysis (FIA) Program to evaluate the fragmentation status of forest types in the eastern United States and to estimate the area of intact forest by forest type (chapter 6). The percentage area in the intact forest area density class varied from 13% to 78% among individual forest types. Fragmentation would be considered a natural attribute of many of the forest types that exhibited low percentages of intact forest. For the forest types that are not naturally fragmented and that occur in relatively accessible locations, typically less than half of the forest type area qualified as intact forest.

The spread of introduced species into natural plant communities can threaten native plant diversity and ecosystem functions. Surveys have been conducted to assess the extent of the most harmful known species, but many introduced species do not become invasive until many years after their initial introduction. The presence and abundance of introduced species across the forests of the northeastern portion of the United States were examined to determine what broad-scale factors can be used to predict their distribution (chapter 7). The distributions of introduced species were examined over the entire Northern Research Station region, by level of forest intactness, using ecoregion provinces as subpopulations. The results indicate a strong association between forest fragmentation and the regional distribution of introduced species. Occupancy of introduced species varied across provinces; those with a higher proportion of forest-edge plots had the highest occupancy by introduced species.

Ozone is a highly toxic air contaminant that has been shown repeatedly to damage tree growth and cause significant disturbance to forest ecosystems. It also causes distinct foliar injury symptoms to certain plant species that can be used to detect and monitor ozone stress in the forest environment (chapter 8). Biomonitoring surveys, begun in 1994 in the East and 1998 in the West, provide important regional information on ozone air quality, and a field-based measure of ozone injury and probable impact unavailable from any other data source. Results from the North indicate that injury indices have fluctuated annually in response to seasonal ozone concentrations and site moisture conditions. There is an overall declining trend in percent injured plots and injury severity, especially after 2002. Results from the Pacific Northwest also suggest a declining trend in foliar injury severity, while results from the South show a steady decline in percent injured plots.

Finally, three recently completed Evaluation Monitoring (EM) projects address a wide variety of forest health concerns at a scale smaller than the national or multi-state regional analyses included in the first sections of the report. These EM projects, funded by the Forest Health Monitoring Program:

- replicated a landscape scale experiment to restore oak savanna ecosystems in central Iowa, with an objective of collecting sensitive process-level ecosystem indicators of restored and degraded savannas for long-term monitoring (chapter 9);

- developed a distribution and incidence database and established the extent of the host range for *Xylella fasidiosa*, the xylem-inhabiting bacterium that causes bacterial leaf scorch in shade trees (chapter 10);

- tested whether the fuel estimations derived from the Forest Inventory and Analysis (FIA) Phase 3 plots capture multiple and distinct fuel complexes in the Southern Appalachian Mountains (chapter 11).

The Forest Health Monitoring program, in cooperation with forest health specialists and researchers inside and outside the Forest Service, continues to investigate a broad range of issues relating to forest health using a wide variety of data and techniques. This report presents some of the latest results from ongoing national-scale detection monitoring and smaller-scale environmental monitoring efforts by FHM and its cooperators. For more information about efforts to determine the status, changes and trends in indicators of the condition of U.S. forests, please visit the FHM Web site at www.fs.fed.us/foresthealth/fhm.

Literature Cited

Costanza, R. 1992. Toward an operational definition of ecosystem health. In: Costanza, R.; Norton, B.G.; Haskell, B.D., eds. Ecosystem health: New goals for environmental management. pp. 239-256. Washington, DC: Island Press: 239-256.

Forest Health Monitoring. 2010. Program description. Forest Health Monitoring Fact Sheet Series. http://www.fhm.fs.fed.us/fact/ [Date accessed: Oct. 22, 2010]

Chapter 1. Introduction

Kevin M. Potter

Forests cover a vast area of the United States, 304 million hectares (751 million acres) or approximately one-third of the nation's land area (Smith and others 2004). These forests possess substantial ecological and socioeconomic importance. Both their ecological integrity and their continued capacity to provide goods and services are of concern in the face of a long list of threats, including insect and disease infestation, fragmentation, catastrophic fire, invasive species, and the effects of climate change.

Assessing and monitoring the health of these forests are critical and challenging tasks. While there is no universally accepted definition of forest health, the current understanding of ecosystem dynamics suggests that healthy ecosystems are those that are able to maintain their organization and autonomy over time while remaining resilient to stress (Costanza 1992), and that evaluations of forest health should emphasize factors that affect the inherent processes and resilience of forests (Kolb and others 1994, Raffa and others 2009). This National Technical Report, the eleventh in an annual series produced by the Forest Health Monitoring Program (FHM) of the U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, attempts to quantify the status of, changes to, and trends in a wide variety of such indicators of forest health. These indicators encompass forest insect and disease activity, wildland fire occurrence, drought, tree mortality, forest fragmentation, introduced plant species, lichen diversity, and ozone injury.

This report has three specific objectives. The first is to present information about forest health from a national perspective, or from a multi-state regional perspective when appropriate, using data collected by the U.S. Forest Service's Forest Health Protection (FHP) and Forest Inventory and Analysis (FIA) programs, as well as from other sources available at a wide extent. The chapters that present analyses at a national-scale, or multi-state regional scale, are divided between Section I and Section II of the report. Section I presents results from the analyses of forest health data that are available on an annual basis, allowing for the detection of trends over time and changes from one year to the next. Section II presents longer-term forest health trends, in addition to describing new techniques for analyzing forest health data at national or regional scales (the second objective of the report). While in-depth interpretation and analysis of specific geographic or ecological regions are beyond the scope of these parts of the report, the chapters in Sections I and II present information that can be used to identify areas that may require investigation at a finer scale.

The second objective of the report is to present new techniques for analyzing forest health data as well as new applications of established techniques, presented in selected chapters of Section II. Examples in this report are chapter 6, which demonstrates an approach to improve national assessments of forest fragmentation by incorporating information about the specific forest types that are fragmented, and chapter 7, which uses FIA phase 3 data to examine factors important in determining the regional distribution of invasive plants in the upper Midwest and Northeastern United States.

The third objective of the National Technical Report is to present results of recently completed Evaluation Monitoring (EM) projects funded through the FHM national program. These project summaries, presented in Section III, determine the extent, severity and/or cause of forest health problems (Forest Health Monitoring 2010), generally at a finer scale than that addressed by the analyses in Sections I and II. Each chapter in Section III contains an overview of an EM project, key results, and contacts for more information.

When appropriate throughout this report, authors use Bailey's revised ecoregions (Cleland and others 2007) as a common ecologically-based spatial framework for their forest health assessments (fig. 1.1). Specifically, when the spatial scale of the data and the expectation of an identifiable pattern in the data are appropriate, authors use ecoregion sections or provinces as assessment units for their analyses. In Bailey's hierarchical system, the two broadest ecoregion scales, domains and divisions, are based on large ecological climate zones, while each division is broken into provinces based on vegetation macro features (Bailey 1995). Provinces are further divided into sections, which may be thousands of square kilometers in extent and are expected to encompass regions similar in their geology, climate, soils, potential natural vegetation, and potential natural communities (Cleland and others 1997).



Figure 1.1– Ecoregion provinces and sections for the conterminous United States (Cleland and others 2007) and Alaska (Nowacki and Brock 1995). Ecoregion sections within each ecoregion province are shown in the same color.



Figure 1.1 (continued)– Ecoregion provinces and sections for the conterminous United States (Cleland and others 2007) and Alaska (Nowacki and Brock 1995). Ecoregion sections within each ecoregion province are shown in the same color.

Conterminous States Ecoregion Provinces

- Adirondack-New England Mixed Forest - Coniferous Forest - Alpine Meadow (M211)
- American Semi-Desert and Desert (322)
- Arizona-New Mexico Mountains Semi-Desert - Open Woodland - Coniferous Forest - Alpine Meadow (M313)
- Black Hills Coniferous Forest (M334)
- California Coastal Chaparral Forest and Shrub (261)
- California Coastal Range Open Woodland - Shrub - Coniferous Forest - Meadow (M262)
- California Coastal Steppe - Mixed Forest - Redwood Forest (263)
- California Dry Steppe (262)
- Cascade Mixed Forest - Coniferous Forest - Alpine Meadow (M242)
- Central Appalachian Broadleaf Forest-Coniferous Forest-Meadow (M221)
- Central Interior Broadleaf Forest (223)
- Chihuahuan Semi-Desert (321)
- Colorado Plateau Semi-Desert (313)
- Eastern Broadleaf Forest (221)
- Everglades (411)
- Great Plains - Palouse Dry Steppe (331)
- Great Plains Steppe (332)
- Intermountain Semi-Desert and Desert (341)
- Intermountain Semi-Desert (342)
- Laurentian Mixed Forest (212)
- Lower Mississippi Riverine Forest (234)
- Middle Rocky Mountain Steppe - Coniferous Forest - Alpine Meadow (M332)
- Midwest Broadleaf Forest (222)
- Nevada-Utah Mountains Semi-Desert - Coniferous Forest - Alpine Meadow (M341)
- Northeastern Mixed Forest (211)
- Northern Rocky Mountain Forest-Steppe - Coniferous Forest - Alpine Meadow (M333)
- Ouachita Mixed Forest-Meadow (M231)
- Outer Coastal Plain Mixed Forest (232)
- Ozark Broadleaf Forest (M223)
- Pacific Lowland Mixed Forest (242)
- Prairie Parkland (Subtropical) (255)
- Prairie Parkland (Temperate) (251)
- Sierran Steppe - Mixed Forest - Coniferous Forest - Alpine Meadow (M261)
- Southeastern Mixed Forest (231)
- Southern Rocky Mountain Steppe - Open Woodland - Coniferous Forest - Alpine Meadow (M331)
- Southwest Plateau and Plains Dry Steppe and Shrub (315)

Alaska Ecoregion Provinces

- Alaska Mixed Forest (213)
- Alaska Range Taiga (135)
- Aleutian Meadow (271)
- Arctic Tundra (121)
- Bering Sea Tundra (129)
- Brooks Range Tundra (125)
- Pacific Coastal Icefields (244)
- Pacific Gulf Coast Forest (245)
- Upper Yukon Taiga (139)
- Yukon Intermontaine Taiga (131)

Figure 1.1 (continued)– Legend

Data Sources

Forest Service data sources included in this edition of the FHM National Technical Report are: Forest Inventory and Analysis (FIA) annualized Phase 2 and Phase 3 survey data and ozone bioindicator plant data (Bechtold and Patterson 2005), Forest Health Protection (FHP) low-altitude aerial detection survey (ADS) forest mortality and defoliation data for 2010, Moderate Resolution Imaging Spectroradiometer (MODIS) Active Fire Detections for the United States database for 2010, and forest cover data developed from MODIS satellite imagery by the U.S. Forest Service Remote Sensing Applications Center. Other sources of data are: daily weather station data from the National Climatic Data Center (NCDC), Parameter-elevation Regression on Independent Slopes (PRISM) climate mapping system data (PRISM Group 2010), and the 2001 National Land Cover Database (NLCD) map (Homer and others 2007).

A major source of data for FHM's analyses has been the FIA program, which collects forest inventory information across all forest land ownerships in the United States. FIA maintains a network of more than 125,000 permanent forested ground plots across the conterminous United States and southeastern Alaska, with a sampling intensity of approximately one plot per 2,428 hectares (6,000 acres). The FIA program's Phase 2 encompasses the annualized inventory measured on plots at regular intervals, with each plot surveyed every five to seven years in most Eastern States, but with plots in the Rocky Mountain and Pacific Northwest regions surveyed once every 10 years (Reams and others 2005). The standard 0.067 hectare (1/6 acre) plot (fig. 1.2) consists of four 7.315-meter (24-foot) radius subplots (approximately 168.6 m^2 or 1/24 acre), on which field crews measure trees at least 12.7 cm (5 inches) in diameter. Within each of these subplots is nested a 2.073-meter (6.8-foot) radius microplot (approximately 13.48 m^2 or 1/300th acre), on which crews measure trees smaller than 12.7 cm (5 inches) in diameter. A core-optional variant of the standard design includes four "macroplots," each with radius of 17.953 meters (58.9 feet) or approximately 0.1012 hectare (1/4 acre) that originates at the center of each subplot (Forest Inventory and Analysis 2009).



Figure 1.2 – The Forest Inventory and Analysis mapped plot design. Subplot 1 is the center of the cluster with subplots 2, 3, and 4 located 120 feet away at azimuths of 360°, 120°, and 240°, respectively (Forest Inventory and Analysis 2009).

FIA's Phase 3 plots represent a subset of these Phase 2 plots, with one Phase 3 plot for every 16 standard FIA Phase 2 plots. In addition to traditional forest inventory measurements, data for a variety of important ecological indicators

are collected from phase 3 plots, including tree crown condition, lichen communities, down woody material, soil condition, and vegetation structure and diversity. Additionally, data on ozone bioindicator plants are collected on a separate grid of plots. Most of these additional forest health indicators were measured as part of the FHM Detection Monitoring ground plot system prior to 2000[1] (Palmer and others 1991).

The Forest Health Monitoring Program

FHM is a national program designed to determine the status, changes, and trends in indicators of forest condition on an annual basis, and covers all forested lands through a partnership encompassing the U.S. Forest Service, State foresters, and other State and federal agencies and academic groups (Forest Health Monitoring 2010). The FHM program utilizes data from a wide variety of data sources, both inside and outside the Forest Service, and develops analytical approaches for addressing forest health issues that affect the sustainability of forest ecosystems. It encompasses five major activities (fig. 1.3):

- Detection Monitoring – nationally standardized aerial and ground surveys to evaluate status and change in condition of forest ecosystems (Sections I and II of this report);
- Evaluation Monitoring – projects to determine extent, severity, and causes of undesirable changes in forest health identified through Detection Monitoring (Section III of this report);
- Intensive Site Monitoring – projects to enhance understanding of cause-effect relationships by linking Detection Monitoring to ecosystem process studies and to assess specific issues, such as calcium depletion and carbon sequestration, at multiple spatial scales;
- Research on Monitoring Techniques – work to develop or improve indicators, monitoring systems, and analytical techniques, such as urban and riparian forest health monitoring, early detection of invasive species, multivariate analyses of forest health indicators, and spatial scan statistics (Section II of this report).
- Analysis and Reporting – synthesis of information from various data sources within and external to the Forest Service to produce issue-driven reports on status and change in forest health at National, Regional, and State levels (Sections I, II and III of this report).

In addition to its national reporting efforts, FHM generates regional and State reports. These reports may be produced with FHM's partners, both within the Forest Service and in State forestry and agricultural departments representing a variety of analyses on disturbance and forest conditions (Steinman 2004), urban monitoring methods (Lake and others 2006), health conditions in National Forests (Morin and others 2006), urban forest health monitoring (Cumming and others 2006, 2007), crown conditions (Randolph and Moser 2009, Randolph 2010), and ozone monitoring (Rose and Coulston 2009). Reports in the Forest Health Highlights series are annually produced for each state to profile current conditions and are available on the FHM web site at www.fs.fed.us/foresthealth/fhm. These highlights are produced by the FHM regions in cooperation with their respective State partners. FHM and its partners also produce reports and journal articles on monitoring techniques and analytical methods, including analyzing forest health data (Smith and Conkling 2005), soils as an indicator of forest health (O'Neill and others 2005), crown-condition classification (Schomaker and others 2007), sampling and estimation procedures for vegetation diversity and structure (Schulz and others 2009), and the overall forest health indicator program (Woodall and others 2010).

[1] U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service. 1998. Forest Health Monitoring 1998 field methods guide. Research Triangle Park, NC: U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, National Forest Health Monitoring Program, 473 p. On file with: Forest Health Monitoring Program National Office, 3041 Cornwallis Rd., Research Triangle Park, NC 27709.



Figure 1.3 – The design of the Forest Health Monitoring Program (Forest Health Monitoring 2003b). A fifth component, Analysis and Reporting of results, draws from the four FHM components shown here and provides information to help support land management policies and decisions.

For more information about efforts to determine the status, changes and trends in indicators of the condition of U.S. forests, visit the FHM Web site at www.fs.fed.us/foresthealth/fhm. This Forest Health Monitoring National Technical Report is produced by national forest health monitoring researchers at the Eastern Forest Environmental Threat Assessment Center (EFETAC). EFETAC was established under the Healthy Forest Restoration Act to generate knowledge and tools needed to anticipate and respond to environmental threats. For more information about the research team, and about threats to U.S. forests, please visit www.forestthreats.org/about.

Literature Cited

Bailey, R.G. 1995. Descriptions of the ecoregions of the United States. Second Edition. Miscellaneous Publication No. 1391, Map scale 1:7,500,000. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service. 108 p.

Bechtold, W.A.; Patterson, P.L., eds. 2005. The enhanced Forest Inventory and Analysis program—national sampling design and estimation procedures. Gen. Tech. Rep. SRS-80. Asheville, NC: U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Southern Research Station. 85 p.

Cleland, D.T.; Avers, P.E.; McNab, W.H. [and others]. 1997. National hierarchical framework of ecological units. In: Boyce, M. S.; Haney, A., eds. Ecosystem management applications for sustainable forest and wildlife resources. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press. p. 181-200.

Cleland, D.T.; Freeouf, J. A., Keys, J.E., Jr. [and others]. 2007. Ecological Subregions: Sections and subsections for the conterminous United States. (A.M. Sloan, technical editor). Gen. Tech. Report WO-76. Washington,

DC: U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service. Map, presentation scale 1:3,500,000; Albers equal area projection; colored. Also as a GIS coverage in ArcINFO format on CD-ROM or at http://fsgeodata.fs.fed.us/other_resources/ecosubregions.html [Date accessed: March 18, 2011].

Costanza, R. 1992. Toward an operational definition of ecosystem health. In: Costanza, R.; Norton, B.G.; Haskell, B.D., eds. Ecosystem health: New goals for environmental management. pp. 239-256. Washington, DC: Island Press: 239-256.

Cumming, A.B.; Twardus, D.B.; Smith, W.D. 2006. National Forest Health Monitoring Program, Maryland and Massachusetts Street Tree Monitoring Pilot Projects. NA-FR-01-06. Newtown Square, PA: U.S. Department of Agriculture Forest Service, Northeastern Area, State and Private Forestry.

Cumming, A.B.; Nowak, D.J.; Twardus, D.B. [and others]. 2007. Urban forests of Wisconsin: pilot monitoring project 2002. NA-FR-05-07. Newtown Square, PA: U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Northeastern Area State and Private Forestry. 33p. Available online:
Low resolution: http://www.na.fs.fed.us/pubs/fhm/pilot/pilot_study_wisconsin_02_lr.pdf
High resolution: http://www.na.fs.fed.us/pubs/fhm/pilot/pilot_study_wisconsin2_02_hr.pdf
[Date accessed: October 19, 2007]

Forest Health Monitoring. 2010. Program description. Forest Health Monitoring Fact Sheet Series. http://www.fhm.fs.fed.us/fact/ [Date accessed: Oct. 22, 2010]

Forest Inventory and Analysis. 2009. The Forest Inventory and Analysis Database: Database Description and Users Manual Version 4.0 for Phase 2. http://www.fia.fs.fed.us/library/database-documentation [Date accessed: May 1, 2009]

Homer, C.; Dewitz, J.; Fry, J. [and others]. 2007. Completion of the 2001 National Land Cover Database for the conterminous United States. Photogrammetric Engineering and Remote Sensing 73:337-341.

Kolb, T.E.; Wagner, M.R.; Covington, W.W. 1994. Concepts of forest health: Utilitarian and ecosystem perspectives. Journal of Forestry. 92:10-15.

Lake, M.; Marshall, P.; Mielke, M. [and others]. 2006. National Forest Health Monitoring program monitoring urban forests in Indiana: pilot study 2002, Part 1. Analysis of field methods and data collection. Gen. Tech Rep. NA FR-06-06. Newtown Square, PA: U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Northeastern Area. Available at: http://www.fhm.fs.fed.us/pubs/ufhm/indianaforests02/indianaforests02.html [Date accessed: November 6, 2007]

Morin, R.S.; Liebhold, A.M.; Gottschalk, K.W. [and others]. 2006. Analysis of Forest Health Monitoring surveys on the Allegheny National Forest (1998-2001). Gen. Tech. Rep. NE-339. Newtown Square, PA: U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Northeastern Research Station. 102 p. http://www.fs.fed.us/ne/newtown_square/publications [Date accessed: November 6, 2007]

Nowacki, G.; Brock, T. 1995. Ecoregions and Subregions of Alaska, EcoMap Version 2.0. Juneau, AK: U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Alaska Region. Map, presentation scale 1:5,000,000; colored.

O'Neill, K.P.; Amacher, M.C.; Perry, C.H. 2005. Soils as an indicator of forest health: a guide to the collection, analysis, and interpretation of soil indicator data in the Forest Inventory and Analysis Program. Gen. Tech. Rep. NC-258. St. Paul, MN: U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, North Central Research Station. 53 p.

Palmer, C.J.; Riitters, K.H.; Strickland, T. [and others]. 1991. Monitoring and research strategy for Forests - Environmental Monitoring and Assessment Program (EMAP). EPA/600/4-91/012. Washington: U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. 187 p.

PRISM Group. 2010. 2.5-arcmin (4 km) gridded monthly climate data. ftp://prism.oregonstate.edu//pub/prism/us/grids. [Date accessed: September 16, 2010].

Raffa, K.F.; Aukema, B.; Bentz, B.J. [and others]. 2009. A literal use of "forest health" safeguards against misuse and misapplication. Journal of Forestry. 107:276-277.

Randolph, KaDonna C. 2010. Equations Relating compacted and Uncompacted Live Crown Ratio for Common Tree Species in the South. Southern Journal of Applied Forestry. 34(3) 2010: 118-123.

Randolph, KaDonna C.; Moser, W. Keith. 2009. Tree crown condition in Missouri, 2000–2003. Gen. Tech. Rep. SRS–113. Asheville, NC: U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Southern Research Station. 11 p.

Reams, G. A.; Smith, W. D.; Hansen, M. H. [and others]. 2005. The Forest Inventory and Analysis sampling frame. In: Bechtold, W. A.; Patterson, P. L., ed. The Enhanced Forest Inventory and Analysis Program -- National Sampling Design and Estimation Procedures. Asheville, North Carolina: United States Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Southern Research Station: 11-26.

Rose, Anita K.; Coulston, John W. 2009. Ozone injury across the Southern United States, 2002–06. Gen. Tech. Rep. SRS–118. Asheville, NC: U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Southern Research Station. 25 p.

Schomaker, M.E.; Zarnoch, S.J.; Bechtold, W.A. [and others]. 2007. Crown-condition classification: a guide to data collection and analysis. Gen. Tech. Rep. SRS-102. Asheville, NC: U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Southern Research Station. 78 p.

Schulz, B.K.; Bechtold, W.A.; Zarnoch, S.J. 2009. Sampling and estimation procedures for the vegetation diversity and structure indicator. Gen. Tech. Rep. PNW-GTR-781. Portland, OR: U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Pacific Northwest Research Station. 53 p.

Smith, W.D.; Conkling, B.L. 2004. Analyzing forest health data. Gen. Tech. Rep. SRS-077. Asheville, NC: U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Southern Research Station, 33 p. http://www.srs.fs.usda.gov/pubs/gtr/gtr_srs077.pdf. [Date accessed: November 6, 2007]

Smith, W.B.; Miles, P.D.; Perry, Charles H.; Pugh, S.A. 2009. Forest resources of the United States, 2007. Gen. Tech. Rep. WO-78. St. Paul, MN: U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Washington Office. 336 p.

Steinman, J. 2004. Forest Health Monitoring in the Northeastern United States: Disturbances and Conditions during 1993-2002. NA-Technical Paper 01-04. Newtown Square, PA: U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, State and Private Forestry, Northeastern Area. 46 p. http://fhm.fs.fed.us/pubs/tp/dist_cond/dc.shtml [Date accessed: December 8, 2009]

Woodall, C.W.; Amacher, M.C.; Bechtold, W.A.; Coulston, J.W.; Jovan, S.; Perry, C.H.; Randolph, K.C.; Schulz, B.K.; Smith, G.C.; Tkacz, B.; Will-Wolf, S. 2010. Status and future of the forest health indicators program of the USA. Environmental Monitoring and Assessment. DOI 10.1007/s10661-010-1644-8.

Section I. Analyses of Short-Term Forest Health Data

Chapter 2. Large-Scale Patterns of Insect and Disease Activity in the Conterminous United States and Alaska from the National Aerial Detection Survey Database, 2010

Kevin M. Potter and Jeanine L. Paschke

Introduction

Analyzing patterns of forest pest infestations, diseases occurrences, forest declines and related abiotic stress factors is necessary to monitor the health of forested ecosystems and their potential impacts on forest structure, composition, biodiversity, and species distributions (Castello and others 1995). Introduced non-native insects and diseases, in particular, can extensively damage the diversity, ecology and economy of affected areas (Brockerhoff and others 2006, Mack and others 2000). Examining pest occurrences and related stress factors from a landscape-scale perspective is useful, given the regional extent of many infestations and the large-scale complexity of interactions between host distribution, stress factors, and the development of pest outbreaks (Holdenrieder and others 2004). The detection of geographic clusters of disturbance is one such landscape-scale approach, which allows for the identification of areas at greatest risk of significant impact and for the selection of locations for more intensive analysis.

Methods

Nationally compiled Forest Health Protection (FHP) low-altitude aerial survey and ground survey data from 2010 were used to identify forest landscape-scale damages associated with hot spots of forest insect and disease activity in the conterminous 48 States, and to summarize insect and disease activity by ecoregion section in Alaska. Aerial surveys covered approximately 155.6 million hectares (61 percent) of the forested area in the conterminous United States in 2010, and 9.1 million hectares (17.7 percent) of Alaska's forested area (fig. 2.1).

These surveys identify areas of mortality and defoliation caused by insect and pathogen activity, although some important forest insects (such as emerald ash borer and hemlock woolly adelgid), diseases (such as laurel wilt, Dutch elm disease, white pine blister rust, and thousand cankers disease), and mortality complexes (such as oak decline) are not easily detected or thoroughly quantified through aerial detection surveys. Such pests may attack hosts that are widely dispersed throughout diverse forests or may cause mortality or defoliation that is otherwise difficult to detect. A pathogen or insect might be considered a mortality-causing agent in one location and a defoliation-causing agent in another, depending on the level of damage to the forest in a given area and the convergence of stress factors such as drought. In some cases, the identified agents of mortality or defoliation are actually complexes of multiple agents summarized under an impact label related to a specific host tree species (e.g., "subalpine fir mortality" or "aspen defoliation"). Additionally, differences in data collection, attribute recognition, and coding procedures among States and regions can complicate the analysis of the data and the interpretation of the results.

The mortality and defoliation polygons were used to identify the mortality and defoliation agents in the conterminous United States found on more than 5,000 ha of forest, and to identify and list the five most widely detected defoliation and mortality agents for Alaska.



Figure 2.1 – The extent of aerial surveys for insect and disease activity conducted in the conterminous United States and Alaska in 2010. The black lines delineate Forest Health Monitoring regions. (Data source: U.S. Department of Agriculture Forest Service, Forest Health Protection.)

A Getis-Ord hot spot analysis (Getis and Ord 1992) in ArcMap 9.2 (ESRI 2006) was employed to identify surveyed forest areas with the greatest exposure to the detected mortality-causing and defoliation-causing agents. The Environmental Monitoring and Assessment Program (EMAP) North American hexagon coordinates (White and others 1992b) were intensified to develop a lattice of hexagonal cells, of approximately 2,500 km^2 extent, for the conterminous United States. This cell size allows for analysis at a medium-scale resolution of approximately the same area as a typical county. The percent of ADS-surveyed forest area in each hexagon exposed to either mortality-causing or defoliation-causing agents was then calculated by masking the surveyed-area and mortality and defoliation polygons with a forest cover map (1 km^2 resolution), derived from Moderate Resolution Imaging Spectroradiometer (MODIS) satellite imagery by the U.S. Forest Service Remote Sensing Applications Center (United States Department of Agriculture Forest Service 2008). The percent of forest exposed to the identified mortality or defoliation agents was calculated by dividing the forest-masked damage area by the forest-masked surveyed area.

The Getis-Ord G_i* statistic was used to identify clusters of hexagonal cells in which the percent of forest exposed to mortality or defoliation agents was higher than expected by chance. This statistic allows for the decomposition of a global measure of spatial association into its contributing factors, by location, and is therefore particularly suitable for detecting non-stationarities in a data set, such as when spatial clustering is concentrated in one subregion of the data (Anselin 1992).

The Getis-Ord G_i* statistic summed the differences between the mean values in a local sample, determined by a moving window consisting of each hexagon and its six adjacent hexagons, and the global mean of all the forested hexagonal cells in the conterminous 48 states. It is then standardized as a z score with a mean of 0 and a standard deviation of 1, with values greater than 1.96 representing significant ($p < 0.025$) local clustering of high values and values less than -1.96 representing significant clustering of low values ($p < 0.025$), since 95 percent of the observations under a normal distribution should be within approximately 2 standard deviations of the mean (Laffan 2006). In other words, a G_i* value of 1.96 indicates that the local mean of percent forest exposed to mortality-causing or defoliation-causing agents for a hexagon and its six neighbors is approximately 2 standard deviations greater than the mean expected in the absence of spatial clustering, while a G_i* value of -1.96 indicates that the local mortality or defoliation mean for a hexagon and its six neighbors is approximately 2 standard deviations less than the mean expected in the absence of spatial clustering. Values between -1.96 and 1.96 have no statistically significant concentration of high or low values. In other words, when a hexagon has a G_i* value between -1.96 and 1.96, it and its six neighbors have neither consistently high nor consistently low percentages of forest exposed to mortality- or defoliation-causing agents.

It is worth noting that the threshold values are not exact because the correlation of spatial data violates the assumption of independence required for statistical significance (Laffan 2006). The Getis-Ord approach does not require that the input data be normally distributed because the local G_i* values are computed under a randomization assumption, with G_i* equating to a standardized z score that asymptotically tends to a normal distribution (Anselin 1992). The z scores are reliable, even with skewed data, as long as the distance band is large enough to include several neighbors for each feature (ESRI 2006).

The low density of aerial survey data from Alaska in 2010 (fig. 2.1) precluded the use of hot spot analyses for the State. Instead, mortality and defoliation data were summarized by ecoregion section (Nowacki and Brock 1995), calculated as the percent of the forest within the surveyed areas affected by agents of mortality or defoliation. For reference purposes, ecoregion sections (Cleland and others 2007) were also displayed on the geographic hot spot maps of the conterminous 48 United States.

Results and Discussion

The FHP aerial survey data identified 67 different mortality-causing agents on approximately 3.68 million ha of forest across the conterminous United States in 2010, an area slightly smaller than the land area of New Hampshire and Connecticut combined. Forests cover approximately 252.7 million ha (624.4 million acres) of the conterminous 48 States (Smith and others 2009).

Mountain pine beetle (*Dendroctonus ponderosae*) was the most widespread mortality agent, detected on 2.77 million ha (table 2.1). Other mortality agents detected across very large areas, each affecting more than 100 thousand ha, were fir engraver (*Scolytus ventralis*), five-needle pine decline, subalpine fir (*Abies lasiocarpa*) mortality, and spruce beetle (*Dendroctonus rufipennis*). Mortality from western bark beetles, when considered as a group (table 2.2), was detected on a total of more than 3.48 million ha in 2010, a vast majority of the total area on which mortality was recorded.

Table 2.1 – Mortality agents and complexes affecting more than 5,000 ha in the conterminous United States in 2010. The sum of the individual agents is not equal to the total for all agents because of overlapping damage polygons.

Agents/complexes causing mortality, 2010	Area (ha)
mountain pine beetle	2,770,492.4
fir engraver	286,653.5
five-needle pine decline	229,561.8
subalpine fir mortality	173,944.4
spruce beetle	134,062.8
western pine beetle	93,737.5
Douglas-fir beetle	70,526.8
gypsy moth	23,163.2
emerald ash borer	14,711.7
balsam woolly adelgid	9,411.3
eastern larch beetle	7,749.5
forest tent caterpillar	6,883.8
flathead borer	6,589.9
Jeffrey pine beetle	5,868.3
southern pine beetle	5,778.5
white pine blister rust	5,708.9
Total, all agents	**3,675,135**

Additionally, the survey identified 70 defoliation agents affecting approximately 3.72 million ha of forest across the conterminous United States in 2010, an area slightly smaller than the land area of Maryland and Connecticut combined. The most widespread defoliators were western and eastern spruce budworms (*Choristoneura occidentalis* and *C. fumiferana*), affecting 1.08 million ha (table 2.3). Tent caterpillars (*Malacosoma* spp.), pinyon needle scale (*Matsucoccus acalyptus*), gypsy moth (*Lymantria dispar*), aspen (*Populus tremuloides*) decline, and non-specific defoliators each affected more than 100,000 ha.

The hot spot analysis detected three major hot spots of insect and disease mortality in the FHM Interior West region (fig. 2.2), the region in which mountain pine beetle was by far the predominant mortality agent. A very large and highly intense hot spot occurred in Idaho and Montana, the result of very extensive mountain pine beetle mortality and centered on the Idaho Batholith (M332A), the Northern Rockies and Bitterroot Valley (M332B), the Beaverhead Mountains (M332E), and the Belt Mountains (M332D). A second highly intense, but smaller, hot spot was centered on the Wind River Mountains (M331J) of Wyoming, extending into the neighboring Overthrust Mountains (M331D) and Yellowstone Highlands (M331A). In addition to mountain pine beetle, five-needle pine decline and subalpine fir mortality were important mortality agents in this hot spot. A third intense, but smaller, mortality hot spot was caused by mountain pine beetle, subalpine fir mortality and spruce beetle activity in the Northern Parks and Ranges (M331I) of northern Colorado and southern Wyoming. A less intense hot spot associated with mountain pine beetle occurred in the Uinta Mountains (M331E) of northeastern Utah, while another, associated with mountain pine beetle subalpine fir mortality and Douglas-fir beetle, was detected in the Eastern Basin and Range (342J) region of southern Idaho and northwestern Utah.

Table 2.2 – Beetle taxa included in the "western bark beetle"group.

Western bark beetle taxa	
Douglas-fir beetle	*Dendroctonus pseudotsugae*
fir engraver	*Scolytus ventralis*
flatheaded borer	Buprestidae
Ips engraver beetles	*Ips* spp.
Jeffrey pine beetle	*Dendroctonus jeffreyi*
mountain pine beetle	*Dendroctonus ponderosae*
northern spruce engraver beetle	*Ips perturbatus*
roundheaded pine beetle	*Dendroctonus adjunctus*
silver fir beetle	*Pseudohylesinus sericeus*
spruce beetle	*Dendroctonus rufipennis*
tip beetles	*Pityogenes* spp.
western balsam bark beetle	*Dryocoetes confusus*
western cedar bark beetle	*Phloeosinus punctatus*
western pine beetle	*Dendroctonus brevicomis*
bark beetles (non-specific)	--

Table 2.3 – Defoliation agents and complexes affecting more than 5,000 ha in the conterminous United States in 2010. The sum of the individual agents is not equal to the total for all agents because of overlapping damage polygons.

Agents/complexes causing defoliation, 2010	Area (ha)
spruce budworm (eastern and western)	1,080,861.0
tent caterpillars	733,803.3
pinyon needle scale	521,565.3
gypsy moth	488,579.1
aspen decline	152,280.4
defoliators (non_specific)	112,485.9
larch needle cast	47,036.0
baldcypress leafroller	35,779.2
winter moth	31,061.2
needlecast	14,442.5
linden looper	11,705.7
pinyon sawfly	11,025.7
aspen blotchminer	10,674.8
pine butterfly	9,716.6
larch casebearer	7,273.6
Douglas-fir tussock moth	6,664.0
leaftier	6,539.7
aspen leafminer	6,344.4
jack pine budworm	5,468.5
beech bark disease	5,422.5
birch leaf fungus	5,288.2
Total, all agents	**3,715,292**

Mountain pine beetle was also an important cause of mortality in the West Coast and North Central regions. The single, relatively low-intensity mortality hot spot in the West Coast region, located in the Eastern Cascades (M242C) of south-central Oregon (fig. 2.2), was associated with mountain pine beetle and, to a lesser degree, with western pine beetle (*Dendroctonus brevicomis*).



Figure 2.2 – Hotspots of exposure to mortality-causing insects and diseases in 2010. Values are Getis-Ord G_i* scores, with values greater than 2 representing significant clustering of high percentages of forest area exposed to mortality agents. (No areas of significant clustering of low percentages of exposure, -2, were detected). Background forest cover is derived from MODIS imagery by the U.S. Forest Service Remote Sensing Applications Center. (Data source: U.S. Department of Agriculture Forest Service, Forest Health Protection.)

No mortality hot spots occurred in the North Central region, where mountain pine beetle mortality occurred in the Black Hills of South Dakota, or in the North East FHM region. The South, meanwhile, contained a single hot spot, in the Southern Mississippi Alluvial Plain (234A) of northeastern Louisiana (fig. 2.2), where an outbreak of *Ips* engraver beetles occurred. This is part of a large area affected by acute drought in 2010 (see chapter 4). Extensive *Ips*-caused pine mortality across much of Louisiana was largely in response to these drought conditions, with particularly large areas of damage in Franklin and Evangeline parishes (Louisiana Department of Agriculture and Forestry 2011). Due to the scattered nature of *Ips* occurrence, detection and reporting of *Ips* damage is inconsistent and incomplete; there are likely more areas of unreported damage (Louisiana Department of Agriculture and Forestry 2011).

As with mortality, the Interior West FHM region encompassed several defoliation hot spots. One intense and extensive hot spot in the region was associated with pinyon needle scale defoliation in three Nevada ecoregion sections: the West Great Basin and Mountains (M341D), the Southeastern Great Basin (341F), and the East Great Basin and Mountains (M341A). A second, less-intense hot spot was caused by pinyon needle scale, located in the Mono (341D) ecoregion section at the western edge of Nevada (fig. 2.3).

Four other defoliation hot spots in the region were associated with western spruce budworm. A moderately intense hot spot occurred in Idaho, centered on the Idaho Batholith (M332A) and extending into the Challis Volcanics (M332F), the Blue Mountain Foothills (342H), and the Beaverhead Mountains (M332E). Another moderately intense defoliation hot spot caused by western spruce budworm was located in the Utah High Plateau (M341C) of south-central Utah. Two less-intense hot spots were the result of defoliation from western spruce budworm in association with another agent: one with larch needle cast (*Meria laricis*) in the Bitterroot Mountains (M333D), Flathead Valley (M333B), and Okanogan Highland (M333A) of northern Idaho and northwestern Montana; and one with aspen defoliation in the Southern Parks and Rocky Mountain Range (M331F) and South Central Highlands (M331G) of north-central New Mexico and south-central Colorado (fig. 2.3).

There were no defoliation hot spots entirely contained within the West Coast region, where western spruce budworm was also an important defoliation agent.

The most intense defoliation hot spot on hardwoods in the North East FHM region, meanwhile, was caused by forest tent caterpillar, along with eastern tent caterpillar, in the Northern Unglaciated Allegheny Plateau (211G) and the Northern Glaciated Allegheny Plateau (211F) of north-central Pennsylvania and southwest New York (fig. 2.3). A less intense hot spot located in the Catskill Mountains (211I) and Northern Glaciated Allegheny Plateau (211F), mainly in New York, were associated with forest tent caterpillar and generic defoliators. Another low-intensity hot spot in eastern Massachusetts, and the Lower New England (221A) ecoregion, was caused by winter moth (*Operophtera brumata*), Diplodia blight (*Sphaeropsis sapinea*) on select conifer hosts, and gypsy moth.

An intense hot spot of defoliation associated mostly with forest tent caterpillar, along with a comparatively small amount of baldcypress leafroller (*Archips goyerana*) occurred in the South FHM region, in the Louisiana Coastal Prairie and Marshes (232E) and Atchafalaya and Red River Alluvial Plains (234C) of southern Louisiana. The other hot spot in the region was caused by the defoliation of oaks by linden looper (*Erannis tiliaria*) in the Southern Cumberland Plateau (231C) in northeastern Alabama (fig. 2.3).

The North Central region's single high-intensity hot spot, on the Northern Lower Peninsula (212H) of Michigan, was caused largely by gypsy moth, along with some forest tent caterpillar defoliation. Similarly, a less intense hot spot in the Northern Green Bay Lobe (212T) of northeast Wisconsin was associated with gypsy moth with a smaller amount of defoliation by aspen blotchminer (*Lithocolletis tremuloidiella*).

In 2010, three mortality-causing agents were reported for Alaska, affecting approximately 58,000 ha (table 2.4). This represented 0.64 percent of the forest surveyed (9.1 million ha). Alaska contains approximately 51.3 million ha (126.9 million acres) of forest (Smith and others 2009).



Figure 2.3 – Hotspots of exposure to defoliation-causing insects and diseases in 2010. Values are Getis-Ord G_i* scores, with values greater than 2 representing significant clustering of high percentages of forest area exposed to defoliation agents. (No areas of significant clustering of low percentages of exposure, -2, were detected). Background forest cover is derived from MODIS imagery by the U.S. Forest Service Remote Sensing Applications Center. (Data source: U.S. Department of Agriculture Forest Service, Forest Health Protection.)

Table 2.4 – The three mortality agents detected in Alaska in 2010. The sum of the individual agents does not equal to the total for all agents because of overlapping damage polygons.

Agents/complexes causing mortality, 2010	Area (ha)
spruce beetle	31,546.3
Alaska-yellow cedar decline	12,328.4
northern spruce engraver beetle	9,622.1
Total, all agents	**58,096.7**

Spruce beetle was the most widely detected mortality agent, affecting about 32,000 ha of forest, mostly in the south-central and southeastern parts of the State. Yellow-cedar (*Chamaecyparis nootkatensis*) decline was the second most-widely detected mortality agent, found on about 12,000 ha in the Alaska panhandle. Northern spruce engraver beetle (*Ips perturbatus*) was detected on about 10,000 ha of forest, mostly in the central and east-central parts of the State. The ecoregion sections with the highest percentage of surveyed forest affected by mortality agents were the Northern Aleutian Range (M213A) and Northern Chugach Range (M135A) of southern Alaska, with 1.94 percent and 1.03 percent, and the Seward Mountains (M129A) of east-central Alaska, with 1.36 percent (fig. 2.4).

Alaska forests were exposed to 11 defoliation agents recorded on nearly 464,000 ha (table 2.5), or 5.09 percent of the surveyed forest area in 2010. Willow leaf blotchminer (*Micrurapteryx salicifoliella*) was the most widely detected defoliator, found on approximately 228,000 ha, mostly in central and east-central Alaska. The next most important defoliator in 2010 was aspen leafminer (*Phyllocnistis populiella*), present on 184,000 ha, again mostly in the eastern and east-central parts of the State. Non-specific defoliators were detected on nearly 28,000 ha, spruce aphid (*Elatobium abietinum*) was found on about 16,000 ha, and hemlock sawfly (*Neodiprion tsugae*) was observed on approximately 4,000 ha. Twenty percent of the forest surveyed in the Yukon Flats section (139A) was affected by defoliation agents, by far the highest level of detected defoliation activity (fig. 2.5). The Yukon Bottomlands (131A), Olgivie Mountains (M139B) and the Dawson Range (M139C) also had relatively high percentage of forest affected by detected defoliation activity.

Continued monitoring of insect and disease outbreaks across the United States will be necessary for determining appropriate follow-up investigation and management activities. Because of the limitations of aerial survey efforts to detect certain important forest insects and diseases, the pests and pathogens discussed in this chapter do not comprise all the biotic forest health threats that should be considered when making management decisions and budget allocations. However, as these analyses demonstrate, large-scale assessments of mortality and defoliation exposure, including geographical hot spot detection analyses, offer one potentially useful approach for helping to prioritize geographic areas where the concentration of monitoring and management activities would be most effective.



Figure 2.4 – Percent of surveyed forest in Alaska ecoregion sections exposed to mortality-causing insects and diseases in 2010. Background forest cover is derived from MODIS imagery by the U.S. Forest Service Remote Sensing Applications Center. (Data source: U.S. Department of Agriculture Forest Service, Forest Health Protection.)



Figure 2.5 – Percent of surveyed forest in Alaska ecoregion sections exposed to defoliation-causing insects and diseases in 2010. Background forest cover is derived from MODIS imagery by the U.S. Forest Service Remote Sensing Applications Center. (Data source: U.S. Department of Agriculture Forest Service, Forest Health Protection.)

Table 2.5 – The five leading defoliation agents detected in Alaska in 2010.

Agents/complexes causing defoliation, 2010	Area (ha)
willow leaf blotchminer	227,639.1
aspen leafminer	183,539.4
defoliators	27,649.5
spruce aphid	16,231.8
hemlock sawfly	3,680.5
Total, all agents	**463,598.9**

Literature Cited

Anselin, L. 1992. Spatial Data Analysis with GIS: An Introduction to Application in the Social Sciences. Technical Report 92-10. Santa Barbara, California: National Center for Geographic Information and Analysis. 53 pp.

Brockerhoff, E. G.; Liebhold, A. M.; Jactel, H. 2006. The ecology of forest insect invasions and advances in their management. Canadian Journal of Forest Research. 36(2): 263-268.

Castello, J. D.; Leopold, D. J.; Smallidge, P. J. 1995. Pathogens, patterns, and processes in forest ecosystems. Bioscience. 45(1): 16-24.

Cleland, D.T.; Freeouf, J. A., Keys, J.E., Jr. [and others]. 2007. Ecological Subregions: Sections and subsections for the conterminous United States. (A.M. Sloan, technical editor). Gen. Tech. Report WO-76. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service. Map, presentation scale 1:3,500,000; Albers equal area projection; colored. Also as a GIS coverage in ArcINFO format on CD-ROM or at http://fsgeodata.fs.fed.us/other_resources/ecosubregions.html [Date accessed: March 18, 2011].

ESRI. 2006. ArcMap 9.2. Redlands, California: Environmental Systems Research Institute Inc.

Getis, A.; Ord, J. K. 1992. The analysis of spatial association by use of distance statistics. Geographical Analysis. 24(3): 189-206.

Holdenrieder, O.; Pautasso, M.; Weisberg, P. J.; Lonsdale, D. 2004. Tree diseases and landscape processes: the challenge of landscape pathology. Trends in Ecology & Evolution. 19(8): 446-452.

Laffan, S.W. 2006. Assessing regional scale weed distributions, with an Australian example using *Nassella trichotoma*. Weed Research. 46(3):194-206.

Louisiana Department of Agriculture and Forestry. 2011. Louisiana Forest Health Highlights 2010. http://fhm.fs.fed.us/fhh/fhh_10/la_fhh_10.pdf [Date accessed: July 22, 2011]

Mack, R. N.; Simberloff, D.; Lonsdale, W. M. [and others]. 2000. Biotic invasions: Causes, epidemiology, global consequences, and control. Ecological Applications. 10(3): 689-710.

Nowacki, G.; Brock, T. 1995. Ecoregions and Subregions of Alaska, EcoMap Version 2.0. Juneau, AK: U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Alaska Region. Map, presentation scale 1:5,000,000; colored.

Smith, W.B.; Miles, P.D.; Perry, Charles H.; Pugh, S.A. 2009. Forest resources of the United States, 2007. Gen. Tech. Rep. WO-78. St. Paul, MN: U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Washington Office. 336 p.

United States Department of Agriculture Forest Service. 2008. National forest type data development. http://svinetfc4.fs.fed.us/rastergateway/forest_type/. [Date accessed: May 13, 2008].

White, D.; Kimerling, A. J.; Overton, W. S. 1992. Cartographic and geometric components of a global sampling design for environmental monitoring. Cartography and Geographic Information Systems. 19(1):5-22.

Chapter 3. Large-Scale Patterns of Forest Fire Occurrence in the Conterminous United States and Alaska, 2010

Kevin M. Potter

Introduction

Free-burning fire has been a constant ecological presence on the American landscape, the expression of which has changed as new climates, peoples and land uses have become predominant (Pyne 2010). It is an important ecological mechanism that shapes the distributions of species, maintains the structure and function of fire-prone communities, and is a significant evolutionary force (Bond and Keeley 2005).

At the same time, fire outside the historic range of frequency and intensity can have extensive economic and ecological impacts. As a result of intense suppression efforts during most of the 20th century, the number of acres burned annually decreased from approximately 16-20 million hectares (40-50 million acres) in the early 1930s to about 2 million hectares (5 million acres) in the 1970s (Vinton 2004). In some regions, plant communities are undergoing rapid compositional and structural changes as a result of fire suppression (Nowacki and Abrams 2008). At the same time, fires have become larger, more intense, and more damaging because of the accumulation of fuels (Pyne 2010). Current fire regimes on more than half of the forested area in the conterminous United States have been either moderately or significantly altered from historical regimes, potentially altering key ecosystem components such as species composition, structural stage, stand age, canopy closure, and fuel loadings (Schmidt and others 2002).

Fire suppression and the introduction of nonnative plants, in particular, have dramatically altered fire regimes (Barbour and others 1999). Additionally, fire regimes altered by global climate change could cause large-scale shifts in vegetation spatial patterns (McKenzie and others 1996).

Quantifying and monitoring broad-scale patterns of fire occurrence across the United States can help provide a fuller understanding of the ecological and economic impacts of fire, and of the appropriate management and prescribed use of fire. Specifically, large-scale assessments of fire occurrence can help identify areas where specific management activities may be useful, or where research into the ecological and socioeconomic impacts of fires may be necessary.

Methods

Annual monitoring and reporting of active wildland fire events using the Moderate Resolution Imaging Spectroradiometer (MODIS) Active Fire Detections for the United States database (United States Department of Agriculture, Forest Service 2011) allows analysts to spatially display and summarize ***fire occurrences*** (Coulston and others 2005, Potter [In press]a, Potter [in press]b, Potter [in press]c). These are defined as the satellite detection of wildland fire in a 1-km^2 pixel for one day, in a given year across the United States. The data are derived using the MODLand Rapid Response algorithm from the thermal infrared bands of imagery collected daily by two satellites at a resolution of 1 km^2, with the center of a pixel recorded as a fire occurrence when the satellites' MODIS sensors identify the presence of a fire at the time of image collection (U.S. Department of Agriculture Forest Service 2008). The data represent only whether a fire was active, because the MODIS sensors do not differentiate between a hot fire in a relatively small area (0.01 km^2, for example) and a cooler fire over a larger area (1 km^2, for example). The MODIS Active Fire database does well at capturing large fires, but may under-represent rapidly burning, small and low-intensity fires, as well as fires in areas with frequent cloud cover (Hawbaker and others 2008).

The number of fire occurrences per 100 km^2 (10,000 hectares) of forested area was determined for each ecoregion section in the conterminous 48 States (Cleland and others 2007) and Alaska (Nowacki and Brock 1995) for 2010. This was done after screening out wildland fires on non-forested pixels using a forest cover layer derived from MODIS imagery by the U.S. Forest Service Remote Sensing Applications Center (United States Department of Agriculture Forest Service 2008). The total number of fire occurrences across the conterminous States and Alaska was also calculated.

This same approach was used to calculate the mean number of annual fire occurrences, per 100 km^2 (10,000 hectares) of forested area, by ecoregion section for the first 10 full years of MODIS Active Fire data collection (2001-2010).

Additionally, a Getis-Ord hot spot analysis (Getis and Ord 1992) in ArcMap 9.2 (ESRI 2006) was employed to identify forested areas in the conterminous 48 States with greater fire occurrence than expected by chance in 2010. The spatial units of analysis were cells of approximately 2,500 km^2 from a hexagonal lattice of the conterminous United States, intensified from Environmental Monitoring and Assessment Program (EMAP) North America hexagon coordinates (White and others 1992). This cell size allows for analysis at a medium-scale resolution of approximately the same area as a typical county. Fire occurrence values for each hexagon were quantified as the number of forest fire occurrences per 100 km^2 of forested area within the hexagon.

The Getis-Ord G_i* statistic was used to identify clusters of hexagonal cells with fire occurrence values higher than expected by chance. This statistic allows for the decomposition of a global measure of spatial association into its contributing factors, by location, and is therefore particularly suitable for detecting non-stationarities in a data set, such as when spatial clustering is concentrated in one subregion of the data (Anselin 1992).

Briefly, G_i* sums the differences between the mean values in a local sample, determined in this case by a moving window of each hexagon and the six neighboring hexagons, and the global mean of all the forested hexagonal cells in the conterminous 48 states. G_i* is standardized as a z score with a mean of 0 and a standard deviation of 1, with values greater than 1.96 representing significant local clustering of high numbers of fire occurrences ($p < 0.025$) and values less than -1.96 representing significant clustering of low numbers of fire occurrences ($p < 0.025$), since 95 percent of the observations under a normal distribution should be within approximately 2 standard deviations of the mean (Laffan 2006). Values between -1.96 and 1.96 have no statistically significant concentration of high or low values; a hexagon and its six neighbors, in other words, have a range of both high and low numbers of fire occurrences per 100 km^2 of forested area. It is worth noting that the threshold values are not exact because the correlation of spatial data violates the assumption of independence required for statistical significance (Laffan 2006). The Getis-Ord approach does not require that the input data be normally distributed because the local G_i* values are computed under a randomization assumption, with G_i* equating to a standardized z score that asymptotically tends to a normal distribution (Anselin 1992). The z scores are reliable, even with skewed data, as long as the distance band is large enough to include several neighbors for each feature (ESRI 2006).

Results and Discussion

The MODIS Active Fire database captured 53,309 wildland forest fire occurrences across the conterminous United States in 2010, the fewest annual number since 2006 and approximately 30 percent fewer than in 2009 (76,611) (fig. 3.1). It is still greater, however, than the 48,862 mean annual forest fire occurrences over the 10 years since the first full year of MODIS data was collected in 2001. The database captured 2,946 fire occurrences in Alaska in 2010, only about 9 percent of the 33,331 captured the previous year and many fewer than the 10-year annual mean of 14,736.

The decrease in total number of fire occurrences across both regions is consistent with the official wildland fire statistics, which show a 42 percent decrease in the overall area burned nationally between 2009 (2,397,484 hectares) and 2010 (1,385,127 ha) (National Interagency Coordination Center 2011).

In 2010, the Utah High Plateau (M341C) in Utah and the Palouse Prairie (331A) in Idaho had the greatest number of wildland forest fire occurrences among highly forested ecoregions (10.8 and 10.6 per 100 km^2 of forest, respectively) (fig. 3.2). Two regions neighboring each other in Florida also had a relatively high frequency of fire occurrences: the Florida Coastal Lowlands-Gulf (232D) and the Florida Lowlands-Atlantic (232G), with 8.1 and 8.3 fires per 100 km^2 of forest.



Figure 3.1 – Forest fire occurrences detected by MODIS from 2001 to 2010, for the conterminous United States, Alaska, and the two regions combined. (Data source: U.S. Department of Agriculture Forest Service, Remote Sensing Application Center.)



Figure 3.2 – The number of forest fire occurrences, per 100 km^2 (10,000 hectares) of forested area, by ecoregion section within the conterminous 48 states, for 2010. Forest cover is derived from MODIS imagery by the U.S. Forest Service Remote Sensing Applications Center. (Source of fire data: U.S. Department of Agriculture Forest Service, Remote Sensing Application Center.)

Several other regions in the Southeast that had moderately high forest fire density in 2010 included the Arkansas Valley of Oklahoma and Arkansas (231G), the Coastal Plains and Flatwoods-Western Gulf (232F) of Texas and Louisiana, the Gulf Coastal Plains and Flatwoods (232B), and the Southern Atlantic Coastal Plains and Flatwoods (232J). Other than the two regions mentioned above, none experienced more than 4.5 fires per 100 km^2 of forest.

In Alaska, the ecoregion section with the most fire occurrences, the Yukon Flats (139A), recorded only 5.7 per 100 km^2 of forest (fig.3.3). All other Alaska ecoregion sections experienced fewer than 1.5 fires for the same amount of area.

Contrasting such short-term patterns of fire occurrence with longer-term trends is possible by comparing these results to the first 10 full years of MODIS Active Fire data collection (2001-2010). For the conterminous States, definitive geographic patterns are apparent in the frequency of fire occurrences over the last decade (fig. 3.4). Heavily forested areas that have experienced the most fires, on average, are located near the California coast and in central Idaho. Specifically, the Southern California Mountain and Valley (M262B) and Central California Coast (261A) had the most fires per year per 100 km^2 of forest with, respectively, 11.2 and 10.9. Next was the Central California Coast Ranges (M262A) with 6.5, and the Southern California Coast (261B) and the Idaho Batholith (M332A) with 6.2 each. Areas with moderate mean numbers of annual fire occurrence include the Southeastern Coastal Plain and Florida; the southern Plains States; the mountainous regions of Arizona and New Mexico; the Rocky Mountains of northern Idaho, eastern Washington and Oregon, and northwestern Montana; the Sierra Nevada of California; northwestern California and southwestern Oregon; and the Northern Cascades of Washington (fig. 3.4).

In Alaska, the highest number of forest fires per year from 2001 to 2010 occurred in the east-central and central parts of the State (fig. 3.5), in the Yukon Flats (139A), with an average of 8.3 fires per 100 km^2 of forest per year, and Ray Mountains (M139A), with 6.6 fires per year. Three other ecoregions each had an average of 3 to 5 fires per year per 100 km^2 of forested area: the Olgivie Mountains (M139B), the Dawson Range (M139C), and the Yukon Bottomlands (131A).

While summarizing fire occurrence data at the ecoregion scale allows for a comparison of fire severity over time in an area, a geographical hot spot analysis can offer insights into where fire occurrences are concentrated during a given length of time. In 2010, geographical hot spots of fire occurrence within the conterminous States were limited to several fairly large hot spots in the Southeastern Coastal Plain, four small hot spots in the central part of the country, and a handful of small hot spots across the West (fig. 3.6). This pattern of mostly small and mostly low-intensity hot spots scattered widely across the country suggests, as in 2009 (Potter [in press]c), that wildland forest fires in 2010 were relatively evenly distributed across the conterminous States, with slightly higher concentrations in a few areas.

The most intense fire hot spot was small, occurring in three ecoregions of eastern Oregon: the Blue Mountains (M332G), the Northwestern Basin and Range (342B), and the Blue Mountain Foothills (342H) (fig. 3.6). A moderately intense, but large, hot spot was detected in Georgia, Alabama and Florida, centered on the Gulf Coastal Plains and Flatwoods (232B) and the Southern Atlantic Coastal Plains and Flatwoods (232J).



Figure 3.3 – The number of forest fire occurrences, per 100 km^2 (10,000 hectares) of forested area, by ecoregion section within Alaska, for 2010. Forest cover is derived from MODIS imagery by the U.S. Forest Service Remote Sensing Applications Center. (Source of fire data: U.S. Department of Agriculture Forest Service, Remote Sensing Application Center.)



Figure 3.4 – Mean number of forest fire occurrences, per 100 km^2 (10,000 hectares) of forested area from 2001 to 2010, by ecoregion section within the conterminous 48 states, for 2010. Forest cover is derived from MODIS imagery by the U.S. Forest Service Remote Sensing Applications Center. (Source of fire data: U.S. Department of Agriculture Forest Service, Remote Sensing Application Center.)



Figure 3.5 – Mean number of forest fire occurrences, per 100 km^2 (10,000 hectares) of forested area for 2001 to 2010, by ecoregion section within Alaska, for 2010. Forest cover is derived from MODIS imagery by the U.S. Forest Service Remote Sensing Applications Center. (Source of fire data: U.S. Department of Agriculture Forest Service, Remote Sensing Application Center).



Figure 3.6 – Hotspots of fire occurrence across the conterminous United States for 2010. Values are Getis-Ord G_i* scores, with values greater than 2 representing significant clustering of high numbers of fire occurrences. (No areas of significant clustering of low numbers of fire occurrences, -2, were detected). Background forest cover is derived from MODIS imagery by the U.S. Forest Service Remote Sensing Applications Center. (Source of fire data: U.S. Department of Agriculture Forest Service, Remote Sensing Application Center.)

Other low-intensity geographic hot spots of fire occurrence were detected in the following ecoregions:

- the Florida Coastal Lowlands-Atlantic (232G), Florida Coastal Lowlands-Gulf (232D), Florida Coastal Plains Central Highlands (232K), and Everglades (411A) of southern Florida.
- the Atlantic Coastal Flatwoods (232C) of South Carolina.
- the Coastal-Plains and Flatwoods-Western Gulf (232F) of Louisiana and east Texas, and the Atchafalaya and Red River Alluvial Plains (224C) of Louisiana.
- the White and Black Alluvial Plains (234D) and Coastal Plains-Loess (231H) of southeastern Missouri, western Kentucky and Tennessee, and northeastern Arkansas.
- the Cross Timbers and Prairie (255A), Osage Plains (251E), and Flint Hills (251F) of northeastern Oklahoma and southeastern Kansas.
- the White Mountains-San Francisco Peaks-Mongollon Rim (M313A) and Tonto Transition (313C) of central Arizona.
- the Utah High Plateau (M341C) and Bonneville Basin (341A) of southwestern Utah.
- the Bitterroot Mountains (M333D), Okanogan Highland (M333A), and Palouse Prairie (331A) of northern Idaho.
- the Sierra Nevada (M261E), Sierra Nevada Foothills (M261F), Mono (341D), and Southeastern Great Basin (341F) of east-central California.

The results of these geographic analyses are intended to offer insights into where fire occurrences have been concentrated, but are not intended to quantify the severity of a given fire season. Information about the concentration of fire occurrences may be useful for the identification of areas for management activities and for follow-up investigations related to the ecological and socioeconomic impacts of fires that may be outside the range of historic frequency.

Literature Cited

Anselin, L. 1992. Spatial Data Analysis with GIS: An Introduction to Application in the Social Sciences. Technical Report 92-10. Santa Barbara, California: National Center for Geographic Information and Analysis. 53 pp.

Barbour, M.G.; Burk, J.H.; Pitts, W.D. [and others]. 1999. Terrestrial Plant Ecology. Menlo Park, California: Addison Wesley Longman, Inc. 649 p.

Bond, W.J.; Keeley, J.E. 2005. Fire as a global 'herbivore': The ecology and evolution of flammable ecosystems. Trends in Ecology & Evolution. 20(7):387-394.

Cleland, D.T.; Freeouf, J. A., Keys, J.E., Jr. [and others]. 2007. Ecological Subregions: Sections and subsections for the conterminous United States. (A.M. Sloan, technical editor). Gen. Tech. Report WO-76. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service. Map, presentation scale 1:3,500,000; Albers equal area projection; colored. Also as a GIS coverage in ArcINFO format on CD-ROM or at http://fsgeodata.fs.fed.us/other_resources/ecosubregions.html [Date accessed: March 18, 2011].

Coulston, J.W.; Ambrose, M.J.; Riitters, K.H.; Conkling, B.L. 2005. Forest Health Monitoring 2004 national technical report. General Technical Report SRS-90. Asheville, North Carolina: United States Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Southern Research Station. 81 p.

ESRI. 2006. ArcMap 9.2. Redlands, California: Environmental Systems Research Institute Inc.

Getis, A.; Ord, J.K. 1992. The analysis of spatial association by use of distance statistics. Geographical Analysis. 24(3):189-206.

Hawbaker, T.J.; Radeloff, V.C.; Syphard, A.D. [and others]. 2008. Detection rates of the MODIS active fire product. Remote Sensing of Environment. 112: 2656-2664.

Laffan, S.W. 2006. Assessing regional scale weed distributions, with an Australian example using *Nassella trichotoma*. Weed Research. 46(3):194-206.

McKenzie, D.; Peterson, D.L.; Alvarado, E. 1996. Predicting the effect of fire on large-scale vegetation patterns in North America. Research Paper PNW-RP-489. United States Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Pacific Northwest Research Station. 38 p.

National Interagency Coordination Center. 2011. Wildland Fire Summary and Statistics Annual Report: 2010. [Online]. http://www.predictiveservices.nifc.gov/intelligence/2010_statssumm/intro_summary.pdf. [Date accessed: May 26, 2011].

Nowacki, G.J.; Abrams, M.D. 2008. The demise of fire and "mesophication" of forests in the eastern United States. BioScience. 58(2):123-138.

Nowacki, G.; Brock, T. 1995. Ecoregions and Subregions of Alaska, EcoMap Version 2.0. Juneau, AK: U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Alaska Region. Map, presentation scale 1:5,000,000; colored.

Potter, K.M. [In press]a. Large-scale patterns of forest fire occurrence in the conterminous United States and Alaska, 2005-07. In: Potter, K. M.; Conkling, B. L., ed. Forest Health Monitoring 2008 National Technical Report. Asheville, North Carolina: U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Southern Research Station.

Potter, K.M. [In press]b. Large-scale patterns of forest fire occurrence in the conterminous United States and Alaska, 2001-08. In: Potter, K. M.; Conkling, B. L., ed. Forest Health Monitoring 2009 National Technical Report. Asheville, North Carolina: U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Southern Research Station.

Potter, K.M. [In press]c. Large-scale patterns of forest fire occurrence in the conterminous United States and Alaska, 2009. In: Potter, K. M.; Conkling, B. L., ed. Forest Health Monitoring 2010 National Technical Report. Asheville, North Carolina: U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Southern Research Station.

Pyne, S.J. 2010. America's Fires: A Historical Context for Policy and Practice. Durham, North Carolina: Forest History Society. 91 p.

Schmidt, K.M.; Menakis, J.P.; Hardy, C.C. [and others]. 2002. Development of coarse-scale spatial data for wildland fire and fuel management. General Technical Report RMRS-GTR-87. Fort Collins, Colorado: United States Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Rocky Mountain Research Station. 41 p.

United States Department of Agriculture Forest Service. 2008. National forest type data development. [Online]. http://svinetfc4.fs.fed.us/rastergateway/forest_type/. [Date accessed: May 13, 2008].

United States Department of Agriculture Forest Service. 2011. MODIS Active Fire Mapping Program: Continental United States Fire Detection GIS Data. [Online]. http://activefiremaps.fs.fed.us/gisdata.php. [Date accessed: March 18, 2011].

Vinton, J.V., ed. 2004. Wildfires: Issues and Consequences. Hauppauge, New York: Nova Science Publishers, Inc. 127 p.

White, D.; Kimerling, A.J.; Overton, W.S. 1992. Cartographic and geometric components of a global sampling design for environmental monitoring. Cartography and Geographic Information Systems. 19(1):5-22.

Chapter 4. Recent Drought Conditions in the Conterminous United States

Frank H. Koch, William D. Smith and John W. Coulston

Introduction

Droughts are common in virtually all U.S. forests, but their frequency and intensity vary widely both between and within forest ecosystems (Hanson and Weltzin 2000). Forests in the Western United States generally exhibit a pattern of annual seasonal droughts. Forests in the Eastern United States tend to exhibit one of two prevailing patterns: random occasional droughts, typical of the Appalachian Mountains and the Northeast, or frequent late-summer droughts, typical of the Southeastern Coastal Plain and the eastern edge of the Great Plains (Hanson and Weltzin 2000). For plants, a reduction in basic growth processes (i.e., cell division and enlargement) is the most immediate response to drought; photosynthesis, which is less sensitive than these basic processes, decreases slowly at low levels of drought stress, but begins to decrease more sharply when the stress becomes moderate to severe (Kareiva and others 1993, Mattson and Haack 1987). Drought makes some forests more susceptible to infestations of tree-damaging insects and diseases (Clinton and others 1993, Mattson and Haack 1987). Furthermore, drought may increase wildland fire risk by impeding decomposition of organic matter and reducing the moisture content of downed woody materials and other potential fire fuels (Clark 1989, Keetch and Byram 1968, Schoennagel and others 2004).

Notably, forests appear to be relatively resistant to short-term drought conditions (Archaux and Wolters 2006), although individual tree species differ in their responses (Hinckley and others 1979, McDowell and others 2008). The duration of a drought event is arguably more significant than its intensity (Archaux and Wolters 2006); for example, multiple consecutive years of drought (2-5 years) are more likely to result in high tree mortality than a single dry year (Guarín and Taylor 2005, Millar and others 2007). This suggests that a comprehensive characterization of drought impact in forested areas should include analysis of moisture conditions in the United States over relatively long (i.e., multi-year) time windows.

In the 2010 FHM National Technical Report, we outlined a new methodology for mapping drought conditions across the conterminous United States (Koch and others, in press-c). As in previous work related to this topic (Koch and others, in press-a,b), a primary objective of this new methodology was to provide forest managers and researchers with drought-related spatial data sets that are finer-scale than products available from, for example, the National Climatic Data Center (2007) or the U.S. Drought Monitor program (Svoboda and others 2002). The primary inputs are gridded climate data (i.e., monthly raster maps of precipitation and temperature over a 100-year period) created with the Parameter-elevation Regression on Independent Slopes (PRISM) climate mapping system (Daly and others 2002). A pivotal aspect of our new methodology is a standardized drought indexing approach that allows us to directly compare, for any given location of interest, its moisture status during different time windows, regardless of their length. For example, the 2010 National Technical Report includes a comparison of national drought maps for 2009, the three-year window 2007-2009, and the five-year window 2005-2009 (Koch and others, in press-c).

One of our main goals for the current analysis was to apply the methodology devised for the 2010 National Technical Report to the most recently available climate data (i.e., the monthly PRISM data through 2010), thus providing a second time step in what we anticipate to be an ongoing annual record of drought status across the conterminous United States from 2009 forward. In addition, we performed a separate national-scale analysis in which we mapped, for the 100-year period from 1911 to 2010, the frequency of two, three, four, and five consecutive years of moderate to extreme drought conditions during the late spring-early summer "season". We focused on this late spring-early summer period because it is a time of peak emergence for certain adult forest insect pests such as the emerald ash borer, *Agrilus planipennis* (Anulewicz and others 2008, Poland and McCullough 2006). Trees that experience acute drought stress during this period may be especially attractive hosts for the newly emerged adults and also more vulnerable to attack, promoting the likelihood of pest outbreaks (Guarín and Taylor 2005, Mattson and Haack 1987). Our interest in consecutive-year frequencies was driven by the idea that any geographic area where this late spring-early summer drought pattern tends to be repeated from year to year faces an even higher outbreak risk, and so should be prioritized for pest surveillance or other management activities.

Methods

At the time when we performed these analyses, monthly PRISM grids for total precipitation, mean daily minimum temperature, and mean daily maximum temperature were available from the PRISM group web site (PRISM Group 2010) for all years from 1895 to 2010. Each gridded data set covered the entire conterminous United States. The spatial resolution of these input grids was approximately 4 km (cell area = 16 km^2). However, for the purpose of future applications and better compatibility with other spatial data sets, all output grids were resampled to a spatial resolution of approximately 2 km (cell area = 4 km^2) using a nearest neighbor approach.

Potential Evapotranspiration (PET) Maps

As in our previous work on drought (Koch and others, in press-a,b), we adopted an approach in which a moisture index value for each location of interest (i.e., each grid cell in a map of the conterminous United States) was calculated based on both precipitation and potential evapotranspiration values for that location during the time period of interest. Potential evapotranspiration measures the loss of soil moisture through plant uptake and transpiration (Akin 1991). It does not measure actual moisture loss, but rather the loss that would occur under ideal conditions (i.e., if there was no possible shortage of moisture for plants to transpire) (Akin 1991, Thornthwaite 1948). The inclusion of both precipitation and potential evapotranspiration provides a fuller accounting of a location's water balance than precipitation alone.

To complement the available PRISM monthly precipitation grids, we computed corresponding monthly potential evapotranspiration (*PET*) grids using the Thornthwaite formula (Akin 1991, Thornthwaite 1948):

[1] $$PET_m = 1.6 L_{l\,m} (10 \frac{T_m}{I})^a$$

where
PET_m = the potential evapotranspiration for a given month m in cm
L_{lm} = a correction factor for the mean possible duration of sunlight during month m for all locations (i.e., grid cells) at a particular latitude l [see Table V in Thornthwaite (1948) for a list of L correction factors by month and latitude]
T_m = the mean temperature for month m in degrees C
I = an annual heat index, calculated as $I = \sum_{m=1}^{12} \left(\frac{T_m}{5} \right)^{1.514}$, where T_m is the mean temperature for each month m of the year
a = an exponent calculated as $a = 6.75 \times 10^{-7} I^3 - 7.71 \times 10^{-5} I^2 + 1.792 \times 10^{-2} I + 0.49239$ [see Appendix I in Thornthwaite (1948) regarding the empirical derivation of a]

To implement Equation 1 spatially, we created a grid of latitude values for determining the L adjustment for any given grid cell (and any given month) in the conterminous United States. We calculated the mean monthly temperature grids as the mean of the corresponding PRISM daily minimum and maximum monthly temperature grids.

Moisture Index Maps

We used the precipitation (*P*) and *PET* grids to generate baseline moisture index grids for the past 100 years (i.e., 1911-2010) for the conterminous United States. We used a moisture index, *MI'*, proposed by Willmott and Feddema (1992), which has the following form:

[2] $$MI' = \begin{cases} P/PET - 1 & , \quad P < PET \\ 1 - PET/P & , \quad P \geq PET \\ 0 & , \quad P = PET = 0 \end{cases}$$

where
P = precipitation
PET = potential evapotranspiration
(P and PET must be in equivalent measurement units, e.g., mm)

This set of equations yields a dimensionless index scaled between -1 and 1. MI' can be calculated for any time period, but is commonly calculated on an annual basis using summed P and PET values (Willmott and Feddema 1992). An alternative to this summation approach is to calculate MI' from monthly precipitation and potential evapotranspiration values and then, for a given time window of interest, calculate its moisture index as the mean of the MI' values for all months in the window. This "mean-of-months" approach limits the ability of short-term peaks in either precipitation or potential evapotranspiration to negate corresponding short-term deficits, as would happen under a summation approach.

For each year in our study period (i.e., 1911-2010), we used the mean-of-months approach to calculate moisture index grids for three different time windows: one year (MI_1'), three years (MI_3'), and five years (MI_5'). Briefly, the MI_1' grids are the mean of the twelve monthly MI' grids for each year in the study period, the MI_3' grids are the mean of the 36 monthly grids from January two years prior through December of each year, and the MI_5' grids are the mean of the 60 consecutive monthly MI' grids from January four years prior to December of each year. For example, the MI_1' grid for the year 2010 is the mean of the monthly MI' grids from January to December 2010, while the MI_3' grid is the mean of grids from January 2008 to December 2010 and the MI_5' grid is the mean of the grids from January 2006 to December 2010.

Annual and Multi-Year Drought Maps

To determine degree of departure from typical moisture conditions, we first created a normal grid, $MI'_{i\,norm}$, for each of our three time windows, representing the mean of the 100 corresponding moisture index grids (i.e., the MI_1', MI_3', or MI_5' grids, depending on the window; see fig. 4.1). We also created a standard deviation grid, $MI'_{i\,SD}$, for each time window, calculated from the window's 100 individual moisture index grids as well as its $MI'_{i\,norm}$ grid. We subsequently calculated moisture difference z-scores, MDZ_j, for each time window using these gridded data sets:

[3] $$MDZ_{ij} = \frac{MI_i' - MI_{i\,norm}'}{MI_{i\,SD}'}$$

where
i = the analytical time window (i.e., 1, 3, or 5 years) and j = a particular target year in our 100-year study period (i.e., 1911-2010).

MDZ scores may be classified in terms of degree of moisture deficit or surplus (table 4.1). The classification scheme includes categories (e.g., severe drought, extreme drought) like those associated with the Palmer Drought Severity Index (PDSI) (Palmer 1965). Importantly, because of the standardization in Equation 3, the breakpoints between categories remain the same regardless of the size of the time window of interest. For comparative analysis, we generated classified *MDZ* maps, based on all three time windows, for the target year 2010 (figs. 4.2, 4.3, and 4.4). Because our analysis focused on drought (i.e., moisture deficit) conditions, we combined the four moisture surplus categories from table 4.1 into a single category for map display.

Table 4.1 – Moisture difference z-score (*MDZ*) value ranges for nine wetness and drought categories, along with each category's approximate theoretical frequency of occurrence.

MDZ Score	Category	Frequency
<-2	Extreme drought	2.3%
-2 to -1.5	Severe drought	4.4%
-1.5 to -1	Moderate drought	9.2%
-1 to -0.5	Mild drought	15%
-0.5 to 0.5	Near normal conditions	38.2%
0.5 to 1	Mild moisture surplus	15%
1 to 1.5	Moderate moisture surplus	9.2%
1.5 to 2	Severe moisture surplus	4.4%
> 2	Extreme moisture surplus	2.3%



Figure 4.1 – The 100-year (1911-2010) mean annual moisture index, or MI_1', for the conterminous United States. Ecoregion section (Cleland and others 2007) boundaries and labels are included for reference. Forest cover data (overlaid green hatching) derived from Moderate Resolution Imaging Spectroradiometer (MODIS) imagery by the U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Remote Sensing Applications Center. Data source: PRISM Group, Oregon State University.



Figure 4.2 - The 2010 annual (i.e., one-year) moisture difference z-score, or *MDZ*, for the conterminous United States. Ecoregion section (Cleland and others 2007) boundaries and labels are included for reference. Forest cover data (overlaid green hatching) derived from MODIS imagery by the U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Remote Sensing Applications Center. Data source: PRISM Group, Oregon State University.



Figure 4.3 - The 2008-2010 (i.e., three-year) moisture difference z-score, or *MDZ*, for the conterminous United States. Ecoregion section (Cleland and others 2007) boundaries are included for reference. Forest cover data (overlaid green hatching) derived from MODIS imagery by the U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Remote Sensing Applications Center. Data source: PRISM Group, Oregon State University.



Figure 4.4 - The 2006-2010 (i.e., five-year) moisture difference z-score, or *MDZ*, for the conterminous United States. Ecoregion section (Cleland and others 2007) boundaries are included for reference. Forest cover data (overlaid green hatching) derived from MODIS imagery by the U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Remote Sensing Applications Center. Data source: PRISM Group, Oregon State University.

Frequency of Consecutive Years of Late Spring-Early Summer Drought

As opposed to the mean-of-months approach used in the previously described analyses, for the late spring-early summer drought analysis we calculated MI' (Eq. 2) based on the total P and PET values summed over a three-month period. Notably, late spring-early summer represents a different time window depending on geographic location within the conterminous United States (i.e., depending on latitude, elevation, and climatic regime). Hence, we actually calculated nationwide MI' grids for three different three-month windows during each year of our 1911-2010 study period: March-May, April-June, and May-July. For each of these three-month windows, we next calculated distinct MI'_{norm} and MI'_{SD} grids based on the window's 100 individual MI' grids calculated for each year of our study period. We then applied Equation 3 to generate distinct MDZ grids for each window in each year. (In this context, the index i in Equation 3 should be interpreted as corresponding to one of the three-month windows rather than the 1-, 3-, or 5-year windows discussed previously.)

To combine the March-May, April-June, and May-July MDZ grids for each year into a single nationwide grid depicting late spring-early summer moisture conditions, we first subset them using spatial data related to frost-free period. These data served to represent the approximate beginning of spring and the growing season. Briefly, we divided the conterminous United States into three geographic regions (fig. 4.5) based on the 30-year mean Julian date of the last spring freeze: Zone 1, including all areas with a mean Julian date ≤ 90 (i.e., last freeze prior to April 1); Zone 2, all areas with a mean Julian date between 90 and 120 (i.e., last freeze between April 1 and April 30); and Zone 3, all areas with a mean Julian date > 120 (i.e., last freeze after April 30). Next, we matched each three-month window to the most appropriate zone (fig. 4.5), and then clipped the corresponding MDZ grid to the zonal boundaries. Finally, we mosaiced these clipped grids into a single late spring-early summer grid covering the conterminous United States.

To estimate consecutive-year drought frequencies, we began by generating a binary grid from each late spring-early summer grid, assigning all grid cells with MDZ values less than -1 (i.e., exhibiting moderate to extreme drought stress) a value of 1 and all other cells a value of 0. We stacked the 100 resulting binary grids in annual order (i.e., from 1911 to 2010), creating a geographically referenced, three-dimensional array; conceptually, each geographic location (i.e., each grid cell in a map of the conterminous United States) was represented by a vector, V, containing 100 temporally ordered elements (indexed by $x = 1\ldots100$) with a value of 0 or 1. We analyzed each vector V element-by-element to tally the following frequencies (fig. 4.6): (1) the number of times that V_x and V_{x-1} were both equal to 1, indicating two consecutive years of moderate to extreme drought during the late spring-early summer season; (2) the number of times that V_x, V_{x-1}, and V_{x-2} were all equal to 1, indicating three consecutive years of moderate to extreme drought); (3) the number that of times that V_x, V_{x-1}, V_{x-2}, and V_{x-3} were all equal to 1, indicating four consecutive years of moderate to extreme drought; and (4) the number of times that V_x, V_{x-1}, V_{x-2}, V_{x-3}, V_{x-4} were all equal to 1, indicating five consecutive years of moderate to extreme drought during the late spring-early summer.

Results and Discussion

The 100-year (1911-2010) mean annual moisture index, or MI_1', grid (fig. 4.1) provides a general illustration of climatic regimes across the conterminous United States. (Because the 100-year mean MI_3' and MI_5' grids were only negligibly different from the mean MI_1' grid, they are not shown here.) In general, wet climates ($MI' > 0$) are characteristic through the Eastern United States, especially the Northeast. Notably, it appears that southern Florida, in particular ecoregion sections 232C – Florida Coastal Lowlands-Atlantic, 232D – Florida Coastal Lowlands-Gulf, and 411A – Everglades, is the driest region of the Eastern United States. Although this region typically has a high level of precipitation, this is more than offset by a high level of potential evapotranspiration, resulting in negative MI' values. This explanation for the relative dryness of southern Florida (i.e., high P offset by high PET) differs from the circumstances in the driest regions of the western United States, particularly the Southwest (e.g., sections 322A – Mojave Desert, 322B – Sonoran Desert, and 322C – Colorado Desert), where potential evapotranspiration is very high but precipitation levels are usually very low. In fact, dry climates ($MI' < 0$) are common across much of the Western United States because of generally lower precipitation than the East. However, mountainous areas in the central and northern Rocky Mountains as well as the Pacific Northwest are relatively wet, for example ecoregion sections M242A – Oregon and Washington Coast Ranges, M242B – Western Cascades, M331G – South-Central Highlands, and M333C – Northern Rockies. This is at least partially shaped by high levels of winter snowfall.



Figure 4.5 - Three analysis zones, each corresponding to a particular three-month time window used when calculating late spring-early summer drought conditions for the associated areas of the conterminous United States. Ecoregion section (Cleland and others 2007) boundaries and labels are included for reference. Zones were developed from data describing frost-free period. Data source: The Climate Source, LLC, Corvallis, Oregon.

Figure 4.2 shows the annual (i.e., one-year) *MDZ* map for 2010 for the conterminous United States. Most of the Western United States experienced a moisture surplus in 2010, although there were scattered pockets of moderate to extreme drought, largely limited to ecoregion sections (Cleland and others 2007) in the Rocky Mountain region such as M331B – Bighorn Mountains, M331F – Southern Parks and Rocky Mountain Range, M331G – South Central Highlands, and M331I – Northern Parks and Ranges (as well as the southeastern tip of 313D – Painted Desert, an area that is largely unforested). This pattern of general moisture surplus in the West is a significant departure from a trend of intense and prolonged region-wide drought during most of the last decade (Groisman and Knight 2008, Mueller and others 2005, National Climatic Data Center 2010, 2011, O'Driscoll 2007). In contrast, there were fairly extensive areas of drought in the Eastern United States during 2010. Two areas are particularly noteworthy. The first is a large "hotspot" of drought in the Southeastern United States along the central coast of the Gulf of Mexico. This hotspot is centered on the heavily forested sections 231E – Mid Coastal Plains-Western and 232F – Coastal Plains and Flatwoods-Western Gulf, each of which had large areas of severe to extreme drought during 2010. The adjacent (and less heavily forested) sections 232E – Louisiana Coastal Prairie and Marshes, 234A – Southern Mississippi Alluvial Plain, 234C – Atchafalaya and Red River Alluvial Plains, and 234E – Arkansas River Alluvial Plain also contained sizeable areas of severe drought. By way of an explanation, this geographic region had near-record dry conditions throughout the spring and summer of 2010, which was further amplified by record high summer temperatures (National Climatic Data Center 2011). These conditions have been linked to a marked increase in *Ips* bark beetle damage in this region, resulting in scattered mortality of thousands of trees and, occasionally, high mortality in individual forest stands (Louisiana Department of Agriculture and Forestry 2011). The second hotspot of note is the western Great Lakes region, particularly the heavily forested sections 212L – Northern Superior Uplands, 212R – Eastern Upper Peninsula, and 212S – Northern Upper Peninsula, all of which contained large areas of severe to extreme drought. This portion of the Great Lakes region experienced record dryness during the spring of 2010 ((National Climatic Data Center 2011).

Besides these two prominent drought hotspots, there were numerous pockets of drought distributed across the Eastern United States in 2010 (fig. 4.2). Foremost is a distinctive pattern of moderate to extreme drought along much of the Atlantic Coast, especially in the forested ecoregion sections 221A – Lower New England, 232A – Northern Atlantic Coastal Plain, 232C – Atlantic Coastal Flatwoods, 232H – Middle Atlantic Coastal Plains and Flatwoods, and 232I – Northern Atlantic Coastal Flatwoods. This pattern appears to have been influenced by hot, dry weather that occurred in the region from July to September 2010 (National Climatic Data Center 2011, National Drought Mitigation Center 2011).

When combined with the annual (i.e., single-year) *MDZ* map in figure 4.2, the three-year (fig. 4.3) and five-year (fig. 4.4) *MDZ* maps provide an overview of the recent chronology of moisture conditions in the conterminous United States. For instance, the persistent drought conditions that affected much of the Western United States, and especially the Desert Southwest region, during the last decade (Groisman and Knight 2008, Mueller and others 2005, National Climatic Data Center 2010, 2011, O'Driscoll 2007) are partially captured by the three-year and five-year *MDZ* maps. (Note also that these two maps contrast strongly with the annual *MDZ* map, which supports the notion that the observed pattern of moisture surplus throughout most of the West in 2010 represents a substantial departure from the region's recent history.) Additionally, the drought hotspot that appeared in the Great Lakes region during 2010 (see fig. 4.2) is also reflected in the three-year and five-year *MDZ* maps, suggesting that drought stress may be a persistent problem for forests in this region. This may similarly be true regarding the previously described hotspot on the central Gulf Coast. It is worth mentioning that in these geographic regions as well as others (e.g., central to southern Florida) the five-year *MDZ* map (fig. 4.4) appears to show more extensive and/or severe drought conditions than the three-year *MDZ* map (fig. 4.3). This discrepancy between maps may indicate temporally variable, yet fundamentally persistent, drought conditions in a region of interest, as is the case for the Western United States. However, it may instead be explained by the occurrence of markedly bad drought conditions at some point during the first two years of the five-year *MDZ* window (i.e., 2006-2007 for the current analysis). For example, a portion of the Southeastern United States (i.e., parts of sections 231I – Central Appalachian Piedmont, 232H – Middle Atlantic Coastal Plain and Flatwoods, and 232I – Northern Atlantic Coastal Plain and Flatwoods) showed substantially worse drought conditions in the five-year *MDZ* map than in the three-year map; a historically exceptional drought that occurred during 2007 (O'Driscoll 2007) is probably the major factor behind this difference. Thus, while the one-year, three-year, and five-year *MDZ* maps together provide a fairly comprehensive short-term overview, it may be additionally important to consider a particular region's longer-term drought history when evaluating the current health level of the region's forests.

With respect to the late spring-early summer drought frequency maps (fig. 4.6), no especially strong geographic pattern emerges, although some parts of the conterminous United States may benefit from further investigation. For example, figure 4.6A highlights a number of areas where two consecutive years of moderate or worse late spring-early summer drought occurred nine or more times between 1911 and 2010; because this represents a fairly large proportion of our 100-year study period, it seems reasonable to assume these highlighted areas face an elevated risk of outbreaks of certain forest pests. Two geographic regions contain the largest clusters of high-frequency areas and may therefore deserve additional attention: the south-central United States (particularly the forested ecoregion sections 223E – Interior Low Plateau-Highland Rim and 231B – Coastal Plains-Middle) and the western Great Lakes region (particularly the forested sections 212Q – North Central Wisconsin Uplands and 212X – Northern Highlands).

Despite lacking a strong pattern, the moderate level of spatial variability in the two-consecutive-year drought map suggests that it might serve well as an input to future pest risk mapping projects (i.e., as an additional discriminatory layer to complement data on host distribution, pathways of introduction, and the pest's environmental constraints). In contrast, perhaps the most important thing demonstrated by the three-, four- and five-consecutive-year drought maps (figs. 4.6B-4.6D) is that very little of the country is likely to see a protracted pattern of repeated late spring-early summer droughts. A few ecoregion sections did have small areas where there were multiple (i.e., five or more) occurrences of three consecutive years of late spring-early summer drought during our study period (fig. 4.6B), such as the aforementioned section 223E in the south-central United States, and in the West, sections 313A – Grand Canyon and M331G – South Central Highlands. However, less than eight percent of the conterminous United States saw four consecutive years of late spring-early summer occur at least once during our 100-year study period, and only 0.2 percent saw this happen more than twice. Furthermore, just over one percent of the country experienced five consecutive years of late spring-early summer drought at any point during the study period.

A similar set of consecutive-year frequency maps could be produced for any season deemed relevant to a particular forest health issue (e.g., to test drought-related hypotheses pertaining to the issue). In addition to this type of on-demand product, and assuming the spatial data (i.e., the high-resolution maps of precipitation and temperature) underlying these analyses continue to be available for public use, we expect to produce our one-year, three-year and five-year *MDZ* maps in the future as a standard component of national-scale forest health reporting. Nevertheless, it is important for users to interpret and compare the *MDZ* drought maps cautiously. Although the maps use a standardized index scale that applies regardless of the size of the time window, it should also be understood that, for instance, an extreme drought (i.e., where $MDZ < -2$) that persists over a five-year period has substantially different forest health implications than an extreme drought over a one-year period. In future work, we hope to provide forest managers and other decision makers with better quantitative evidence regarding some of these relationships between drought and forest health.



Figure 4.6 - (A) Over a 100-year period (1911-2010), the frequency of two consecutive years of moderate to extreme drought conditions during the late spring-early summer for the conterminous United States; (B) the frequency of three consecutive years of moderate to extreme drought during late-spring early summer; (C) the frequency of four consecutive years of moderate to extreme drought during late spring-early summer; (D) the frequency of five consecutive years of moderate to extreme drought during late spring-early summer. Ecoregion section (Cleland and others 2007) boundaries are included for reference. Data source: PRISM Group, Oregon State University.

Literature Cited

Akin, W. E. 1991. Global patterns: climate, vegetation, and soils. Norman, OK: University of Oklahoma Press. 370 p.

Anulewicz, A. C.; McCullough, D. G.; Cappaert, D. L.; Poland, T. M. 2008. Host range of the emerald ash borer (*Agrilus planipennis* Fairmaire) (Coleoptera: Buprestidae) in North America: results of multiple-choice field experiments. Environmental Entomology. 37(1): 230-241.

Archaux, F.; Wolters, V. 2006. Impact of summer drought on forest biodiversity: what do we know? Annals of Forest Science. 63: 645-652.

Clark, J. S. 1989. Effects of long-term water balances on fire regime, north-western Minnesota. Journal of Ecology. 77: 989-1004.

Cleland, D. T.; Freeouf, J. A.; Keys, J. E., Jr. [and others]. 2007. Ecological subregions: sections and subsections for the conterminous United States. (A.M. Sloan, technical editor.) Gen. Tech. Rep. WO-76. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service. Map, presentation scale 1:3,500,000; Albers equal area projection; colored. Also as a GIS coverage in ArcINFO format on CD-ROM or at http://fsgeodata.fs.fed.us/other_resources/ecosubregions.html [Date accessed: May 9, 2011].

Clinton, B. D.; Boring, L. R.; Swank, W. T. 1993. Canopy gap characteristics and drought influences in oak forests of the Coweeta Basin. Ecology. 74(5): 1551-1558.

Daly, C.; Gibson, W. P.; Taylor, G. H. [and others]. 2002. A knowledge-based approach to the statistical mapping of climate. Climate Research. 22: 99-113.

Groisman, P. Y.; Knight, R. W. 2008. Prolonged dry episodes over the conterminous United States: new tendencies emerging during the last 40 years. Journal of Climate. 21: 1850-1862.

Guarín, A.; Taylor, A. H. 2005. Drought triggered tree mortality in mixed conifer forests in Yosemite National Park, California, USA. Forest Ecology and Management. 218: 229-244.

Hanson, P. J.; Weltzin, J. F. 2000. Drought disturbance from climate change: response of United States forests. The cience of the Total Environment. 262: 205-220.

Hinckley, T. M.; Dougherty, P. M.; Lassoie, J. P. [and others]. 1979. A severe drought: impact on tree growth, phenology, net photosynthetic rate, and water relations. American Midland Naturalist. 102(2): 307-316.

Kareiva, P. M.; Kingsolver, J. G.; Huey, B. B., eds. 1993. Biotic interactions and global change. Sunderland, MA: Sinauer Associates, Inc. 559 p.

Keetch, J. J.; Byram, G. M. 1968. A drought index for forest fire control. Res. Pap. SE-38. Asheville, NC: U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Southeastern Forest Experiment Station. 33 p.

Koch, F. H.; Coulston, J. W.; Smith, W. D. In press-a. Chapter 4. High-resolution mapping of drought conditions. In: Potter, K. M.; Conkling, B. L., eds. Forest Health Monitoring 2008 National Technical Report. Asheville, NC: U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Southern Research Station.

Koch, F. H.; Coulston, J. W.; Smith, W. D. In press-b. Chapter 9. Mapping drought conditions using multi-year windows. In: Potter, K. M.; Conkling, B. L., eds. Forest Health Monitoring 2009 National Technical Report. Asheville, NC: U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Southern Research Station.

Koch, F. H.; Smith, W. D.; Coulston, J. W. In press-c. Chapter 6. An improved method for standardized mapping of drought conditions. In: Potter, K. M.; Conkling, B. L., eds. Forest Health Monitoring 2010 National Technical Report. Asheville, NC: U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Southern Research Station.

Louisiana Department of Agriculture and Forestry. 2011. Louisiana Forest Health Highlights 2010. http://fhm.fs.fed.us/fhh/fhh_10/la_fhh_10.pdf. [Date accessed: November 9, 2011].Mattson, W. J.; Haack, R. A. 1987. The role of drought in outbreaks of plant-eating insects. BioScience. 37(2): 110-118.

McDowell, N.; Pockman, W. T.; Allen, C. D. [and others]. 2008. Mechanisms of plant survival and mortality during drought: why do some plants survive while others succumb to drought? New Phytologist. 178: 719-739.

Millar, C. I.; Westfall, R. D.; Delany, D. L. 2007. Response of high-elevation limber pine (*Pinus flexilis*) to multiyear droughts and 20th-century warming, Sierra Nevada, California, USA. Canadian Journal of Forest Research. 37: 2508-2520.

Mueller, R. C.; Scudder, C. M.; Porter, M. E. [and others]. 2005. Differential tree mortality in response to severe drought: evidence for long-term vegetation shifts. Journal of Ecology. 93: 1085-1093.

National Climatic Data Center. 2007. Time bias corrected divisional temperature-precipitation-drought index. Documentation for dataset TD-9640. http://www1.ncdc.noaa.gov/pub/data/cirs/drought.README. [Date accessed: July 20, 2010].

National Climatic Data Center. 2010. State of the Climate - Drought - Annual Report 2009 [web page]. http://www.ncdc.noaa.gov/sotc/2009/13. [Date accessed: May 12, 2011].

National Climatic Data Center. 2011. State of the Climate - Drought - Annual Report 2010 [web page]. http://www.ncdc.noaa.gov/sotc/drought/2010/13. [Date accessed: May 10, 2011].

National Drought Mitigation Center. 2011. U.S. Drought Monitor GIS data archive. http://drought.unl.edu/dm/dmshps_archive.htm. [Date accessed: May 12, 2011].

O'Driscoll, P. 2007. A drought for the ages; From the dried lake beds of Florida to the struggling ranches of California, a historic lack of rain is changing how Americans live. USA Today. June 8: 1A.

Palmer, W. C. 1965. Metereological drought. Res. Pap. No. 45. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Commerce, Weather Bureau. 58 p.

Poland, T. M.; McCullough, D. G. 2006. Emerald ash borer: invasion of the urban forest and the threat to North America's ash resource. Journal of Forestry. 104(3): 118-124.

PRISM Group. 2010. 2.5-arcmin (4 km) gridded monthly climate data. ftp://prism.oregonstate.edu//pub/prism/us/grids. [Date accessed: September 16, 2010].

Schoennagel, T.; Veblen, T. T.; Romme, W. H. 2004. The interaction of fire, fuels, and climate across Rocky Mountain forests. BioScience. 54(7): 661-676.

Svoboda, M.; LeComte, D.; Hayes, M. [and others]. 2002. The Drought Monitor. Bulletin of the American Meteorological Society. 83(8): 1181-1190.

Thornthwaite, C. W. 1948. An approach towards a rational classification of climate. Geographical Review. 38(1): 55-94.

Willmott, C. J.; Feddema, J. J. 1992. A more rational climatic moisture index. Professional Geographer. 44(1): 84-87.

Chapter 5. Tree Mortality

Mark J. Ambrose

Introduction

Tree mortality is a natural process in all forest ecosystems. However, extremely high mortality can also be an indicator of forest health issues. On a regional scale, high mortality levels may indicate widespread insect or disease problems. High mortality may also occur if a large proportion of the forest in a particular region is made up of older, senescent stands.

In early Forest Health Monitoring (FHM) national reports (2001-2004), mortality was analyzed using FHM and Forest Inventory and Analysis (FIA) phase 3 (P3) data. Those data spanned a relatively long time period (for some States, up to 12 years), but the sample was not spatially intense (approximately 1 plot per 96,000 acres). In the 2008 FHM national report (Ambrose, in press), the same method was applied to FIA phase 2 (P2) data which were more spatially intense (approximately 1 plot per 6,000 acres) but came from the relatively small number of States in the Eastern United States where repeated plot measurements had been taken. In the 2009 and 2010 reports, the method was applied to larger areas, using increasing numbers of plots. For this report, the repeated P2 data cover much of the Central and Eastern U.S., and we can begin to use data from a third cycle of measurements (i.e. a third measurement of the plots).

The mission of FHM is to monitor, assess, and report on the status, changes, and long-term trends in forest ecosystem health in the U.S. (U.S. Dept. of Agriculture, Forest Health Monitoring 1994). Thus, the aim of this mortality analysis contrasts with how mortality might be approached in other reports, such as FIA State reports or State Forest Health Highlights. The approach to mortality presented here seeks to detect mortality patterns that might reflect subtle changes to fundamental ecosystem processes (due to such large-scale factors as air pollution, global climate change, or fire-regime change) that transcend individual tree species-pest/pathogen interactions. However, sometimes the proximate cause of mortality may be discernable. In such cases, the cause of mortality is reported, both because it is of interest in and of itself to many readers and because understanding such proximate causes of mortality ***might*** provide insight into whether the mortality is within the range of natural variation or reflects more fundamental changes to ecological processes.

At this point a mortality baseline is still being established for most of the U.S. To discern trends in mortality rates, at least three complete cycles of FIA data are required. With the data currently available, it is only possible to do a spatial comparison of ecoregions and identify regions of higher than average mortality (relative to growth) for further study.

Data

FIA P2 inventory data are collected using a rotating panel sample design (Bechtold and Patterson 2005). Field plots are divided into spatially balanced panels, with one panel being measured each year. A single cycle of measurements consists of measuring all panels. This “annualized” method of inventory was adopted, State by State, beginning in 1999. Any analysis of mortality requires data collected at a minimum of two points in time from any given plot. Therefore, mortality analysis was possible for areas where data from repeated plot measurements using consistent sampling protocols were available (i.e., where one cycle of measurements had been completed and at least one panel of the next cycle had been measured, and where there had been no changes to the protocols affecting measurement of trees or saplings).

Because the data used here are collected using a rotating panel design and all available annualized data are used, most of the data used in this mortality analysis were also used in the analysis presented in the previous FHM National Report. Using the data in this way, it would be very unusual to see any great changes in mortality patterns from one annual report to the next. Nevertheless, it is important to look at mortality patterns every year so as not to miss detecting changes in mortality patterns as soon as they may become discernable.

Table 5.1 shows the 36 States from which consistent, repeated P2 measurements were available, the time period spanned by the data, and the number of panels of data available. Additional measurements of any plot, beyond the minimum of two required for a single mortality estimate, improves the mortality estimate. At present, third plot measurements have been taken in some States (Table 5.1). The States included in this analysis, as well as the forest cover within those States, are shown in figure 5.1.

Table 5.1 – States from which repeated Forest Inventory and Analysis Phase 2 measurements were available, the time period spanned by the data, and the number of panels of data available. Each panel represents approximately 1/5th of the plots in a State.

Time period	**States**	**Number of remeasured P2 panels**	**Number of P2 panels measured a third time**
1999 [a]-2010	IN, WI	5 [b]	1
1999-2009	ME	5	1
1999 [a] -2009	MN, MO	5 [b c]	0
2000-2009	AR, IA, PA	5	0
2000-2010	MI	5 [d]	1
2000-2010	VA	4	0
2001-2009	IL, KS, NE, OH, SD	4	0
2001-2009	OH	3	0
2001-2010	AL, GA, ND, TN	5	0
2001-2010	TX [e]	5	2
2002-2009	FL	1	0
2002-2009	KY, NY, PA	3	0
2002-2010	NH	3	0
2002-2010	SC	4	0
2003-2009	MA, RI	2	0
2003-2010	NC	2	0
2003-2010	CT, VT	3	0
2004-2009	DE, MD, NJ, WV	1	0

[a] In Indiana, Minnesota, Missouri, and Wisconsin, the field season often begins late in the calendar year, so while the earliest data are from 1999, they do not represent a separate panel but are part of the panel mostly measured in 2000.
[b] In Minnesota and Wisconsin, the P2 inventory was done at twice the standard FIA sample intensity, approximately 1 plot per 3,000 acres.
[c] In Missouri the P2 inventory was done at twice the standard FIA sample intensity, approximately 1 plot per 3,000 acres, on National Forest lands, and at the standard intensity on all other lands.
[d] In Michigan the P2 inventory was done at triple the standard FIA sample intensity, approximately 1 plot per 2,000 acres.
[e] Annualized growth and mortality data were only available for eastern Texas.



Figure 5.1 - Forest cover in the States where mortality was analyzed. Forest cover was derived from Advanced Very High Resolution Radiometer satellite imagery (Zhu and Evans 1994).

Methods

FIA P2 tree and sapling data were used to estimate average annual tree mortality in terms of tons of biomass per acre. The biomass represented by each tree in tons was calculated by FIA and provided in the FIA Database - version 4.0 (U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Forest Inventory and Analysis Program 2010). To compare mortality rates across forest types and climate zones, the ratio of annual mortality to gross growth (MRATIO) is used as a standardized mortality indicator (Coulston and others 2005a). Gross growth rate and mortality rate, in terms of tons of biomass per acre, were independently calculated for each ecoregion section (Cleland and others 2005, McNab and others 2007) using a mixed modeling procedure where plot to plot variability is considered a random effect and time is a fixed effect. The mixed modeling approach has been shown to be particularly efficient for estimation using data where not all plots have been measured over identical time intervals (Gregoire and others 1995). In the estimation procedure, within plot temporal correlation was based on a covariance matrix modeled using a Toeplitz matrix. MRATIOs were then calculated from the growth and mortality rates. For details on the method, see Appendix A – Supplemental Methods in *Forest Health Monitoring 2001 National Technical Report* (Coulston and others 2005b) and Appendix A – Supplemental Methods in *Forest Health Monitoring 2003 National Technical Report* (Coulston and others 2005c).

The MRATIO can be large if an over-mature forest is senescing and losing a cohort of older trees. If forests are not naturally senescing, a high MRATIO (> 0.6) may indicate high mortality due to some acute cause(s) (e.g., insects, pathogens, drought) or due to generally deteriorating forest health conditions. An MRATIO value greater than 1 indicates that mortality exceeds growth and live standing biomass is actually decreasing.

In addition, the ratio of average dead tree diameter to average surviving live tree diameter (DDLD ratio) was calculated for each plot where mortality occurred. Low DDLD ratios (much less than 1) usually indicate competition-induced mortality typical of young, vigorous stands, while high ratios (much greater than 1) indicate mortality associated with senescence or some external factors such as insects, disease, or severe drought stress (Smith and Conkling 2005). Intermediate DDLD ratios can be hard to interpret because a variety of stand conditions can produce such DDLD values. The DDLD ratio is most useful for analyzing mortality in regions that also have high MRATIOs. High DDLD values in regions with very low MRATIOs may indicate small areas experiencing high mortality of large trees or locations where the death of a single large tree (such as a remnant pine in a young hardwood stand) has produced a deceptively high DDLD.

To further analyze tree mortality, the number of stems and the total biomass of trees that died also were calculated by species within each ecoregion. Identifying the tree species experiencing high mortality in an ecoregion is a first step in identifying what forest health issue may be affecting the forests. Although determining particular causal agents associated with all the observed mortality is beyond the scope of this report, often there are well-known insects and pathogens that are "likely suspects" once the affected tree species are identified.

Also, a biomass weighted mean mortality age was calculated by ecoregion and species. For each species experiencing mortality in an ecoregion the mean stand age was calculated, weighted by the dead biomass on the plot. This value gives a rough indicator of the average age of trees that died. However, the age of individual trees may differ significantly from the age assigned to a stand by FIA field crews, especially in mixed species stands. When the age of trees that die is relatively low compared with the age at which trees of a particular species usually become senescent, it suggests that some pest, pathogen, or other forest health problem may be affecting the forest.

Results and Discussion

The MRATIO values are shown in figure 5.2. Table 5.2 shows the tree species experiencing the greatest mortality in ecoregions having MRATIOs of 0.6 or greater.

The highest MRATIO occurred in ecoregion section 331F-Western Great Plains (MRATIO = 1.98) in South Dakota and Nebraska, where mortality actually exceeded growth. Other areas of high mortality relative to growth were sections 332D-North-Central Great Plains, also in South Dakota and Nebraska, (MRATIO = 0.82), 232D-Florida Coastal Lowlands (MRATIO = 0.72), 255D-Central Gulf Prairie and Marshes in eastern Texas (MRATIO = 0.70), and 251B-North Central Glaciated Plains, which stretch from southeastern North Dakota to central Iowa (MRATIO = 0.62).

The results of the analysis of the relative sizes of trees that died to those that lived, the DDLD ratio, are shown in table 5.3. The DDLD ratio is a plot-level indicator, so we obtained summary statistics for the ecoregions where mortality relative to growth was highest. In all cases the mean and median DDLDs were rather close to one, meaning that the trees that died were similar in size to the trees that survived. However, there were some plots with extremely high DDLD values. Interestingly, the same pattern of mean and median DDLD close to one and some high DDLD values was observed in nearly all ecoregions, regardless of the overall mortality level. So the DDLD analyzed at the ecoregion scale is not very revealing.

In three of the ecoregion sections exhibiting highest mortality relative to growth (331F-Western Great Plains, 332D-North-Central Great Plains, and 251B-North Central Glaciated Plains), the predominant vegetation is grassland, and there were few forested plots measured. Tree growth rates in these regions (especially in 331F) are quite low, so the high MRATIOSs are due to a combination of low growth and high mortality. Most of the forest in these sections is riparian forest, and, indeed, most of the species experiencing greatest mortality (table 5.2) are commonly found in riparian areas. The one exception was high ponderosa pine mortality in ecoregion section 331F-Western Great Plains. Ponderosa pine is not typically a part of the plains ecosystem, so one suspects that the pine mortality is occurring on plots close to ecoregion M334A – Black Hills (perhaps on plots actually in the Black Hills but included in section 331F-Western Great Plains due to mapping error).



Figure 5.2 - Tree mortality expressed as the ratio of annual mortality of woody biomass to gross annual growth in woody biomass (MRATIO) by ecoregion section (Cleland and others 2005). (Data source: U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service Forest Inventory and Analysis Program).

DDLD values vary widely within each of these sections. There are a small number of plots with high DDLDs, and these plots represent most of the biomass that died in these sections. However, on many of these plots the overall level of mortality is fairly low, as would be the case when remnant larger trees die, leaving young, vigorous stands behind. Tree growth is generally slow in these ecoregion sections because of naturally dry conditions. Where the number of sample plots is small and tree growth is slow, care must be taken in interpreting mortality relative to growth over short time intervals.

In ecoregion section 331F-Western Great Plains, where the MRATIO was highest (MRATIO = 1.98), by far the largest amount of biomass that died was ponderosa pine (table 5.2); however, this represented a relatively small proportion of the ponderosa pine in the ecorgion. Green ash, which made up only half as much of the ecoregion mortality as ponderosa pine, suffered a much larger loss of the total ash stock (about 22 percent of both biomass and stems). This suggests that ash may be suffering from much more serious forest health issues than pine in this ecoregion.

In ecoregion section 332D-North-Central Great Plains, four species experienced the highest total mortality in terms of biomass and together represent about 75 percent of the mortality in the ecoregion: bur oak, hackberry, green ash, and ponderosa pine. Of these, hackberry and green ash suffered the greatest proportional loss of biomass (11.98 and 13.21 percent, respectively). The relatively high mean age of the dead trees suggests that the mortality is at least partially due to senescence of older stands.

Table 5.2 –Tree species responsible for at least ten percent of the mortality (in terms of biomass) for ecoregions where the MRATIO was 0.60 or greater.

Ecoregion section	MRATIO	Tree species	Percent of total ecoregion mortality biomass	Mean age of dead trees[a]	Species percent mortality (biomass)	(stems)
331F-Western Great Plains	1.98	ponderosa pine (*Pinus ponderosa*)	51.21	76	5.51	12.02
		green ash (*F. pennsylvanica*)	25.48	42	21.80	22.48
332D-North-Central Great Plains	0.82	bur oak (*Quercus macrocarpa*)	29.35	74	4.99	5.33
		hackberry (*Celtis occidentalis*)	19.33	60	11.98	6.25
		green ash (*F. pennsylvanica*)	15.26	77	13.21	19.68
		ponderosa pine (*P. ponderosa*)	10.91	59	8.18	43.48
232D-Florida Coastal Lowlands	0.72	live oak (*Quercus virginiana*)	12.44	56	14.42	15.19
		slash pine (*Pinus elliotii*)	12.25	39	7.61	13.79
255D-Central Gulf Prairie and Marshes	0.70	loblolly pine (*Pinus taeda*)	26.70	66	8.23	6.80
		pecan (*Carya illinoensis*)	23.54	60	48.30	28.08
		water oak (*Quercus nigra*)	21.37	48	21.32	21.48
251B-North Central Glaciated Plains	0.62	American elm (*Ulmus americana*)	35.43	54	32.24	26.12
		bur oak (*Q. macrocarpa*)	12.30	106	4.65	4.30

[a] Ages are estimated from the stand age as determined by the FIA field crew. It is possible, especially in mixed-species stands that the age of individual trees that died differed significantly from the stand age.

Table 5.3 – Dead diameter live diameter (DDLD) ratios for ecoregion sections where the MRATIO was 0.60 or greater.

Ecoregion section	Mean DDLD	Maximum DDLD	Median DDLD	Minimum DDLD	MRATIO
255D-Central Gulf Prairies and Marshes	1.29	3.16	1.16	0.28	0.70
232D-Florida Coastal Lowlands	1.13	7.66	0.90	0.22	0.72
251B-North Central Glaciated Plains	1.00	4.44	0.74	0.12	0.62
331F-Western Great Plains	0.98	3.29	0.91	0.22	1.98
332D-North-Central Great Plains	0.89	1.83	0.96	0.29	0.82

One might be tempted to suspect the invasive insect, the emerald ash borer as the cause of the ash mortality in sections 331F-Western Great Plains and 332D-North-Central Great Plains. However, this pest had not yet been reported in or near these regions as of the time that the mortality data were collected or the time of this writing (USDA Forest Service and others,2011, N.d.). More likely possible causes of the ash mortality include ash yellows (Pokorny and Sinclair 1994), environmental conditions, or simply senescence of older stands.

In ecoregion 232D-Florida Coastal Lowlands live oak and slash pine each represented about 12 percent of the mortality. The causes are unclear. Researchers in Florida are investigating pests that effect slash pine (southern pine beetle) and oak (variable oakleaf caterpillar). However, these research and monitoring efforts are focused in northern Florida, not in most of the area experiencing high mortality (Florida Dept. of Agriculture and Consumer, Division of Forestry 2009)

In ecoregion 255D-Central Gulf Prairie and Marshes in eastern Texas, most of the mortality occurred in loblolly pine, pecan, and water oak. Of these, pecan suffered the largest proportional loss (48.3 percent of biomass and 28.08 percent of stems). The causes of this mortality are not readily apparent. In the case of water oak, one might suspect oak wilt, which is a major problem in much of Texas. However, oak wilt has not been confirmed in much of this ecoregion (Appel and others 2008).

In ecoregion section 251B-North Central Glaciated Plains, by far the largest amount of biomass that died was American elm. Elm also suffered the largest proportional loss, in terms of both biomass (32.24 percent) and number of stems (26.12 percent). Dutch elm disease is the suspected cause. The pathogen which causes it is known to occur throughout the Midwest, including every county of Iowa since 2002 (Feeley 2010). Dutch elm disease has severely affected riparian forests in North Dakota (North Dakota Forest Service 2007). The disease is also reported to be a problem in Minnesota (Minnesota Department of Natural Resources 2009) and nearby Illinois (Illinois Department of Natural Resources 2009).

The mortality pattern shown in these analyses do not immediately suggest large-scale forest health issues. Mortality is rather low in most of the areas for which data are available. The areas of highest mortality occur in the mostly riparian forests of several plains ecoregions. Further study of the health of these forests may be warranted. Further investigation may also be warranted into the causes of mortality in the Gulf Coast ecoregions of Florida and Texas.

Literature Cited

Ambrose, M.J. [In press]. Chapter 5 – Mortality. In: Ambrose, M.J. and Conkling, B.L, eds. Forest Health Monitoring 2007 national technical report. Gen. Tech. Rep. SRS-xxx. Asheville, NC: U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Southern Research Station. xxx p.

Appel, D.N.; Cameron, R.S.; Wilson, A.D.; Johnson, J.D. 2008. How to identify and manage oak wilt in Texas. Texas Forest Service and USDA Forest Service, Southern Research Station. 2 p. Available online: http://www.texasoakwilt.org/ (Date accessed: 7/19/2011).

Bechtold, W.A.; Patterson, P.L., eds. 2005. The enhanced Forest Inventory and Analysis program—national sampling design and estimation procedures. Gen. Tech. Rep. SRS-80. Asheville, NC: U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Southern Research Station. 85 p.

Cleland, D.T.; Freeouf, J. A.; Keys, J.E.; [and others]. 2005. Ecological Subregions: Sections and Subsections for the conterminous United States. (A.M. Sloan, technical editor). Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service. Map, presentation scale 1:3,500,000; colored. Also on CD-ROM as a GIS coverage in ArcINFO format.

Coulston, J.W.; Ambrose, M.J.; Stolte. K.S.; [and others]. 2005a. Criterion 3 – health and vitality. In: Conkling, B.L.; Coulston, J.W.; Ambrose, M.J., eds. Forest Health Monitoring 2001 national technical report. Gen. Tech. Rep. SRS-81. Asheville, NC: U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Southern Research Station. 203 p.

Coulston, J.W. ; Smith, W.D.; Ambrose, M.J.; [and others]. 2005b. Appendix A – supplemental methods. In: Conkling, B.L.; Coulston, J.W.; Ambrose, M.J., eds. Forest Health Monitoring 2001 national technical report. Gen. Tech. Rep. SRS-81. Asheville, NC: U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Southern Research Station. 203 p.

Coulston, J.W. ; Ambrose, M.J.; Riitters, K. H. [and others]. 2005c. Appendix A – supplemental methods. In: Forest Health Monitoring 2003 national technical report. Gen. Tech. Rep. SRS-85. Asheville, NC: U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Southern Research Station. 97 p.

Feeley, T. 2010. Iowa's Forest Health Report. Des Moines: Iowa Department of Natural Resources, Forestry Bureau. 75 p. Available online: http://fhm.fs.fed.us/fhh/ncregion.shtml (Date accessed: 2/1/2011).

Florida Dept. of Agriculture and Consumer, Division of Forestry. 2009. Florida Forest Health Highlights 2009. 3 p. Available online: http://fhm.fs.fed.us/fhh/sregion.shtml (Date accessed: 6/28/2011).

Gregoire, T.G.; Schabenberger, O.; Barret, J.P. 1995. Linear modeling of irregularly spaced, unbalanced, longitudinal data from permanent-plot measurements. Can. J. For. Res. 25: 137-156.

Illinois Department of Natural Resources. 2009. 2009 Illinois Forest Health Highlights. 10 p. Available online: http://fhm.fs.fed.us/fhh/ncregion.shtml (Date accessed: 2/1/2011).

McNab, W.H.; Cleland, D.T.; Freeouf, J.A.; [and others], comps. 2007. Description of ecological subregions: sections of the conterminous United States [CD-ROM]. Gen. Tech. Report WO-76B. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service. 80 p.

Minnesota Department of Natural Resources. 2009. Federal Forest Health Highlights for 2009. St. Paul: Minnesota Department of Natural Resources – Division of Forestry. 21 p. Available online: http://fhm.fs.fed.us/fhh/ncregion.shtml (Date accessed: 2/1/2011).

North DakotaForest Service. 2007. North Dakota Forest Health Highlights – 2007. Fargo: North Dakota Forest Service. 5 p. Available online: http://fhm.fs.fed.us/fhh/ncregion.shtml (Date accessed: 6/1/2011).

Pokorny, J.D.; Sinclair, W.A. 1994. How to identify and manage ash yellows in forest stands and home landscapes. NA-FR-03-94. St. Paul, MN: USDA Forest Service NA, State and Private Forestry. 6 p. Available online: http://www.na.fs.fed.us/pubs/howtos/ht_ash/ash_yell.pdf (Date accessed: 11/5/2011).

Smith, W.D.; Conkling, B.L. 2004. Analyzing forest health data. Gen . Tech. Rep. SRS-77. Asheville, NC: U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Southern Research Station. 35 p.

U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Forest Health Monitoring Program. 1994. Forest Health Monitoring: a national strategic plan. Research Triangle Park, NC: U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Forest Health Monitoring Program. 13 p.

U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Forest Inventory and Analysis Program. 2010. The Forest Inventory and Analysis database: database description and users manual version 4.0 for Phase 2, revision 3. Washington: U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service. Available online: http://fia.fs.fed.us/library/database-documentation/ (Date accessed: 2/10/11).

U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service; Michigan State University; Purdue University; Ohio State University. 2011. Cooperative emerald ash borer project: initial county EAB detections in Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Kentucky, Maryland, Michigan, Minnesota, Missouri, New York, Ohio, Pennsylvania, Tennessee, Virginia, Wisconsin, West Virginia, and Canada, June 1, 2011. http://www.emeraldashborer.info/files/MultiState_EABpos.pdf (Date accessed: 6/29/2011).

U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service; Michigan State University; Purdue University; Ohio State University. [N.d.]. Emerald ash borer: Where is EAB? http://www.emeraldashborer.info/surveyinfo.cfm (Date accessed: 6/29/2011).

Zhu, Z.; Evans, D.L. 1994. U.S. forest types and predicted percent forest cover from AVHRR data. Photogrammetric Engineering and Remote Sensing. 60: 525-531.

Section II. Analyses of Long-Term Forest Health Trends and Presentations of New Techniques

Chapter 6. Fragmentation of Eastern United States Forest Types

Kurt H. Riitters and John W. Coulston

Introduction

Fragmentation is a continuing threat to the sustainability of forests in the eastern United States, where land use changes supporting a growing human population are the primary driver of forest fragmentation (Stein and others 2009). While once mostly forested, approximately 40 percent of the original forest area has been converted to other land uses, and most of the remainder is not original forest (Smith and others 2009). The direct loss of forest land is an obvious threat; less obvious are the threats posed by isolation and edge which encompasses a wide range of negative biotic and abiotic influences on remnant forest (e.g., Murcia 1995; Forman and Alexander 1998; Ries and others 2004; Harper and others 2005; Laurance 2008). Land cover data from 1992 indicated that forest tended to be dominant and well connected where it occurred, but also that fragmentation was so pervasive that only 10 percent of the eastern forest area was not fragmented at a landscape scale of 66 ha, and that at least 40 percent of forest area was within 90 m of forest edge (Riitters and others 2002, 2004). Between 1992 and 2001, there was a net loss of interior forest in the east, and landscapes once dominated by forest are now dominated by other land uses (Wickham and others 2007, 2008). In 16 of the 31 eastern States, the wildland-urban interface now encompasses more than 25 percent of total land area (Radeloff and others 2005), and one-third of the eastern forest exists within neighborhoods that also contain at least ten percent agricultural land cover (Riitters 2011).

The objective of this section is to demonstrate an approach to improve national assessments of forest fragmentation by incorporating information about the specific forest types that are fragmented. National assessments are appropriately based on high resolution, wall-to-wall land cover maps (Heinz Center 2008), but the current generation of those maps does not describe in much detail the forest types that are fragmented. Such information could improve land management and policy by identifying forest types of special concern for conservation or remediation, especially if fragmentation is related to specific ecological services like wildlife habitat or water quality (e.g., Burkhard and others 2009; Kienast and others 2009). The approach demonstrated here combines land cover data from the 2001 National Land Cover Data (NLCD) land cover map (Homer and others 2007) with field plot information from the Forest Inventory and Analysis (FIA) Program (USDA Forest Service 2010). We evaluate the fragmentation status of forest types in the eastern United States (fig. 6.1) and estimate the area of intact forest by forest type.

Methods

Bechtold and Patterson (2005) provide a detailed description of the FIA inventory which may be summarized as follows. The FIA inventory uses a permanent, national, grid-based, equal probability sample design across all land. Each sample location is determined to be either a forest land use or a nonforest land use. For those locations determined to be a forest land use, a field inventory plot is installed to collect additional information. A variety of site and vegetation measurements are taken on a cluster of four fixed-area sub-plots spanning approximately 0.4 ha, which may extend into more than one forest type. FIA uses a post-stratified estimator which accounts for different sampling intensities that arise because of intentional increases in sample size or unintentionally as a result of survey non-response. In effect, each plot has a weight factor that accounts for those differences. In addition, each within-plot forest type is weighted by its relative area on the field plot. The area estimates that we report were derived by combining the two weight factors (Bechtold and Patterson 2005). We used data from 152,804 plot locations across the study area, using the most recent measurement for measurement years 2000 to 2008. Forest types were defined by FIA protocols (USDA Forest Service 2010). We selected 75 of the 92 forest types in the FIA database by excluding nonstocked forest land and the forest types which occupied less than 70,000 ha each.

Figure 6.1 – The study area includes 31 eastern States.

Fragmentation was measured using the 2001 NLCD land cover map (Homer and others 2007). The NLCD map identifies 16 land cover types at a spatial resolution of 0.09 ha per pixel and a minimum mapping unit of 0.45 ha. The 16 NLCD land cover types were combined into two generalized land cover types called forest (including the NLCD deciduous forest, evergreen forest, mixed forest, and woody wetlands classes) and nonforest (including all other NLCD classes). Forest area density (Pf), defined as the proportion of a fixed-area neighborhood that has forest land cover, was measured within a 4.41 ha (7 pixel X 7 pixel) neighborhood centered on each inventory plot location (Riitters and others 2002). That neighborhood size was large enough to reliably estimate Pf yet small enough to characterize fragmentation in the immediate vicinity of a field plot. Pf was converted to a categorical variable (Pf class) with seven classes labeled as intact (Pf = 1.0), interior ($0.9 \leq Pf < 1.0$), dominant ($0.6 \leq Pf < 0.9$), transitional ($0.4 \leq Pf < 0.6$), patchy ($0.1 \leq Pf < 0.4$), rare ($0.0 < Pf < 0.1$), and none (Pf = 0.0). The class 'none' was included because it was possible for inventory plots to occur in neighborhoods containing no forest land cover. The Pf class was then treated as a new plot-level attribute when using the FIA weight factors to summarize Pf classes by forest types.

Results

The percentage of each forest type's total area that is in each of the seven Pf classes is shown in figure 6.2. The forest types are sorted in descending order by percentage of intact forest land cover, such that the forest type with the highest percentage (chestnut oak) is at the top of figure 6.2A and that with the lowest percentage (black walnut) is at the bottom of figure 6.2B. In figure 6.3, the estimated area of intact forest land cover is shown for each forest type sorted in descending order. Note the scale change on the x-axis between figure 6.3A and figure 6.3B.



Figure 6.2 – The percentage of total forest type area in each of seven forest area density (Pf) classes, sorted descending by percentage in the intact area density class. Forest type nomenclature is from Appendix F of USDA Forest Service (2010).



Figure 6.3 – Estimated total area of intact forest land cover, by forest type, sorted descending by area. Note the scale change between (a) and (b). Forest type nomenclature is from Appendix F of USDA Forest Service (2010).

Discussion

Over all forest types, approximately 81% of forest area was contained in a neighborhood that consisted of at least 60% forest land cover (Pf classes dominant, interior, and intact), and approximately 45% was contained in a neighborhood with intact forest land cover. While these results apply to forest land area as defined by the FIA inventory, they are generally consistent with earlier estimates of dominant and intact eastern forest that were made for forest land cover in general (Riitters and others 2002; Wickham and others 2008). The high percentage (81%) of area with sufficient forest land cover to qualify as dominant indicates that forest land cover tends to be dominant where forest occurs, and the low percentage (45%) of intact forest indicates that fragmentation is pervasive.

The percentage area in the intact forest area density class varied from 13% to 78% among individual forest types. Fragmentation would be considered a natural attribute of many of the forest types that exhibited low percentages of intact forest. For example, cottonwood and willow are typical of narrow riparian forests in the semi-arid western part of the study area, and intactness is lost from fragmentation by water. Bur oak is an example of naturally fragmented forest in savannah regions where fragmentation by grass-shrub land cover is a natural condition. Forest types exhibiting the largest percentages of intact forest are partly explained by (lack of) accessibility due to steep slopes (e.g., chestnut oak) or hydric soils (northern white cedar, black spruce, pond pine). Perhaps the best evidence for the pervasiveness of fragmentation is between those extremes, for the forest types that are not naturally fragmented and that occur in relatively accessible locations; typically less than half of the area of those forest types qualified as intact forest in a modest 4.41 ha neighborhood. Except for 'natural' fragmentation by water or grassland, the majority of that fragmentation is associated with anthropogenic land uses such as agriculture, housing, and infrastructure (Riitters and Coulston 2005; Wade and others 2003).

The regional supply of intact forest is driven more by total area than by the characteristics of individual forest types. A large share of the total area of intact forest was contributed by the sugar maple/beech/yellow birch forest type (fig. 6.2A) which exhibited the second-largest percentage of intact forest on a per-forest type basis and which occupied a large share of total forest area. In contrast, large shares of total intact forest area were also contributed by three forest types (mixed upland hardwoods, loblolly pine, white oak/red oak/hickory) that individually exhibited moderate to low percentages of intact forest but that occupied a large share of total forest area. Approximately 36% of intact forest area was concentrated in only three forest types – white oak / red oak / hickory, sugar maple / beech / yellow birch, and loblolly pine – and the 37 forest types with the least individual intact areas together comprised only 9% of total intact forest area. Mitigation of fragmentation and conservation of intact forest may be desired to improve the sustainability of ecological services obtained from specific forest types. If so, land management plans should be specifically directed at those types because plans aimed generally at conserving intact forest would be directed disproportionally to the most common forest types.

In summary, previous national assessments of forest fragmentation did not account for potential differences among forest types because the land cover maps which portray fragmentation did not identify forest types (USDA Forest Service 2001, 2004). This section demonstrated an approach to estimating the degree and area of fragmentation by forest type by combining land cover maps with field inventory data. The statistical features of the field inventory system permit forest types to be compared in terms of the fragmentation that they experience, and permit estimation of fragmented land cover area in a way that is consistent with national forest inventory. In principle, fragmentation data may be summarized by other plot attributes such as ownership by using the methods demonstrated here.

Literature Cited

Bechtold WA, Patterson PL (eds.) (2005) The enhanced forest inventory and analysis program – national sampling design and estimation procedures. General Technical Report SRS-80, US Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Southern Research Station, Asheville NC. 85 p.

Burkhard B, Kroll F, Muller F, Windhorst W (2009) Landscapes' capacities to provide ecosystem services – a concept for land-cover based assessments. Landscape Online 15:1-22.

Forman RTT, Alexander LE. 1998. Roads and their major ecological effects. Annual Review of Ecology, Evolution, and Systematics 29:207-231.

Harper KA, MacDonald SE, Burton PJ, Chen J, Brosofske KD, Saunders SC, Euskirchen ES, Roberts D, Jaiteh MS, Esseen P-A. 2005. Edge influence on forest structure and composition in fragmented landscapes. Conservation Biology 19:768-782.

Heinz Center. 2008. Landscape pattern indicators for the nation: a report from the Heinz Center's landscape pattern task group. The H. John Heinz III Center for Science, Economics and the Environment, Washington DC. 108 p.

Homer C, Dewitz J, Fry J, Coan M, Hossain N, Larson C, Herold N, McKerrow A, VanDriel JN, Wickham J. 2007. Completion of the 2001 national land cover database for the conterminous United States. Photogrammetric Engineering and Remote Sensing 73:337-341.

Kienast F, Bolliger J, Potschin M, de Groot RS, Verburg PH, Heller I, Wascher D, Haines-Young R (2009) Assessing landscape functions with broad-scale environmental data: insights gained from a prototype development for Europe. Environmental Management 44:1099-1120.

Laurance WF. 2008. Theory meets reality: how habitat fragmentation research has transcended island biogeography theory. Biological Conservation 141:1731-1744

Murcia C. 1995. Edge effects in fragmented forests: implications for conservation. Trends in Ecology and Evolution 10: 58-62.

Radeloff VC, Hammer RB, Stewart SI, Fried JS, Holcomb SS, McKeefry JF (2005) The wildland-urban interface in the United States. Ecological Applications 15:799-805.

Ries L, Fletcher RJ, Battin J, Sisk TD. 2004. Ecological responses to habitat edges: mechanisms, models, and variability explained. Annual Review of Ecology, Evolution and Systematics 35:491-522.

Riitters K (2011) Spatial patterns of land cover in the United States: a technical document supporting the Forest Service 2010 RPA Assessment. General Technical Report SRS-XXX, US Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Southern Research Station, Asheville NC. 64 p.

Riitters KH, Wickham JD, O'Neill RV, Jones KB, Smith ER, Coulston JW, Wade TG, Smith JH (2002) Fragmentation of continental United States forests. Ecosystems 5:815–822.

Riitters KH, Wickham JD, Coulston JW (2004) A preliminary assessment of Montréal process indicators of forest fragmentation for the United States. Environmental Monitoring and Assessment 91:257-276.

Riitters KH, Coulston JW (2005) Hotspots of perforated forest in the eastern United States. Environmental Management 35:483-492.

Smith WB, Miles PD, Perry CH, Pugh SA (2009) Forest Resources of the United States, 2007. General Technical Report WO-78, US Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Washington DC. 336 p.

Stein SM, McRoberts RE, Mahal LG, Carr MA, Alig RJ, Comas SJ, Theobald DM, Cundiff A (2009) Private forests, public benefits: Increased housing density and other pressures on private forest contributions. General Technical Report PNW-GTR-795. US Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Pacific Northwest Research Station, Portland OR.

USDA (United States Department of Agriculture) Forest Service (2001) 2000 RPA assessment of forest and range lands. Report FS-687, US Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Washington DC. 78 p.

USDA (United States Department of Agriculture) Forest Service (2004) National Report on Sustainable Forests 2003. Report FS-766, US Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Washington DC. 139 p.

USDA (United States Department of Agriculture) Forest Service (2010) The forest inventory and analysis database: database description and users manual for Phase 2, version 4.0, revision 3. Forest Inventory and Analysis Program, US Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Washington DC. 368 p. [Online] URL: http://fia.fs.fed.us/library/database-documentation/ (accessed 18 February 2011).

Wade TG, Riitters KH, Wickham JD, Jones KB (2003) Distribution and causes of global forest fragmentation. Ecology and Society 7(2): 7. [online] URL: http://www.ecologyandsociety.org/vol7/iss2/art7 (accessed 17 February 2011).

Wickham JD, Riitters KH, Wade TG, Coulston JW (2007) Temporal change in forest fragmentation at multiple scales. Landscape Ecology 22:481-489.

Wickham JD, Riitters KH, Wade TG, Homer C (2008) Temporal change in fragmentation of continental US forests. Landscape Ecology 23:891-898.

Chapter 7. Regional Distribution of Introduced Plant Species in the Forests of the Northeastern United States

Beth Schulz, W. Keith Moser, Cassandra Olson, Katherine Johnson

Introduction/Background

Many plant species have been introduced to the United States by humans since European settlement, sometimes deliberately and sometimes inadvertently, such as in contaminated crop seed or soil. Some species have successfully escaped cultivation and become invasive, spreading and establishing new populations distant from original population centers. Indeed, introduced plant species have forever changed the vegetative landscape of North America.

Not every plant that arrives on the scene becomes established and not every established plant becomes a problem invasive. A specific pattern of site and timing is generally needed for an exotic to take hold in an ecosystem. However, while many introduced plants do not exhibit invasive qualities for long periods after introduction, some reach a point of naturalization when they become invasive where they had previously been benign (Mack 2003). Once established, invasive plants can threaten the sustainability of native forest community composition, structure, function, and resource productivity (Webster and others 2006). Native forest ecosystems that developed over centuries were (and are) limited in their ability to compete against these invaders.

There is an economic cost attributable to the control or management of invasive plants in forest ecosystems. Some authors have put the cost nationwide of all invasive species in the billions (Pimentel and others 2005); certainly the cost to Upper Midwest and northeastern U.S. forests is substantial.

Today, introduced plants are expanding their distributions across this region. These plants occur in all the major life forms found in forest ecosystems: trees, shrubs, vines, herbs/forbs, and grasses. As forests are more and more impacted by fragmentation and other forest health stressors, they become more susceptible to trans-regional and trans-national plant invasion, often at the expense of the indigenous species. Generally, pathways that contribute to the spread of introduced plants, contribute to the spread of more than one species or life form.

Fragmentation is a process of site disturbance whereby intact pieces of forest land are broken up either by active human-influenced processes, like roads and urban development, or by parcelization of ownerships, which introduces more subtle, but still significant, management changes. Fragmentation is important because it is generally recognized that introduced species are more common on forests edges than in the interior of undisturbed forests (Kuhman and others 2010; Moser and others 2009; Vilà and Ibàñez 2011).

Yet, other factors can influence the pace and impact of plant invasions in forests. Some have linked the number of introduced species to overall species richness (Stohlgren and others 1999). Others have shown that absolute or temporal availability of resources is important; invasive species are known to thrive on higher productivity sites (Richardson and Pyšek 2006). Spatial scale is important when considering basic predictors of where introduced species are likely to be found (Kuhman and others 2010; Stohlgren and others 1999).

In addition to local surveys and studies, a regional perspective is central to understanding the factors influencing introduced plant distribution. A regional perspective may assist land managers tasked with minimizing the spread of non-native plants by helping them to prioritize the use of limited resources. One goal of this report is to examine factors important in determining the regional distribution of invasive plants in the upper mid-west and northeastern U.S.

The Forest Health Vegetation Indicator (VEG) species data include a census of all vascular plants on a subset of the U.S. Forest Service's Forest inventory and Analysis (FIA) plots and are appropriate for regional- or national-scale reporting (Schulz and others 2009). Forest Health Indicators are collected on a 1/16th subset (phase three, P3) of FIA phase two (P2) plots, or about one plot to every 96,000 acres (Bechtold and Patterson 2005). VEG data have been collected discontinuously since 2001; the Northern Research Station's (NRS) FIA program has collected VEG data more consistently across broader areas than other FIA regions. The data can be used to examine introduced species as a group and by growth habits in addition to measurements of individual species distribution. Overall occupancy

of non-native plants in forests can be estimated as percentage and relative cover of introduced species, as suggested by Noss (1999) and anticipated by the Heinz Center (2008). Ecological provinces are defined by climatic, broad vegetation classes (Cleland and others 2005) and are useful for distinguishing populations at regional scales. They are especially well-suited for reporting forest health indicator results because they are large enough to encompass the sparse FIA-P3 grid to provide adequate sample sizes, while designating areas that provide similar climatic influences on vegetation.

Our objectives are to examine the presence and abundance of introduced species across the forests of the northeastern U.S to determine what broad-scale factors can be used to predict their distribution. Specifically, we look at introduced species distribution over the entire NRS region, by a coarse measure of forest fragmentation (forest intactness), using Ecological Provinces as subpopulations. We examine introduced species as a group, by growth habits, and a selected list of individual species.

Methods

The NRS- FIA collects forest-related data throughout a 24-state region in the northeastern United States. Standard forest inventory data were collected on P2 plots; additional variables related to forest health were collected on P3 plots (Bechtold and Patterson 2005), including VEG.

All vascular plants rooted in or hanging over the four subplots (see Chapter 1; fig.1.2) were identified. Plant identifications were recorded using plant symbols defined by the Natural Resource Conservation Service (NRCS) PLANTS database (USDA NRCS 2000). For each species on the subplot, total percent canopy cover was estimated and recorded. Species rooted in or over-hanging each of three permanently positioned $1m^2$ quadrats on each subplot were also recorded. Unknown species were collected near the plot and identified later by an FIA vegetation specialist or submitted to a qualified herbarium.

Each P3 plot is also a P2; all P2 data were available for each plot. The P2 data included detailed tree and forest stand data, along with physical site information. We examined initial data from 1305 plot visits where vegetation data were collected; this represented about 3/5 of the total P3 grid for the region.

The FIA sampling design was focused on accessible forested lands; this resulted in some plots with less area sampled than the four full subplots (that is, some portion of subplot area was non-forested). These plots provided valuable information, but plot summaries and population estimations must be calculated and presented appropriately. Calculations for attributes that are dependent on fixed area measurements exclude sample units that were not 100 percent within accessible forest lands.

Introduced species were designated using NRCS PLANTS database and refined with local knowledge. As the distribution of introduced species were evaluated, it is important to note that many plants observed were never identified to species due to their phenological stage at the time of plot visits. We assumed that the proportion of introduced species among the unidentified plants to be similar to their proportion of all plants identified to species.

For each plot, species richness and the number of introduced species were compiled. We then calculated the percentage of number of introduced species and relative cover of introduced species. The percentage of number of introduced species is simply the sum of introduced species divided by the number of all species identified to species per plot, multiplied by 100. The relative cover of introduced species is the sum of subplot cover of all introduced species divided by the sum of subplot cover by all taxa (species, genera, or unidentified plants) for each plot. Estimates and variances for population level summaries were computed using methods described in Schulz and others (2009) and results were compiled for each ecological province with at least 20 intact plots. The student's t-test was used to test for significant differences.

Condition type was derived from FIA P2 condition classifications, as a coarse measure of intactness. Conditions were designated by virtue of the following criteria: forest type, stand-size class, land use, regeneration status, reserved status, ownership, and tree density (Bechtold and Patterson 2005). Each plot was designated to one of three condition types based on the number and types of condition classes assigned. If the plot was 100 percent forest and was determined to be a single condition, it was designated as an "intact" stand. Plots that were 100 percent forest

but had more than one condition assigned, were designated as a "Multiple condition". Plots that were less than 100 percent forest were designated as "Forest edge".

Plants identified to species were assigned growth habits based their primary designations in the NRCS PLANTS database, and then compiled into four basic forms: forbs, graminoids (grass-like), shrubs, and trees. Species designated as herbaceous vines were included as forbs, species designated as subshrubs and woody vines were included as shrubs. The chi-square test of independence was used to determine if the categories "origin" and "growth habit" were independent; that is, if distribution of introduced species by growth habits was the same as the distribution of native species by growth habit within the same ecological province.

Individual species selected for distribution analysis were chosen for several reasons; all were among the most common species encountered, some were listed as species of concern for P2 plot sampling, and some were so naturalized that many people don't recognize them as non-native species. We also included species from a variety of growth habits and geographic ranges.

Results

A total of 2570 taxa (unique species, genera, and unknown codes) were recorded, with 2210 identified to species. Of the 2210 species, 303 were considered to be introduced in the NRCS PLANTS database. We included two additional grass species, reed canary grass (*Phalaris arundinacea* L.) and common reed (*Phragmites australis* (Cav.) Trin. ex Steud.) with invasive populations that are of concern in the region as introduced species, bringing the total number of species considered as introduced to 305. Appendix 7.1 lists the introduced species in order of highest constancy (percentage of plots where observed). Of the 1302 plots included in analysis, 864, or about 66 percent, had at least one introduced species present.

The northeastern corner of the United States where the FS Northern Research Station's Forest Inventory and Analysis program conducts forest inventory encompasses, in total or in part, 14 ecological provinces.

Forest Intactness

Plots were summarized by condition type to compare the occupancy of introduced species to the level of forest stand intactness. Plots located on the forest edges have the greatest percentage of plots with introduced species. Compared to the 66.4 percent of all 1302 plots, 58.75 percent of the 720 intact forest plots, 68 percent of the 120 multiple condition plots, and 77.7 percent of the 462 plots with some non-forest had at least one introduced species. On the 864 plots where at least one introduced species was recorded, the percentage of identified species that are introduced is least in intact stands and greatest on plots with some non-forest. This same trend is observed for the relative cover of introduced species (fig. 7.1). Each condition type is significantly different from the others for both measures ($\alpha < 0.05$).

Populations defined by ecological provinces

The 14 ecological provinces are listed in table 7.1, along with the percentage of plots with at least one introduced species and number of plots in each condition type. The five ecological provinces with fewer than 20 intact plots are excluded from analyses that compare plot species richness to PPWI. Average species richness at the quadrat, subplot, and plot level (fig. 7.2) and occupancy by introduced species (fig. 7.3) varied across the nine ecological provinces.

The values of PPWI for each ecological province with more than 20 intact plots were strongly related with the proportion of forest edge plots (fig. 7.4a) and with the average plot species richness (fig. 7.4b). At the broad regional scale, the proportion of forest edge plots explains a greater proportion of variation of PPWI than average species richness.

Table 7.1 – Proportion of plots with at least one introduced species (PPWI) and the number of plots in each condition type by ecological province.

Ecological province		PPWI	Condition type		
			Intact	Multiple Condition	Forest edge
Code	*Name*	*Percentage*	*Number of plots*		
211	Northeastern Mixed Forest	62.7	80	12	34
M211	Adirondack-New England Mixed Forest – Coniferous Forest – Alpine Meadow	41.6	65	12	12
212	Laurentian Mixed Forest	45.5	207	40	76
221	Eastern Broadleaf Forest	87.5	85	18	65
M221	Central Appalachian Broadleaf Forest – Coniferous Forest – Meadow	57.7	50	3	18
222	Midwest Broadleaf Forest	87.2	49	11	81
223	Central Interior Broadleaf Forest	70.2	112	14	65
231	Southeastern Mixed Forest	80	5	0	0
232	Outer Coastal Plain Mixed Forest	64.6	28	4	33
251	Prairie Parkland (Temperate)	85.5	24	4	55
255	Prairie Parkland (Subtropical)	100	3	1	0
331	Great Plains – Palouse Dry Steppe	100	3	0	11
332	Great Plains Steppe	100	5	1	9
M334	Black Hills Coniferous Forest	85.7	4	0	3



Figure 7.1 – Average percentage of introduced species and relative cover by condition type for plots with introduced species. Error bars represent plus and minus one standard error.



Figure 7.2 – Average species richness for Quadrats, Subplots, and Plots of 100-percent forested by ecological province. Error bars represent plus and minus one standard error.



Figure 7.3 – Occupancy of introduced species by ecological province. Error bars represent plus and minus one standard error.



Figure 7.4 - Relationship between PPWI and proportion of forest edge plots (a.) and average plot species richness (b.) across ecological provinces.

Average plot species richness compilations do not include forest edge plots because species richness is related to area sampled, and forest edge plots are not fully forested. However, percentage of introduced species and relative cover are not area-sensitive metrics, unlike direct assessments of species richness, so all plots within each ecological province are included. Each plot does have at least one fully forested subplot, however. The relationship between subplot species richness and PPWI was not as strong ($r^2 = 0.32$), as that for plot species richness and PPWI.

The ecological provinces also varied from one another by the most common introduced species recorded (table 7.2). The constancies for this short list of species drops quickly in those ecological provinces with lower introduced species occupancy measures (M211, 212).

Growth habits of introduced species by ecological provinces

Examination of the distribution of introduced species by growth habits across ecological provinces reveals some interesting trends (table 7.3). Overall, forbs made up the largest proportion of both native and introduced species, ranging from about 45 percent of native species in ecological province 232 to over 72 percent of introduced species in ecological province 212. The proportion of graminoids (grass and grass-like plants) ranged from 10 percent for introduced species in ecological province 212 to about 24 percent for introduced species in ecological province 251. Proportion of shrubs ranged from 9 percent for introduced species in ecological province M211 to 30 percent for introduced species in ecological province 232. Tree species made up less than 5 percent of introduced species in ecological provinces 232 and 251, but accounted for over 23 percent of native species in ecological province 232.

Results of the chi-square test for independence show that in over half of the ecological provinces, the distribution of native and introduced species by growth habit were significantly different. The greatest difference was in ecological province 212, and there were no significant differences ($\alpha \geq 0.05$) in ecological provinces M211, 221, 232, and 251.

Species distribution by condition type

We plotted the constancy of the 23 selected species in each condition type to see if they followed the trend of being more commonly recorded on forest edge plots (fig 7.5). Most species do follow this trend, but several do not. Note how prevalent multiflora rose (*Rosa multiflora*) is across the region.

Table 7.2 – The five most common introduced species per ecological province.

Ecological Province (number of plots)			
Scientific name	**Common Name**	**Growth Habit**	**Constancy**
211 Northeastern Mixed Forest (n = 126)			
Rosa multiflora	multiflora rose	Vine, Shrub	11.90
Anthoxanthum odoratum	sweet vernalgrass	Graminoid	10.32
Epipactis helleborine	helleborine	Forb/herb	10.32
Lonicera morrowii	Morrow's honeysuckle	Shrub	9.52
Hieracium caespitosum	meadow hawkweed	Forb/herb	7.94
M211 Adirondack-New England Mixed Forest – Coniferous Forest – Alpine Meadow (n = 89)			
Epipactis helleborine	helleborine	Forb/herb	12.36
Phleum pratense	timothy	Graminoid	6.74
Leucanthemum vulgare	oxeye daisy	Forb/herb	5.62
Vicia cracca	bird vetch	Vine, Forb/herb	5.62
Trifolium aureum	golden clover	Forb/herb	4.49
212 Laurentian Mixed Forest (n = 323)			
Hieracium aurantiacum	orange hawkweed	Forb/herb	10.84
Rumex acetosella	common sheep sorrel	Forb/herb	4.64
Polygonum convolvulus	black bindweed	Vine, Forb/herb	4.33
Solanum dulcamara	climbing nightshade	Forb/herb	4.33
Phleum pratense	timothy	Graminoid	3.72
221 Eastern Broadleaf Forest (n = 168)			
Rosa multiflora	multiflora rose	Vine, Shrub	70.24
Lonicera japonica	Japanese honeysuckle	Vine	23.21
Berberis thunbergii	Japanese barberry	Shrub	19.05
Polygonum persicaria	spotted ladysthumb	Forb/herb	18.45
Alliaria petiolata	garlic mustard	Forb/herb	17.86
M221 – Central Appalachian Broadleaf Forest – Coniferous Forest – Meadow (n = 71)			
Rosa multiflora	multiflora rose	Vine, Shrub	29.58
Microstegium vimineum	Nepalese browntop	Graminoid	15.49
Elaeagnus umbellata	autumn olive	Shrub	15.49
Berberis thunbergii	Japanese barberry	Shrub	12.68
Alliaria petiolata	garlic mustard	Forb/herb	12.68
222 - Midwest Broadleaf Forest (n = 141)			
Rosa multiflora	multiflora rose	Vine, Shrub	45.39
Alliaria petiolata	garlic mustard	Forb/herb	24.11
Glechoma hederacea	ground ivy	Forb/herb	15.60
Phalaris arundinacea	reed canarygrass	Graminoid	13.48
Phleum pratense	timothy	Graminoid	12.06
223 - Central Interior Broadleaf Forest (n = 191)			
Rosa multiflora	multiflora rose	Vine, Shrub	41.36
Lonicera japonica	Japanese honeysuckle	Vine	19.89
Daucus carota	Queen Anne's lace	Forb/herb	10.99
Elaeagnus umbellata	autumn olive	Shrub	5.76
Lolium pratense	meadow ryegrass	Graminoid	5.24

231 - Southeastern Mixed Forest (n = 5)			
Lonicera japonica	Japanese honeysuckle	Vine	60.00
Microstegium vimineum	Nepalese browntop	Graminoid	60.00
Rosa multiflora	multiflora rose	Vine, Shrub	40.00
Rhamnus cathartica	common buckthorn	Tree, Shrub	20.00
Commelina communis	Asiatic dayflower	Forb/herb	20.00
232 - Outer Coastal Plain Mixed Forest (n = 65)			
Lonicera japonica	Japanese honeysuckle	Vine	47.69
Rosa multiflora	multiflora rose	Vine, Shrub	15.38
Polygonum hydropiper	marshpepper knotweed	Forb/herb	6.15
Hypericum perforatum	common St. Johnswort	Forb/herb	4.62
Microstegium vimineum	Nepalese browntop	Graminoid	4.62
251 - Prairie Parkland (Temperate) (n = 83)			
Rosa multiflora	multiflora rose	Vine, Shrub	46.99
Polygonum convolvulus	black bindweed	Vine, Forb/herb	16.87
Phalaris arundinacea	reed canarygrass	Graminoid	15.66
Morus alba	white mulberry	Tree, Shrub	15.66
Lolium arundinaceum	tall fescue	Graminoid	14.46
255 - Prairie Parkland (Subtropical) (n = 4)			
Rosa multiflora	multiflora rose	Vine, Shrub	50.00
Morus alba	white mulberry	Tree, Shrub	50.00
Torilis arvensis	spreading hedgeparsley	Forb/herb	50.00
Lespedeza cuneata	Chinese lespedeza	Subshrub, Shrub, Forb	50.00
Lolium arundinaceum	tall fescue	Graminoid	25.00
331 - Great Plains – Palouse Dry Steppe (n = 14)			
Tragopogon dubius	yellow salsify	Forb/herb	35.71
Melilotus officinalis	yellow sweetclover	Forb/herb	28.57
Bromus japonicus	Japanese brome	Graminoid	28.57
Nepeta cataria	catnip	Forb/herb	21.43
Lactuca serriola	prickly lettuce	Forb/herb	21.43
332 - Great Plains Steppe (n = 15)			
Morus alba	white mulberry	Tree, Shrub	40.00
Medicago lupulina	black medick	Forb/herb	26.67
Melilotus officinalis	yellow sweetclover	Forb/herb	20.00
Trifolium repens	white clover	Forb/herb	20.00
Verbascum thapsus	common mullein	Forb/herb	20.00
M334 – Black Hills Coniferous Forest (n = 7)			
Poa compressa	Canada bluegrass	Graminoid	28.57
Cirsium arvense	Canada thistle	Forb/herb	28.57
Artemisia absinthium	absinthium	Subshrub, Shrub, Forb	28.57
Agropyron cristatum	crested wheatgrass	Graminoid	14.29
Tragopogon dubius	yellow salsify	Forb/herb	14.29

Table 7.3 – Percentage of native and introduced species by growth habit and results of chi-squared test of independence (degrees of freedom =3) to determine if species origin and growth habits were independent within each ecological province. Significant differences are greater for larger chi-square values and indicate species origin and growth habit are dependent; that is, native and introduced species have different distributions across growth habits.

Ecological Province	Species Origin	Growth habit				Chi-square	Significance Level (alpha)
		Forb	Graminoid	Shrub	Tree		
		- - - - - - - - - - - - - *Percentage*- - - - - - - - - - -					
211	Native	46.86	20.93	15.14	17.07		
211	Introduced	59.81	14.02	16.82	9.35	8.9	0.030
M211	Native	46.21	19.19	17.30	17.30		
M211	Introduced	63.64	20.45	9.09	6.82	6.7	0.076
212	Native	47.00	19.07	19.62	14.31		
212	Introduced	72.73	10.00	11.82	5.45	25.1	> 0.001
221	Native	49.49	17.75	14.86	17.89		
221	Introduced	54.74	16.79	17.52	10.95	4.5	0.212
M221	Native	52.21	13.97	13.24	20.59		
M221	Introduced	50.91	16.36	25.45	7.27	9.7	0.022
222	Native	52.72	14.43	15.91	16.94		
222	Introduced	64.79	14.79	11.97	8.45	9.8	0.020
223	Native	58.01	12.78	13.34	15.87		
223	Introduced	60.67	19.10	12.36	7.87	5.9	0.117
232	Native	44.98	14.53	16.96	23.53		
232	Introduced	47.62	16.67	30.95	4.76	10.1	0.018
251	Native	55.18	17.93	12.30	14.59		
251	Introduced	61.90	23.81	9.52	4.76	7.7	0.052

Regional distribution of selected species

Figures 7.6-7.10 display the regional distribution of selected forbs, grasses, woody shrubs and vines, and trees. Background shadings on maps represent ecological provinces (Cleland and others 2005). Some species are wide-spread throughout the northeastern forests, while others are concentrated in particular ecological provinces (table 7.4).



Figure 7.5 – Constancy of selected species by condition type.



Figure 7.6 - Distribution of selected forb species. Plot locations are approximate.



Figure 7.7 - Distribution of selected grass species. Plot locations are approximate.



Figure 7.8 – Distribution of selected introduced non-tree woody plants. Plot locations are approximate.



Figure 7.9 – Distribution of multiflora rose, the most commonly reported introduced species in the Region. Plot locations are approximate.



Figure 7.10 – Distribution of selected introduced tree species. In some areas buckthorn is more of a shrub than a small tree. Plot locations are approximate.

Table 7.4 – Constancy of selected introduced species for the region and by ecological province.

		Ecological Province Codes (number of plots)								
Common name	Region (1302)	211 (126)	M211 (89)	212 (323)	221 (168)	M221 (71)	222 (141)	223 (191)	232 (65)	251 (83)
Forbs		*Percentage of plots where species was recorded*								
garlic mustard	7.3	6.35	0.00	0.00	17.86	12.68	24.11	2.62	0.00	7.23
lesser burdock	3.3	5.56	0.00	0.62	3.57	0.00	8.51	1.57	0.00	9.64
Queen Anne's lace	6.1	3.17	0.00	1.24	11.31	5.63	12.06	10.99	0.00	10.84
broadleaf helleborine	2.1	10.32	12.36	0.31	0.60	0.00	0.71	0.00	0.00	0.00
ground ivy	4.99	3.17	0.00	0.62	16.67	2.82	15.60	0.52	1.54	4.82
orange hawkweed	4.5	3.97	3.37	10.84	1.19	0.00	7.09	1.57	0.00	0.00
St. Johnswort	3.15	3.17	2.25	3.10	4.76	1.41	4.26	2.62	4.62	1.20
oxeye daisy	4.6	4.76	5.62	3.10	11.31	4.23	5.67	1.57	1.54	3.61
climbing nightshade	3.38	7.14	1.12	4.33	1.19	0.00	11.35	0.52	0.00	0.00
black bindweed	4.22	0.79	0.00	4.33	4.76	5.63	4.96	2.62	0.00	16.87
Grasses										
sweet vernalgrass	2.23	10.32	0.00	0.00	7.14	2.82	0.71	0.00	1.54	0.00
orchardgrass	4.15	3.17	0.00	0.62	11.90	5.63	7.09	2.09	0.00	9.64
Nepalese browntop	3.0	3.17	0.00	0.00	5.36	15.49	0.71	3.14	4.62	1.20
reed canarygrass	4.99	5.56	1.12	3.41	4.17	0.00	13.48	1.57	0.00	15.66
timothy	4.9	6.35	6.74	3.72	8.33	0.00	12.06	0.00	0.00	8.43
Shrubs										
Japanese barberry	4.38	3.97	2.25	0.31	19.05	12.68	3.55	0.52	1.54	1.20
autumn olive	3.5	1.59	0.00	0.62	5.95	15.49	4.26	5.76	1.54	1.20
Amur honeysuckle	3.0	0.79	0.00	0.00	2.38	1.41	9.22	5.24	3.08	8.43
Vines										
Japanese honeysuckle	10.29	0.00	0.00	0.00	23.21	7.04	9.93	19.90	47.69	1.20
multiflora rose	27.65	11.90	0.00	2.17	70.24	29.58	45.39	41.36	15.38	46.99
Trees										
tree-of-heaven	2.76	0.00	0.00	0.00	12.50	11.27	2.13	0.52	3.08	0.00
white mulberry	3.3	0.00	0.00	0.00	2.98	0.00	3.55	4.71	3.08	15.66
common buckthorn	3.23	2.38	3.37	1.55	5.36	0.00	10.64	0.00	0.00	7.23

Discussion

Estimates of occupancy by introduced species by condition type, a coarse measure of forest fragmentation, suggest that introduced species are more abundant on forest edges. An examination of the adjacent non-forest conditions in this data set revealed that the vast majority of non-forest lands on forest edge plots are either developed, agricultural, or range, indicating a close proximity to human activities. This trend was followed at the ecological province level; provinces with a higher percentage of forest edge plots had higher occupancy of introduced species. At finer scales, other predictors for introduced species may prove to be more useful. Fortunately, because data are collected and stored at the subplot level, it will be possible to do further analyses.

The ecological province summaries showed different rates of introduced species occupancy. Provinces M211, 212, and 223 had the lowest occupancy as measured by percentage of introduced species and relative cover (fig. 7.3); together, these provinces include about 48 percent of the plots in this study. Province 223 did have a high rate of PPWI, however (table 7.1).

The full census of vascular plants on each plot allowed us to examine trends of introduced species in terms of growth habits; surveys limited to short lists of species can only assess those species on the list, and are not likely to give a clear picture of overall trends. In an earlier analysis of invasive species in the upper mid-west (Moser and others 2009), it was speculated that herbaceous plants are less likely to invade northern forests. Using the full species lists, we found that the proportion of introduced forbs is greater than the proportion of native forb species in ecological province 212, which encompasses the northern portions of Michigan, Wisconsin, and Minnesota.

Multiflora rose is by far the most common introduced species in the Region, with an overall constancy of 27.65 percent, and as high as 70 percent in province 221. However, it was not recorded in province M211 (table 7.4). Although it probably does occur within the province, the fact that it was not recorded on any of the 89 forested plots illustrates that it is much less prominent there. Originally introduced to the U.S. as root stock for ornamental roses, it was widely promoted starting in the 1930s as a natural fence row to contain live stock, then promoted as a wildlife forage species and crash barrier in highway medians (Swearingen and others 2010). It's not surprising that it is so wide-spread today.

We have the ability to look at the distribution of any individual species recorded in the inventory. Although it was not practical to examine every introduced species for this report, we examined the distribution of several species of high interest (figs. 7.5 – 7.10; table 7.4). The species highlighted in figures 7.6-7.10 show a variety of ranges. Orange hawkweed (*Hieracium aurantiacum*) was most concentrated in ecological province 212 where intact forest plots are more common than forest edge plots (fig 7.6 and table 7.1). Timothy (*Phleum pretense*), a grass so common it is often mistaken for a native species, was widespread, while Nepalese browntop (*Microstegium vimineum*), was limited to the southern portion of the Region.

Most of the selected species followed the trend of being recorded more often in forest edge or multiple forest condition plots but a few did not (fig. 7.5). Shade-tolerant species are troubling because they can survive in closed canopy forests, potentially far from traffic corridors where they may have originally been introduced.

Tree of heaven (*Ailianthus altissima*) is a short-lived, pollution tolerant tree. It grows fast, up to one to two meters per year in its first few years. Although it grows best in full sunlight, it is able to take advantage of gaps in the forest canopy and quickly fill them (Knapp and Canham 2000). It also produces an alleopthic chemical that inhibits most other nearby plant growth (Mergen 1959). One species that is not affected by this chemical is white ash (*Fraxinus americana*) (Mergen 1959). Indeed, white ash was present on 26 of the 39 plots where tree-of-heaven was recorded.

Nepalese browntop, also known as Japanese stiltgrass, is problematic in more southern climates, but has been found as far north as Massachusetts and New York. It reproduces vegetatively and by seed and is prevalent along river corridors. Seed dispersal is facilitated along waterways by flooding where spread of seeds increases (Swearingen and others 2010; Warren and others 2011). Preliminary mapping has shown the spread and establishment along waterways, roads and hiking trails in undisturbed forests (Shelton unpublished data). It has also been observed in openings on the forest floor in canopy gaps. It is thought that the seeds are also being carried on the feet of animals (Angie Shelton, pers. comm.). Kuhman and others (2010) found that in the southern Appalachians, this grass was positively correlated with forest canopy cover, unlike the other species in their study. Twenty six of 39 plots with

stiltgrass were intact forest, with 13 different forest types represented. However, nine of those plots were in the white oak/red oak/ hickory type. As the floods of 2011 recede, we may see an increase of this invasive grass.

Broadleaf helleborine (*Epipactis helleborine*) was found slightly more often in intact forests than forest edges plots (fig. 7.5). It was relatively common (ranked 34th among 305 species), but concentrated in provinces 211 and M211 (table 7.4). Little information could be found on this particular species. However, Swearingen and others (2010) list it as a plant "to watch" in the mid-Atlantic states as it becomes more wide-spread in dry, gravely soils in forests and woodland edges. Because VEG data collection included all vascular species, we were able to provide information on the distribution of up-and-coming species of concern.

Common buckthorn and Japanese barberry (*Berberis thunbergii*) are found nearly as often in intact forests as in forest edge or multiple condition plots (fig. 7.5). Buckthorn is a good example of a cultivated plant that survived for many years and then became naturalized and spread into natural areas. While best growth is in full light, it produces an abundance of seed that can germinate in partial light conditions and are borne in berries that are spread by birds. (Swearingen and others 2010). Japanese barberry was promoted as an ornamental plant in the late 1800s; it rapidly spread into abandoned agricultural fields and open areas. DeGasperis and Motzkin (2007) studied the current distribution of this species and found it occurred more often in forests that re-established after agriculture abandonment in the early 20th century, after barberry had been introduced. More modern disturbances did not result in additional spread if seed sources were not immediately available and although barberry may be present in areas that were wooded in the early 20th century, it occurs in a smaller proportion of these stands.

One species we expected to see more often on intact plots was garlic mustard (*Alliaria petiolata)*, known for its shade tolerance. Although it was wide spread in the southeastern portion of the region (fig. 7.6), it was recorded most often on forest edge plots (fig. 7.5).

It is often preferable to summarize data by ecological province and forest type in reports focused on FIA data. In this data set, there are 212 ecological province/forest type pairs, 89 of which are represented by 1 plot, and a total of 166 have 5 or fewer plots. There are 27 pairs with at least 10 plots, and 13 of these ecological province/forest type pairs were designated as either multiple conditions or forest edge condition types. This data set is only about 60 percent of the total P3 grid for the region; more thorough analyses should be conducted with a complete set of FIA-P3 plots.

Conclusion

The FIA-P3 VEG data allow for estimation of the occupancy of introduced species in terms of percent number of introduced species and relative cover. Results indicate a strong influence of forest fragmentation on the regional distribution of introduced species. Occupancy of introduced species varied across ecological provinces; ecological provinces with a higher proportion of forest edge plots had the highest occupancy by introduced species.

Although the proportion of introduced species by growth habits was different from the proportion of native species in each growth habit for more than half of the provinces, forb species dominated both native and introduced growth habits in all ecological provinces. The two provinces with the lowest occupancy of introduced species (M211 and 212) had higher proportions of introduced forb species compared to their proportion of native forb species.

The distribution of individual species varied across ecological provinces and by condition type. Multiflora rose was by far the most common introduced species, but varied in constancy from zero (M211) to 70-percent (221). Of the selected species, most were recorded in forest edge or multiple condition plots, but a few were found more often in intact forest stands. One of the more commonly recorded forb species, broadleaf helleborine, was found more often on intact forest plots, and has only recently become a species to watch for invasive tendencies. We are able to report on the distribution of this species because of the full vascular plant species inventories available from plots where VEG data has been recorded.

Our findings highlight the importance of efforts to manage roadside and trailhead vegetation to minimize the spread of introduced and potentially invasive plant species into intact forests. This Region-wide analysis examining the distribution of introduced species that have established in the forests of the northeastern United States is just a beginning. Further examination of distribution and abundance within each ecological province are possible with

these data. However, with the additional plot data collected in 2009 and 2010, more ecological province/ forest type pairs and some revisited plots will be available, providing for new ways to examine trends and report indications of changing species distributions.

Literature Cited

Bechtold, W.A.; Patterson P.L. eds. 2005**.** The enhanced Forest Inventory and Analysis Program–national sampling design and estimation procedures. Gen. Tech. Rep. SRS-80. Ashville, NC: U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Southern Research Station. 85 p.

Cleland, D.T.; Freeouf, J.A.; Keys, J.E.; Nowacki, G.J.; Carpenter, C.A.; McNab, W.H. 2005. Ecological subregions; sections and subsections for the conterminous United States. [Map on CD-ROM [1:3,500,000]]. (A.M. Sloan, cartographer) Washington DC: U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service.

DeGasperis, B.G.; Motzkin, G. 2007. Windows of opportunity: Historical and Ecological Controls on *Berberis thunbergii* Invasions. Ecology, 88(12): 3115-3125.

Heinz Center. 2006. Filling the gaps: priority data needs and key management challenges for national reporting on ecosystem condition. Washington, DC: H. John Heinz Center for Science, Economics and the Environment. 104 p.

Hutchinson, T.F.; Vankat, J.L. 1997. Invasibility and effects of amur honeysuckle in southwestern Ohio forests. Conservation Biology 11 (5):117-1124.

Knapp, L.B.; Canham, C.D. 2000. Invasion of an old-growth forest in New York by *Ailanthus altissima*: sapling growth and recruitment in canopy gaps. Journal of the Torrey Botanical Society. 127 (4); 307-315.

Kuhman, T. R.; Pearson, S. M.; Turner, M. G. 2010. Effects of land-use history and the contemporary landscape on non-native plant invasion at the local and regional scales in the forest-dominated southern Appalachians. Landscape Ecology 25 (9):1433-1445 .

Mack, R.N. 2003. Plant naturalizations and invasions in the eastern United States: 1634-1860. Ann. Missouri Bot. Gard. 90 (1):77-90.

Meiners, S.J.; Picktt, S.T.; Cadenasso, M.L . 2002. Exotic plant invasions over 40 years of old field successions: community patterns and associations. Ecography 25 (2): 215-223.

Mergen, F. 1959. A toxic principle in the leaves of Ailanthus. Botanical Gazette. 121 (1); 32-36.

Moser, W.K.; Hansen, M.D.; Nelson, M.D.; McWilliams, W.H. 2009. Relationship of invasive ground cover plant presence to evidence of disturbance in forests of the upper Midwest of the United States. In Kohli, R.K.; Jose, S.; Singh, H.P.; Batish, D.E., eds. Invasive plants and forest ecosystems. Boca Ratan, FL. CRC Press 29-58.

Noss, R.F. 1999. Assessing and monitoring forest biodiversity: A suggested framework and indicators. Forest Ecology and Management. 115(March):135-146.

Pimentel, D.; Zuniga, R.; Morrison, D. 2005. Update on the environmental and economic costs associated with alien-invasive species in the United States. Ecological Economics. 52 (3): 273-288.

Richardson, D.M.; Pyšek, P., 2006. Plant invasions: Merging concepts of species invasiveness and community invisibility. Progress in Physical Geography. 30 (3) 409-431

Schulz, B. K.; Bechtold, W.A.; Zarnoch, S.J. 2009. Sampling and estimation procedures for the vegetation diversity and structure indicator. PNW-GTR-781. Portland, OR: U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Pacific Northwest Research Station, 53 p.

Shelton, Angie. *Predicting Invasive Species Spread*. MS. *Indiana University*. Web. 11 May 2011. <http://www.indiana.edu/~preserve/InvasiveSpread/home>.

Stohlgren, T.J.; Binkely, D.; Chong, G.W.; Kalkhan, M.A.; Schell, L.A.; Bull, K.A.; Otsuki, Y.; Newman, G.; Baskin, M.; Son, Y. 1999. Exotic plant species invade hotspots of native plant diversity. Ecological Monographs 69(1); pp 25-46.Swearingen, J.; Slattery, B.; Reshetiloff, K.; Zwicker, S. 2010. Plant Invaders of Mid-Atlantic Natural Areas, 4th ed.

U.S. Department of Agriculture, Natural Resource Conservation Service (USDA NRCS). 2000. The PLANTS Database (http://npdc.usda.gov/,). National Plant Data Center, Baton Rouge, LA 70874-4490 USA

U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service. 2007. Forest inventory and analysis national core field guide: field data collection procedures for phase 3 plots. Version 4.0. U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Washington Office. Internal report. On file with: U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service (The current version is available online at: http://fia.fs.fed.us/library/field-guides-methods-proc/)

Vilà, M.; Ibàñez, I. 2011. Plant invasions in the landscape. Landscape Ecology 26 (4):461-472.
Warren, R.J.; Bahn, V.; Kramer, T.D.; Tang, Y.; Bradford, M.A. 2011. Performance and reproduction of an exotic invader across temperate forest gradients. Ecosphere. 2 (2) Article 14. www.esajournals.org
Webster, C.R.; Jenkins, M.A.; Jose, S., 2006. Woody invaders and the challenges they pose to forest ecosystems in the eastern United States. Journal of Forestry104 (7): 366-374.

Appendix 7.1 – Introduced species recorded on 1,302 plots in Northeastern United States, in order of number of plots where recorded.

Common name	Scientific name	Number of plots
multiflora rose	*Rosa multiflora* Thunb. ex Murr.	360
Japanese honeysuckle	*Lonicera japonica* Thunb.	134
garlic mustard	*Alliaria petiolata* (Bieb.) Cavara & Grande	95
Queen Anne's lace	*Daucus carota* L.	80
reed canarygrass	*Phalaris arundinacea* L.	65
ground ivy	*Glechoma hederacea* L.	65
timothy	*Phleum pratense* L.	64
oxeye daisy	*Leucanthemum vulgare* Lam.	60
orange hawkweed	*Hieracium aurantiacum* L.	59
Japanese barberry	*Berberis thunbergii* DC.	57
black bindweed	*Polygonum convolvulus* L.	55
orchardgrass	*Dactylis glomerata* L.	54
spotted ladysthumb	*Polygonum persicaria* L.	54
red clover	*Trifolium pratense* L.	51
white clover	*Trifolium repens* L.	49
autumn olive	*Elaeagnus umbellata* Thunb.	46
climbing nightshade	*Solanum dulcamara* L.	44
white mulberry	*Morus alba* L.	43
lesser burdock	*Arctium minus* Bernh.	43
common buckthorn	*Rhamnus cathartica* L.	42
common St. Johnswort	*Hypericum perforatum* L.	41
Nepalese browntop	*Microstegium vimineum* (Trin.) A. Camus	39
Amur honeysuckle	*Lonicera maackii* (Rupr.) Herder	39
tree of heaven	*Ailanthus altissima* (P. Mill.) Swingle	36
common sheep sorrel	*Rumex acetosella* L.	36
meadow ryegrass	*Lolium pratense* (Huds.) S.J. Darbyshire	33
Canada bluegrass	*Poa compressa* L.	32
black medick	*Medicago lupulina* L.	30
sweet vernalgrass	*Anthoxanthum odoratum* L.	29
yellow sweetclover	*Melilotus officinalis* (L.) Lam.	29
sulphur cinquefoil	*Potentilla recta* L.	29
redtop	*Agrostis gigantea* Roth	28
Morrow's honeysuckle	*Lonicera morrowii* Gray	28
broad-leaved helleborine	*Epipactis helleborine* (L.) Crantz	27
glossy buckthorn	*Frangula alnus* P. Mill.	26
quackgrass	*Elymus repens* (L.) Gould	25
Asian bittersweet	*Celastrus orbiculata* Thunb.	25
narrowleaf plantain	*Plantago lanceolata* L.	25
creeping jenny	*Lysimachia nummularia* L.	25
curly dock	*Rumex crispus* L.	25
common mullein	*Verbascum thapsus* L.	25
Tatarian honeysuckle	*Lonicera tatarica* L.	24
Canada thistle	*Cirsium arvense* (L.) Scop.	23
bull thistle	*Cirsium vulgare* (Savi) Ten.	23
rough bluegrass	*Poa trivialis* L.	22
tall fescue	*Lolium arundinaceum* (Schreb.) S.J. Darbyshire	21

Common name	Scientific name	Number of plots
European privet	*Ligustrum vulgare* L.	20
sweet cherry	*Prunus avium* (L.) L.	20
spreading hedgeparsley	*Torilis arvensis* (Huds.) Link	19
Deptford pink	*Dianthus armeria* L.	18
bird vetch	*Vicia cracca* L.	18
Scotch pine	*Pinus sylvestris* L.	17
prickly lettuce	*Lactuca serriola* L.	17
meadow hawkweed	*Hieracium caespitosum* Dumort.	17
coltsfoot	*Tussilago farfara* L.	17
yellow salsify	*Tragopogon dubius* Scop.	16
Asiatic dayflower	*Commelina communis* L.	15
common velvetgrass	*Holcus lanatus* L.	14
catnip	*Nepeta cataria* L.	14
common hawkweed	*Hieracium lachenalii* K.C. Gmel.	14
bitter dock	*Rumex obtusifolius* L.	14
golden clover	*Trifolium aureum* Pollich	14
wine raspberry	*Rubus phoenicolasius* Maxim.	13
Japanese brome	*Bromus japonicus* Thunb. ex Murr.	11
annual bluegrass	*Poa annua* L.	11
big chickweed	*Cerastium fontanum ssp. vulgare* Baumg.	11
marshpepper knotweed	*Polygonum hydropiper* L.	11
dames rocket	*Hesperis matronalis* L.	11
common motherwort	*Leonurus cardiaca* L.	11
Chinese lespedeza	*Lespedeza cuneata* (Dum.-Cours.) G. Don	11
tall morning-glory	*Ipomoea purpurea* (L.) Roth	11
common chickweed	*Stellaria media* (L.) Vill.	11
common sowthistle	*Sonchus oleraceus* L.	11
purple crownvetch	*Coronilla varia* L.	10
Indian strawberry	*Duchesnea indica* (Andr.) Focke	10
Russian olive	*Elaeagnus angustifolia* L.	10
spotted knapweed	*Centaurea biebersteinii* DC.	10
fly honeysuckle	*Lonicera x xylosteoides* Tausch	10
oriental ladysthumb	*Polygonum cespitosum* Blume	10
butter and eggs	*Linaria vulgaris* P. Mill.	10
birdfoot deervetch	*Lotus corniculatus* L.	10
garden yellowrocket	*Barbarea vulgaris* Ait. f.	10
alsike clover	*Trifolium hybridum* L.	10
common reed	*Phragmites australis* (Cav.) Trin. ex Steud.	9
common mouse-ear chickweed	*Cerastium fontanum* Baumg.	9
Norway spruce	*Picea abies* (L.) Karst.	9
false baby's breath	*Galium mollugo* L.	9
spotted snapweed	*Impatiens balsamina* L.	9
nodding plumeless thistle	*Carduus nutans* L.	8
paradise apple	*Malus pumila* P. Mill.	8
Norway maple	*Acer platanoides* L.	8
common tansy	*Tanacetum vulgare* L.	8
narrowleaf cattail	*Typha angustifolia* L.	8
field bindweed	*Convolvulus arvensis* L.	7
brittlestem hempnettle	*Galeopsis tetrahit* L.	7

Common name	Scientific name	Number of plots
alfalfa	*Medicago sativa* L.	7
greater burdock	*Arctium lappa* L.	7
mouseear hawkweed	*Hieracium pilosella* L.	7
green bristlegrass	*Setaria viridis* (L.) Beauv.	7
field clover	*Trifolium campestre* Schreb.	7
cheatgrass	*Bromus tectorum* L.	6
poison hemlock	*Conium maculatum* L.	6
Fuller's teasel	*Dipsacus fullonum ssp. sylvestris* L.	6
marijuana	*Cannabis sativa* L.	6
colonial bentgrass	*Agrostis capillaris* L.	6
love-lies-bleeding	*Amaranthus caudatus* L.	6
wild garlic	*Allium vineale* L.	6
white sweetclover	*Melilotus alba* Medikus	6
corn speedwell	*Veronica arvensis* L.	6
Johnsongrass	*Sorghum halepense* (L.) Pers.	6
Jack-go-to-bed-at-noon	*Tragopogon pratensis* L.	6
Siberian elm	*Ulmus pumila* L.	6
wild parsnip	*Pastinaca sativa* L.	5
barnyardgrass	*Echinochloa crus-galli* (L.) Beauv.	5
winged burning bush	*Euonymus alata* (Thunb.) Sieb.	5
chicory	*Cichorium intybus* L.	5
dwarf honeysuckle	*Lonicera xylosteum* L.	5
common barberry	*Berberis vulgaris* L.	5
Japanese knotweed	*Polygonum cuspidatum* Sieb. & Zucc.	5
celandine	*Chelidonium majus* L.	5
purple loosestrife	*Lythrum salicaria* L.	5
maidenstears	*Silene vulgaris* (Moench) Garcke	5
field sowthistle	*Sonchus arvensis* L.	5
princesstree	*Paulownia tomentosa* (Thunb.) Sieb. & Zucc. ex Steud.	4
creeping buttercup	*Ranunculus repens* L.	4
burnweed	*Erechtites hieracifolia* (L.) Raf. ex DC.	4
marsh thistle	*Cirsium palustre* (L.) Scop.	4
absinthium	*Artemisia absinthium* L.	4
ornamental jewelweed	*Impatiens glandulifera* Royle	4
hairy catsear	*Hypochaeris radicata* L.	4
henbit deadnettle	*Lamium amplexicaule* L.	4
Korean clover	*Kummerowia stipulacea* (Maxim.) Makino	4
Japanese clover	*Kummerowia striata* (Thunb.) Schindl.	4
tall hawkweed	*Hieracium piloselloides* Vill.	4
rugosa rose	*Rosa rugosa* Thunb.	4
prickly Russian thistle	*Salsola tragus* L.	4
black nightshade	*Solanum nigrum* L.	4
grasslike starwort	*Stellaria graminea* L.	4
corn gromwell	*Buglossoides arvensis* (L.) I.M. Johnston	3
leafy spurge	*Euphorbia esula* L.	3
winter creeper	*Euonymus fortunei* (Turcz.) Hand.-Maz.	3
silver cinquefoil	*Potentilla argentea* L.	3
hoary false madwort	*Berteroa incana* (L.) DC.	3

Common name	Scientific name	Number of plots
Austrian pine	*Pinus nigra* Arnold	3
musk mallow	*Malva moschata* L.	3
common mallow	*Malva neglecta* Wallr.	3
dwarf snapdragon	*Chaenorhinum minus* (L.) Lange	3
hedge false bindweed	*Calystegia sepium ssp. sepium* (L.) R. Br.	3
oriental bittersweet	*Celastrus orbiculatus* Thunb.	3
rampion bellflower	*Campanula rapunculoides* L.	3
peppermint	*Mentha x piperita* L. (pro sp.)	3
true forget-me-not	*Myosotis scorpioides* L.	3
purple deadnettle	*Lamium purpureum* L.	3
redstar	*Ipomoea coccinea* L.	3
corn	*Zea mays* L.	3
witch's moneybags	*Hylotelephium telephium ssp. telephium* (L.) H. Ohba.	3
germander speedwell	*Veronica chamaedrys* L.	3
common wheat	*Triticum aestivum* L.	3
beefsteakplant	*Perilla frutescens* (L.) Britt.	2
shepherd's purse	*Capsella bursa-pastoris* (L.) Medik.	2
meadow brome	*Bromus commutatus* Schrad.	2
lesser pond sedge	*Carex acutiformis* Ehrh.	2
India mustard	*Brassica juncea* (L.) Czern.	2
field mustard	*Brassica rapa* L.	2
smooth hawksbeard	*Crepis capillaris* (L.) Wallr.	2
scarlet pimpernel	*Anagallis arvensis* L.	2
Chinese yam	*Dioscorea oppositifolia* L.	2
codlins and cream	*Epilobium hirsutum* L.	2
wormseed wallflower	*Erysimum cheiranthoides* L.	2
stinkgrass	*Eragrostis cilianensis* (All.) Vign. ex Janchen	2
smooth crabgrass	*Digitaria ischaemum* (Schreb.) Schreb. ex Muhl.	2
David's spurge	*Euphorbia davidii* Subils	2
thymeleaf sandwort	*Arenaria serpyllifolia* L.	2
spearmint	*Mentha spicata* L.	2
meadow foxtail	*Alopecurus pratensis* L.	2
redroot amaranth	*Amaranthus retroflexus* L.	2
velvetleaf	*Abutilon theophrasti* Medik.	2
Yellow Spring bedstraw	*Galium verum* L.	2
gallant-soldier	*Galinsoga parviflora* Cav.	2
tall yellow sweetclover	*Melilotus altissimus* Thuill.	2
field pepperweed	*Lepidium campestre* (L.) Ait. f.	2
ivyleaf morning-glory	*Ipomoea hederacea* Jacq.	2
wild oat	*Avena fatua* L.	2
woolly burdock	*Arctium tomentosum* P. Mill.	2
Bermudagrass	*Cynodon dactylon* (L.) Pers.	2
rose of Sharon	*Hibiscus syriacus* L.	2
fig buttercup	*Ranunculus ficaria* L.	2
cereal rye	*Secale cereale* L.	2
white willow	*Salix alba* L.	2
Japanese bristlegrass	*Setaria faber*i Herrm.	2
spiny sowthistle	*Sonchus asper* (L.) Hill	2

Common name	Scientific name	Number of plots
yellow bristlegrass	*Setaria pumila* (Poir.) Roemer & J.A. Schultes	2
hedgemustard	*Sisymbrium officinale* (L.) Scop.	2
bladder campion	*Silene latifolia ssp. alba* Poir.	2
suckling clover	*Trifolium dubium* Sibthorp	2
garden vetch	*Vicia sativa* L.	2
common comfrey	*Symphytum officinale* L.	2
common periwinkle	*Vinca minor* L.	2
garden valerian	*Valeriana officinalis* L.	2
field pennycress	*Thlaspi arvense* L.	2
rabbitfoot clover	*Trifolium arvense* L.	2
erect hedgeparsley	*Torilis japonica* (Houtt.) DC.	2
birdeye speedwell	*Veronica persica* Poir.	2
stinging nettle	*Urtica dioica ssp. dioica* L.	2
pearl millet	*Pennisetum glaucum* (L.) R. Br.	1
Japanese pachysandra	*Pachysandra terminalis* Sieb. & Zucc.	1
erect brome	*Bromus erectus* Huds.	1
wild radish	*Raphanus raphanistrum* L.	1
black mustard	*Brassica nigra* (L.) W.D.J. Koch	1
Siberian peashrub	*Caragana arborescens* Lam.	1
Caucasian bluestem	*Bothriochloa bladhii* (Retz.) S.T. Blake	1
smooth brome	*Bromus inermis ssp. inermis var. inermis* Leyss.	1
whitetop	*Cardaria draba* (L.) Desv.	1
caraway	*Carum carvi* L.	1
bald brome	*Bromus racemosus* L.	1
Kenilworth ivy	*Cymbalaria muralis* P.G. Gaertn., B. Mey. & Scherb.	1
rye brome	*Bromus secalinus* L.	1
corn brome	*Bromus squarrosus* L.	1
tidalmarsh flatsedge	*Cyperus serotinus* Rottb.	1
splitlip hempnettle	*Galeopsis bifida* Boenn.	1
acacia	*Acacia sophorae* (Labill.) R.Br.	1
Indian teasel	*Dipsacus sativus* (L.) Honckeny	1
tall oatgrass	*Arrhenatherum elatius* (L.) Beauv. ex J.& K. Presl	1
birthwort	*Aristolochia clematitis* L.	1
garden chervil	*Anthriscus cerefolium* (L.) Hoffmann	1
corn chamomile	*Anthemis arvensis* L.	1
annual vernalgrass	*Anthoxanthum aristatum* Boiss.	1
annual wallrocket	*Diplotaxis muralis* (L.) DC.	1
violet crabgrass	*Digitaria violascens* Link	1
blessed thistle	*Cnicus benedictus* L.	1
weeping lovegrass	*Eragrostis curvula* (Schrad.) Nees	1
hairy cupgrass	*Eriochloa villosa* (Thunb.) Kunth	1
doubtful knight's-spur	*Consolida ajacis* (L.) Schur	1
buckwheat	*Fagopyrum esculentum* Moench	1
sweet autumn virginsbower	*Clematis terniflora* DC.	1
European spindletree	*Euonymus europaea* L.	1
blue flax	*Linum perenne* L.	1
rose campion	*Lychnis coronaria* (L.) Desr.	1
black bindweed	*Polygonum convolvulus var. convolvulus* L.	1

Common name	Scientific name	Number of plots
border privet	*Ligustrum obtusifolium* Sieb. & Zucc.	1
European stoneseed	*Lithospermum officinale* L.	1
Chinese privet	*Ligustrum sinense* Lour.	1
white poplar	*Populus alba* L.	1
oval-leaf knotweed	*Polygonum arenastrum* Jord. ex Boreau	1
gold-of-pleasure	*Camelina sativa* (L.) Crantz	1
oakleaf goosefoot	*Chenopodium glaucum* L.	1
sticky chickweed	*Cerastium glomeratum* Thuill.	1
sneezeweed	*Achillea ptarmica* L.	1
Amur peppervine	*Ampelopsis brevipedunculata* (Maxim.) Trautv.	1
crested wheatgrass	*Agropyron cristatum* (L.) Gaertn.	1
wild chives	*Allium schoenoprasum* L.	1
broadleaf wild leek	*Allium ampeloprasum* L.	1
Amur maple	*Acer ginnala* Maxim.	1
common yarrow	*Achillea millefolium var. millefolium* L.	1
European columbine	*Aquilegia vulgaris* L.	1
broadleaf Solomon's seal	*Polygonatum hirsutum* (Bosc ex Poir.) Pursh	1
common corncockle	*Agrostemma githago* L.	1
monkshoodvine	*Ampelopsis aconitifolia* Bunge	1
common bugle	*Ajuga reptans* L.	1
bishop's goutweed	*Aegopodium podagraria* L.	1
orange daylily	*Hemerocallis fulva* (L.) L.	1
weeping forsythia	*Forsythia suspensa* (Thunb.) Vahl	1
dovefoot geranium	*Geranium molle* L.	1
roundfruit rush	*Juncus compressus* Jacq.	1
common barley	*Hordeum vulgare* L.	1
plume poppy	*Macleaya cordata* (Willd.) R. Br.	1
disc mayweed	*Matricaria discoidea* DC.	1
spotted henbit	*Lamium maculatum* L.	1
Italian ryegrass	*Lolium perenne ssp. multiflorum* L.	1
field cottonrose	*Logfia arvensis* (L.) Holub	1
European stickseed	*Lappula squarrosa* (Retz.) Dumort.	1
Bell's honeysuckle	*Lonicera x bella* Zabel	1
Chinese ginseng	*Panax ginseng* C. Meyer	1
garden asparagus	*Asparagus officinalis* L.	1
field scabiosa	*Knautia arvensis* (L.) Coult.	1
hyssop	*Hyssopus officinalis* L.	1
white deadnettle	*Lamium album* L.	1
jimsonweed	*Datura stramonium* L.	1
hibiscus	*Hibiscus lunariifolius* Willd.	1
dwarf iris	*Iris pumila* L.	1
orchardgrass	*Dactylis glomerata ssp. glomerata* L.	1
European meadow rush	*Juncus inflexus* L.	1
flower of an hour	*Hibiscus trionum* L.	1
Asiatic tearthumb	*Polygonum perfoliatum* L.	1
European gooseberry	*Ribes uva-crispa var. sativum* L.	1
sweetbriar rose	*Rosa eglanteria* L.	1
European black currant	*Ribes nigrum* L.	1
St. Anthony's turnip	*Ranunculus bulbosus* L.	1

Common name	Scientific name	Number of plots
cultivated currant	*Ribes rubrum* L.	1
common pear	*Pyrus communis* L.	1
laurel willow	*Salix pentandra* L.	1
cutleaf blackberry	*Rubus laciniatus* Willd.	1
bouncingbet	*Saponaria officinalis* L.	1
old-man-in-the-Spring	*Senecio vulgaris* L.	1
grain sorghum	*Sorghum bicolor ssp. bicolor* (L.) Moench	1
yellow bristlegrass	*Setaria pumila ssp. pallidifusca* (Poir.) Roemer & J.A. Schultes	1
Japanese meadowsweet	*Spiraea japonica* L. f.	1
bladder campion	*Silene latifolia* Poir.	1
small tumbleweed mustard	*Sisymbrium loeselii* L.	1
garden vetch	*Vicia sativa ssp. nigra* L.	1
Alexanders	*Smyrnium olusatrum* L.	1
Lewiston cornsalad	*Valerianella locusta* (L.) Lat.	1
common lilac	*Syringa vulgaris* L.	1
nightflowering silene	*Silene noctiflora* L.	1
bigleaf periwinkle	*Vinca major* L.	1
small-leaf spiderwort	*Tradescantia fluminensis* Vell.	1
European cranberrybush	*Viburnum opulus var. opulus* L.	1
threadstalk speedwell	*Veronica filiformis* Sm.	1

Chapter 8. National Trends in Ozone Injury to Forest Plants: 16 Years of Biomonitoring

Gretchen Smith

Abstract

The ozone indicator, an important component of the USFS Forest Health Monitoring Program, was developed and implemented to address specific concerns about the negative effects of ground-level ozone pollution on forest health and productivity. Ozone is a highly toxic air contaminant that has been shown repeatedly to damage tree growth and cause significant disturbance to forest ecosystems. Ozone also causes distinct foliar injury symptoms to certain species (bioindicator plants) that can be used to detect and monitor ozone stress (biomonitoring) in the forest environment. Biomonitoring surveys, begun in 1994 in the East and 1998 in the West, provide important regional information on ozone air quality, and a field-based measure of ozone injury and probable impact unavailable from any other data source. Currently, the national biomonitoring network consists of over 1,005 field sites in 40 states. At every site, the amount and severity of injury to the foliage of ozone-sensitive plants is used to formulate a plot-level injury index referred to as the ozone biosite index or BI. Three FIA regional units participate in the program: Northern (NRS), Southern (SRS), and Pacific Northwest (PNW) with the NRS having the longest record of biomonitoring data extending from 1994 to 2010. Results from the North indicate that injury indices have fluctuated annually in response to seasonal ozone concentrations and site moisture conditions. There is an overall declining trend in percent injured plots and injury severity especially after 2002 when peak ozone exposures declined across the entire region. Results from the PNW also suggest a declining trend in foliar injury severity, and for the SRS, a steady decline in percent injured plots. At the regional level, the ozone indicator is designed to assess if plant-damaging concentrations of ozone are present in US forests, where ozone stress is highest and most frequent, and whether or not ozone stress is increasing or decreasing over time. The purpose of this report is to address these issues of forest health assessment with a summary review of the major findings of the ozone surveys for each region. The broad relationship between BI and ozone exposure is also discussed.

Introduction

The ozone indicator, an important component of the USFS Forest Health Monitoring Program, was developed and implemented to address specific concerns about the negative effects of ground-level ozone pollution on forest health and productivity. Ozone is a highly toxic air contaminant that has been shown repeatedly to damage tree growth and cause significant disturbance to forest ecosystems. Ozone also causes distinct foliar injury symptoms to certain species (bioindicator plants) that can be used to detect and monitor ozone stress (biomonitoring) in the forest environment.

Biomonitoring surveys, begun in 1994 in the East and 1998 in the West, provide important regional information on ozone air quality, and a field-based measure of ozone injury and probable impact unavailable from any other data source (Coulston and others 2003; Smith and others 2007). Currently, the national biomonitoring network consists of over 1,005 field sites in 40 states. At every site, the amount and severity of injury to the foliage of ozone-sensitive plants is used to formulate a plot-level injury index referred to as the ozone biosite index or BI (Smith and others 2007). BI values can be used to identify forested areas at risk of ozone impact (Coulston and others 2003) and to describe relative ozone air quality. This report does not address risk, per se, but does examine how emerging long term trends in the BI in different regions of the country may be informing the risk assessment process.

The Forest Inventory and Analysis Program (FIA) took over implementation of the biomonitoring program in 2002. Data collection, documentation, and reporting are coordinated out of three regional FIA units: Northern, Southern, and Pacific Northwest with the Northern unit having the longest record of biomonitoring data extending from 1994 to 2010. At the regional level, the ozone indicator was designed to assess if plant-damaging concentrations of ozone are present in US forests, where ozone stress is highest and most frequent, and whether or not ozone stress is increasing or decreasing over time. The purpose of this report is to address these issues of forest health assessment with a summary review of the major findings of the ozone surveys for each region. The broad relationship between injury (BI) and ozone exposure is also discussed.

Methods

Sample Area:
Ozone sampling occurs on a unique national grid (White and others 1992; Smith and others 2007) that consists of a single panel of ozone biomonitoring sites that are measured every year (fig. 8.1). The field sites vary in size and do not have set boundaries. They are defined by the presence of ozone sensitive bioindicator species indigenous to each FIA region. The Northern study area (NRS) includes 24 states which are typically divided into the Northeast and North Central sub-regions; the Southern unit (SRS) includes 13 states from Virginia to east-Texas with data available starting in 1997; and the Pacific Northwest (PNW) includes three states, California, Oregon and Washington, with data from 2000. Procedures for biomonitoring are standardized nationally (USFS 2006; Woodall and others 2010) using a defined temporal evaluation window to minimize variability associated with the seasonality of plant response to ozone exposure.



Figure 8.1 – Forest Inventory and Analysis ozone biomonitoring grid developed from the Environmental Monitoring and Assessment Program (EMAP) base grid (White and others 1992). The grid has four sampling intensities based on sensitive species and ambient ozone concentrations.

Foliar Injury:
Crews return to the same sites, and evaluate the same species and general population of plants every year. They are trained and certified in ozone injury recognition every year, and submit injured leaf vouchers to regional experts to validate the field results. The site-level biosite index (BI) is derived from the amount, severity, and incidence of ozone-induced foliar injury to ozone-sensitive bioindicator plants at each biosite (Smith and others 2007). The site-level values describe a gradation of plant injury response that quantifies the degree of *ozone injury conditions*[2] on the biomonitoring plots.

Ozone Exposure:
SUM06 and N100 are two cumulative ozone exposure indices that are used to characterize ambient ozone exposures. Hourly ozone data obtained from the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (http://www.epa.gov/air/data/index.html),

[2] As defined by Smith and others (2008): visible symptoms on bioindicator plants indicate that O_3 is present at concentrations that cause injury and that predisposing conditions (e.g., adequate site moisture) are coincident.

were used to interpolate an ozone exposure surface across the landscape and assign an average growing season (June, July, and August) SUM06 (the sum of all hourly average ozone concentrations ≥ 0.06 ppm) value to each biosite and year. The same database was used to assign an N100 (the number of hours of ozone ≥ 100 ppb) value to each biosite and year. The SUM06 metric provides an indication of chronic ozone stress for the growing season, and N100 an indication of peak ozone concentrations.

Analysis:
Descriptive statistics presented here include the percent plots with validated ozone injury by year and region. Calculations of the average BI by year and region were also made. Additional plot-level estimates of ozone exposure and site moisture were obtained for the Northern region only to determine if fluctuations and trends in foliar injury over the 16-year period from 1994 to 2009 are correlated with trends in ozone exposure.

Results and Discussion

Field Implementation:
National field implementation began in New England in 1994 and spread south to the mid-Atlantic states, and west to the North Central states; new states entering the program every year. In the NRS, the number of years of biomonitoring varies from 9 to 17 depending on the start year for each state (table 8.1) and an occasional year when sampling was interrupted. By 2002, the ozone grid was complete and all 24 states in the NRS were participating in the biomonitoring program.

In the SRS, the first sites were established in Alabama, Georgia and Virginia in 1997 and 1998 with nine new states added over the 1999 to 2002 time period. Two states, Mississippi and Oklahoma have only been participating since 2009. Sites are largely absent from the coastal areas of the more southern states due to an absence of bioindicator species in these areas, and the generally wet conditions. The PNW initiated pilot studies in 1998 and 1999, but considers 2000 the official start year for the ozone surveys. They have been sampling without interruption for the last 10 years.

For all three FIA units, the number of biosites evaluated every year tended to stabilize in 2002, the year when FIA took over implementation on an improved ozone grid (table 8.2).

Air quality and the ozone grid:
Differences in maximum and mean ozone exposure statistics help to define the FIA regions and states in terms of ozone air quality during the growing season (table 8.3). Relatively clean air states are found in Northern New England (ME, NH, VT), the Northern Plains (NE, SD, ND), and the Northwest (OR, WA); while moderate air quality states are found in southern New England (MA, CT, RI), the East North Central region (IL, IN, OH), and the South (GA, SC, NC, TN, KY). States with unhealthy air quality are in the mid-Atlantic region (VA, WV, MD, DE, PA, NJ, NY) and Southwest (CA). Additional states such as KS, IA, and the Lake States (MN, WI, MI) tend to fall into an intermediate air quality category or have a wide range of ozone exposures from clean to moderate depending on proximity to population centers within each state.

The exposure characteristics of a given state or sub-region do not always line up with the results of the ozone survey in terms of how often ozone-induced foliar injury is detected on the ozone grid (table 8.1). For example, over the 1994 to 2010 time period, ozone injury was detected every year in almost every state in the Eastern US from Maine (clean) south to Georgia (moderate), and from Ohio (moderate) west to Kansas and north to Wisconsin; and in the western US in Washington (clean) as well as California (unhealthy). The only states with no ozone injury or very few years with injury detected are North and South Dakota, Nebraska, Oregon, Alabama, Arkansas, Florida, Louisiana, and east Texas.

Table 8.1 – Number of years of biomonitoring, number of years with ozone injury, and year biomonitoring was started by region and state for the years 1994 to 2010.

Region and year	Number of years		Start year[a]
	Biomonitoring	Ozone injury detected	
Northeast States			
Connecticut	17	17	1994
Delaware	15	14	1995
Maine	17	9	1994
Maryland	17	17	1994
Massachusetts	17	17	1994
New Hampshire	17	15	1994
New Jersey	17	15	1994
New York	12	12	1999
Ohio	14	14	1997
Pennsylvania	14	14	1995
Rhode Island	17	17	1994
Vermont	17	17	1994
West Virginia	16	16	1995
North Central States			
Illinois	14	14	1997
Indiana	15	15	1996
Iowa	11	6	2000
Kansas	9	5	2002
Michigan	17	16	1994
Minnesota	17	6	1994
Missouri	11	9	2000
Nebraska	9	1	2002
North Dakota	9	0	2002
South Dakota	9	3	2002
Wisconsin	17	17	1994
Southern States			
Alabama	13	2	1998
Arkansas	10	3	2001
Florida	9	1	2002
Georgia	14	13	1997
Kentucky	11	11	2000
Louisiana	8	3	2001
Mississippi	2	1	2009
North Carolina	12	10	1999
Oklahoma	2	2	2009
South Carolina	12	12	1999
Tennessee	11	10	2000
Texas	9	4	2002
Virginia	14	11	1997
West Coast States			
California	10	10	2000
Oregon	10	0	2000
Washington	10	7	2000

[a] Some states are missing interim years between start date and current year.

Table 8.2 – Number of evaluated biosites by year and by Forest Inventory and Analysis region.

	Number of Biosites Evaluated		
Region and year	Northern	Southern	Pacific Northwest
1994	118	-	-
1995	284	-	-
1996	229	-	-
1997	274	19	-
1998	465	22	-
1999	560	90	-
2000	559	178	70
2001	574	248	77
2002	490	316	125
2003	498	320	134
2004	494	351	130
2005	472	359	136
2006	470	335	138
2007	463	314	132
2008	457	314	129
2009	467	382	134
2010	470	401	134

Table 8.3 – Regional differences in maximum and mean ozone exposure data for 1994-2005.

Region[a]	Range of maximum ozone exposure values (SUM06)[b] 1994-2005	Mean value 1994-2005	Ozone exposure Category[c]
Northern New England	8.3 - 29.2	6.2	Clean
Southern New England	14.9 - 34.7	18.0	Moderate
Mid-Atlantic States	22.2 – 71.2	25.9	Unhealthy
Northern Plains	7.7 – 24.2	6.1	Clean
East North Central	17.1 – 52.3	20.7	Moderate
South	20.9 – 92.8	16.9	Moderate
Northwest	6.5 – 25.1	5.9	Clean
Southwest	76.8 - 117.3	28.7	Unhealthy

[a] Regions are defined as follows: Northern New England: ME, NH, VT; Southern New England: MA, CT, RI; Mid-Atlantic: DE, MD, NJ, PA, VA, WV; Northern Plains: NE, ND, SD; East North Central: IL, IN, OH; South: AL, GA, KY, NC, SC, TN; Northwest: OR, WA; and Southwest: CA.
[b] SUM06 = Sum of hourly ozone concentrations ≥0.06 ppm. Maximum and mean values are calculated by state and year and then averaged for each region.
[c] Descriptive ozone exposure categories are based on mean values. Clean: SUM06 <10 ppm-hr; Moderate: SUM06 10-25 ppm-hr; Unhealthy: SUM06 >25 ppm-hr.

It is noteworthy when ozone injury is detected in a state or region previously thought to be free of ozone stress, even if the injury occurs on only a small number of the bioindicator plants or sites. This is the case in Washington state where the repeated detection of ozone injury at a single location is, at least in part, explained by the soil moisture conditions at the biosite, and in northern portions of Vermont which may be influenced by polluted air masses moving north from the mid-Atlantic region or by the absence of other pollutants which react with O_3 and effectively remove it from the air. FIA ozone surveys also detected injury for the first time at several locations in the more northern portions of California (Campbell and others 2007) starting in 2005. In the many states where ozone injury is detected every year, or almost every year, the survey results underscore the fact that a large area of forest land in this country, both East and West, is subject to levels of ozone pollution that may negatively affect the forest ecosystem.

Every year the EPA publishes an ozone exceedance map (http://www.asl-associates.com/revised_8-hr_075.htm) which highlights the counties in each state that are out of compliance with the National Ambient Air Quality Standard (NAAQS) for O_3 set to protect vegetation from harmful effects. In preparation for the 2007 review of the ozone standard, the EPA overlay the USFS biomonitoring data with the exceedance map and found that there were many counties in compliance with the existing O_3 standard where FIA field crews were routinely documenting ozone injury to sensitive plants (US EPA July 2007). This study was one of several that served as evidence that the secondary ozone standard needed to be strengthened, a recommendation that was adopted by the EPA's Clean Air Scientific Advisory Committee and the EPA Administrator, and became law in 2008. Currently, there is a new proposal by the EPA to establish a distinct cumulative, seasonal "secondary" standard, referred to as the W126 index, which is designed to protect sensitive vegetation and ecosystems, including forests, parks, wildlife refuges, and wilderness areas (http://www.epa.gov/air/ozonepollution/actions.html#jan10s). The multi-year findings of the FIA field-based biomonitoring program suggest that this protective action has scientific merit.

Trend data:
Air: EPA reports that ground-level O_3 concentrations are 10% lower in 2008 than in 2001 across the nation with the most notable decline occurring after 2002 (US EPA 2010[1]). Still, there are localized areas such as parts of the Los Angeles air basin, and in or near Atlanta, GA where ground-level O_3 is increasing. There are also growing concerns about ozone air quality in parts of the Interior US (e.g., Wyoming, Utah and Idaho) where increased activity associated with the natural gas industry is contributing to previously undocumented peaks in localized O_3 concentrations. A comparison of trend data from California *vs.* the eastern US shows that the majority of ozone improvement in recent years occurred in the East as a result of successfully implemented pollution control measures leading to large reductions in NO_x emissions (ozone precursor pollutants) beginning in 2003.

Injury: The percent injured biosites indicates how widespread ozone injury conditions are for the NRS, SRS, and PNW regions by year for the 1994 to 2010 time period (fig. 8.2). Percent injured sites for the North fluctuated from one year to the next showing an overall downward trend over 17 years of biomonitoring. The highest percent injury occurred in 1994 (55.9%), 1998 (48.4%), and 2000 (47.6%), the lowest in 2008 (23.2%) and 2009 (19.9%). In the years prior to 2003, percent injured plots averaged above 30% for 7 of the 9 years, and for only 3 of the 8 years from 2003 on. Although the overall trend was downward, percent injured plots was back up above 30% in 2010, perhaps signaling a change in injury conditions.

For the first seven sample years in the South (1997 to 2003), the percent injured biosites was often similar to those in the North and the overall trend was downward. Values were relatively high (>30%) in 1997 through 2001, dropping to 19.3% in 2002, increasing again to 29.1% in 2003 before dropping sharply to <10% in 2006, and continuing to decline to a minimum percent injured plots (<1%) in 2010. In contrast, the percent injured plots in the Pacific Northwest fluctuated between 10 and 17 percent for all eleven years of biomonitoring showing, if anything, a slight increasing trend in percent injured biosites over the 2000 to 2010 time period.

[1] http://www.epa.gov/airtrends/2010/



Figure 8.2 – Ozone injury to forest plants in the United States by FIA Region: Percent injured plots by year, 1994 to 2010.

Even more than percent injured biosites, the BI values are expected to fluctuate from one year to the next in response to variable ozone exposure levels and other factors that influence ozone flux. BI values provide a comparative measure of injury severity with increasing values indicating an increased risk of probable ozone impacts to sensitive trees and ecosystems (Smith and others 2007). Site-level BI data for the NRS are presented with estimated SUM06 and N100 data (fig. 8.3) to show possible associations between foliar injury and ozone exposure over the 1994 to 2009 time period[1].

Mean regional BI values are relatively high in 1994 but fluctuate down and up again over the next 4 years reaching a maximum value of 17.6 in 1998 before dropping off sharply in 1999. BI increases in 2000 but then starts a downward trend to relatively low values suggesting very little risk of ozone impact on a regional scale from 2003 on. Both SUM06 and N100 also fluctuate from one year to the next, but there is little direct association between injury and exposure. In 1995 and 1999, for example, BI values drop off from the previous year even though ozone exposure values are increasing. This can be explained by the fact that 1995 and 1999 were two of the driest years over the 1994 to 2009 survey period especially in the high ozone areas of the NRS such as the mid-Atlantic states (Smith and others 2008, Smith 2009). Dry conditions caused plant stomata to close thus preventing ozone uptake and subsequent injury. This result demonstrates the biological relevance of the biomonitoring data since the BI values reflect how much ozone gets inside the plant rather than what can be measured in the ambient air.

Focusing on trends, it is clear that injury severity and the implied risk of ozone impact as described by the BI data have been steadily decreasing in recent years. As suggested earlier, ground-level ozone concentrations have also been decreasing in the East since 2002, peak concentrations (N100) much more so then the more moderate concentrations captured in the SUM06 statistic. In this sense, the trend in BI and percent injured plots for the North region mirrors the ozone exposure data showing an overall declining trend from 1994 through 2009.
BI data from the South are not available for the most recent years (2008 and 2009), but for the 1997 to 2007 time period there is no obvious decline in BI values (fig. 8.4). In contrast, the BI data for the Pacific Northwest does suggest a decreasing trend in foliar injury severity and probable ozone impact especially for California where the majority of sites and plants with injury are located.

Injury and Exposure - Regional Summaries:
PNW: Reporting on results for the 2000 to 2005 time period, Campbell and others (2007) noted that ozone injury occurs frequently on biosites in California demonstrating that ozone is present at toxic levels. Injury generally correlated with ambient ozone concentrations such that areas with the highest SUM06 values had the highest percent injured sites and highest mean BI. Although the highest percentage of biosites with injury occurred in southern California, new areas of previously unreported injury were detected in northern parts of the state. This early study did not discern any trends in ozone injury between 2000 and 2005. However, with the additional data from 2006 through 2010, we can now suggest that even though the percent injured biosites has not changed much, there is a discernable downward trend in injury severity.

SRS: Rose and others (2009) examined biomonitoring results for the 2002 to 2006 time period and concluded that even though ambient ozone concentrations were reportedly on the decline in the South during that time period, ozone-induced foliar injury was still occurring every year, particularly in Georgia and South Carolina where BI values were highest. However, a five-year average of the BI data suggested that most of the forest land in the South is at low risk of ozone impact. The authors suggest that a prolonged region-wide drought may have served to protect the southern forests from ambient ozone concentrations and lower the regional mean BI values. Examining relationships between injury and exposure, they were able to demonstrate that the difference between sites with and without injury had more to do with site moisture conditions, or the combination of site moisture and ozone exposure, then with ozone exposure alone. No trend data were reported. However, the findings reported here suggest that the percent injured biosites has been declining steadily since 2003.

[1] Air quality data for 2010 was not available from the EPA for inclusion in this report.



Figure 8.3 – Trends in ozone-induced foliar injury (BI) and ozone exposure (SUM06 and N100) in the FIA Northern Region from 1994 to 2009.



Figure 8.4 – Trends in ozone-induced foliar injury (BI) in the FIA-Southern Research Station and FIA-Pacific Northwest Regions from 1997 to 2009.

NRS: Differences in calculated mean values for percent injured biosites and average BI suggest that ozone stress is highest in the mid-Atlantic states, similarly moderate in the East North Central states and southern New England, and relatively low in northern New England and the Northern Plains states. Region-wide trends suggest that ozone injury is declining possibly in response to a decline in peak ozone concentrations in normally high ozone areas. An examination of relationships among injury, exposure, and site moisture (Peng and others 2010) demonstrates that biosites with no injury occur at all SUM06 and N100 exposures; Biosites with injury also occur at all SUM06 and N100 exposures, but when SUM06 and N100 are relatively low, the percentage of uninjured sites (BI=0) is much greater than the percentage of injured sites (BI>0); and at all SUM06 and N100 exposures, when site moisture is limiting, the percentage of uninjured sites (BI=0) is much greater than the percentage of injured sites (BI>0). These findings are in accordance with results reported by Campbell and others (2007) for western forests. They reported a general association of injury and exposure, but found that when looking at individual biosites, high levels of injury can occur in areas of low ozone exposure and low levels of injury can occur in areas of high ozone exposure.

Summary and Conclusions

Ozone has long been considered one of the most widespread and damaging air pollutants to forest health (Percy and others 2003). In addition, it acts as a greenhouse gas contributing significantly to atmospheric warming on a global scale. Campbell and others (2007) make the point that although air quality is improving in the US as result of emission reductions, ozone standards meant to protect plant health are still being exceeded in many areas. Regionally, there are increased sources of ozone pollution as populations increase and more ozone precursor pollutants are moving into the US from Asia via long-range transport. Ozone precursor pollutants are also expected to increase with the regional expansion of the oil and gas industry both in the Interior states and the Northeastern US. On a global scale, as the climate continues to warm, we can expect ground-level ozone concentrations to increase in all areas due to the fact that O_3 formation is driven, in large part, by high sunlight intensity and warm temperatures.

In this report, the ozone indicator data establish the fact that plant-damaging concentrations of O_3 are present in US forests, occurring frequently, if not every year, in most states in the NRS, SRS, and PNW regions. Region specific studies have demonstrated a general association between injury and exposure such that areas with the highest SUM06 values have the highest percent injured sites and mean BI. In eastern forests, annual fluctuations in injury are strongly influenced by both exposure and site moisture conditions. Years of extreme drought result in a sharply reduced BI despite high ozone exposures. Trend data suggest that ozone stress is decreasing over time in all regions particularly in recent years possibly due to a national declining trend in peak ozone concentrations. This trend may reverse with the combined pressure of increasing population, increasing ozone precursor pollutants, and rising temperatures during the growing season.

Literature Cited

Campbell, S. J, Wanek, R., Coulston, J.W. (2007). Ozone injury in west coast forests: 6 years of monitoring. Gen. Tech. Rep. PNW-722. Portland, OR: U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Pacific Northwest Research Station. 53 p.

Coulston, J.W., Smith, G.C., Smith, W.D. (2003). Regional assessment of ozone sensitive tree species using bioindicator plants. Environmental Monitoring and Assessment. 83: 113-127.

Percy, K.E., Legge, A.H., Krupa, S.V. (2003). Tropospheric ozone: a continuing threat to global forests? In: Karnosky, D.F. and others, eds. Air pollution, global change and forests in the new millennium. New York: Elsevier. p. 85-118.

Rose, A., Coulston, J. W. (2009). Ozone injury across the Southern United States, 2002-06. Gen. Tech. Rep. SRS-118. Asheville, N.C.: U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Southern Research Station. 25 p.

Smith, G. C., Smith W. D., Coulston, J. W. (2007). Ozone biomonitoring sampling and estimation. Gen. Tech. Rep. NRS-20. Newtown Square, PA: U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Northern Research Station. 34 p.

Smith, G. C., Coulston, J. W., O'Connell, B. M. (2008). Ozone bioindicators and forest health: A guide to the evaluation, analysis, and interpretation of ozone injury data in the Forest Inventory and Analysis Program.

Gen. Tech. Rep. NRS-34. Newtown Square, PA: U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Northern Research Station. 34 p.

Smith, G. C. (2009) Improving the interpretability of the biosite index for trend analysis in areas with low, moderate, and high ozone exposure regimes. Newtown Square, PA: U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Northern Research Station. 46 p.

U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service. 2006. FIA Field Methods for Phase 3 Measurements. At: http://www.fia.fs.fed.us/ - click on FIA Library - Field Guides, Methods, and Procedures - Ozone bioindicator plants.

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. (2007). Review of the National Ambient Air Quality Standards for ozone: Policy assessment of scientific and technical information. OAQPS Staff Paper. Section 7.6.3.2. EPA 452/R-07-007. Office of Air Quality Planning and Standards. Research Triangle Park, North Carolina.

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. (2010). Our nation's air: Status and trends through 2008. Office of Air Quality Planning and Standards. Research Triangle Park, North Carolina. EPA-454/R-09-002.

Wang, P., Baines, A., Levine, M., Smith, G. C. (2010) Modeling ozone injury to US forests. Submitted to Environmental and Ecological Statistics. 10 p.

White, D., Kimerling, A.J., Overton, W.S. (1992). Cartographic and geometric component of a global sampling design for environmental monitoring, Cartography and Geographic Information Systems. 19: 5-22.

Woodall, C. W., Conkling, B. L., Coulston, J.W., Jovan, S., Perry, C. H., Schulz, B., Smith, G. C., Will-Wolf, S. (2010). The Forest Inventory and Analysis Database Version 4.0: Database Description and User's Manual for Phase 3. Gen. Tech. Rep. NRS-61. Newtown Square, PA: U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Northern Research Station. 180 p.

Section III. Evaluation Monitoring Project Summaries

Each year the Forest Health Monitoring (FHM) Program funds a variety of Evaluation Monitoring (EM) projects, which are "designed to determine the extent, severity, and causes of undesirable changes in forest health identified through Detection Monitoring (DM) and other means" (Forest Health Monitoring 2009). In addition, EM projects can produce information about forest health improvements. EM projects are submitted, reviewed and selected in two main divisions, base EM projects, and fire plan EM projects. More detailed information about how EM projects are selected, the most recent call letter, lists of EM projects awarded by year, and EM project poster presentations can all be found on the FHM website: www.fs.fed.us/foresthealth/fhm.

Beginning in 2008, each FHM national technical report contains summaries of recently completed EM projects. Each summary provides an overview of the project and results, citations for products and other relevant information, and a contact for questions or further information. The summaries provide an introduction to the kinds of research projects supported by FHM and include enough information for readers to pursue specific interests. Three project summaries are included in this report.

Literature Cited

Forest Health Monitoring. 2009. Evaluation monitoring. Forest Health Monitoring Fact Sheet Series. http://www.fhm.fs.fed.us/ (Date accessed: July 14, 2010)

Chapter 9. Oak Savanna Restoration in Central Iowa: Assessing Indicators of Forest Health for Ecological Monitoring (project NC-F-04-02)

Heidi Asbjornsen[1] *and Lars Brudvig*[2]

Introduction

Savanna ecosystems were once a dominant feature of the Midwestern Corn Belt Plains Ecoregion, occurring within the dynamic boundary between prairies to the west and forests to the east, and maintained in the landscape by complex interactions between fire, climate, topography, and human activities (Anderson 1998). Characterized by their continuous understory layer and widely scattered overstory trees, primarily oak species, Midwestern savannas are today extremely rare, largely converted to agricultural or transitioned to woodlands following changes to disturbance regime. Today, less than one percent of the original extent of savanna vegetation remains (Nuzzo 1986), mostly in a highly degraded state due to fire suppression, over-grazing, habitat fragmentation, and subsequent woody encroachment and invasion by non-savanna under and overstory species (Anderson 1998, Gobster and others 2000). The health of Midwestern oak savannas is of regional concern due to low rates of oak regeneration and increasing domination of the understory by shade tolerant species, both of which alter the quality, composition, structure, and ecological functions of these forested systems. Restoring native oak savanna ecosystems generally involves overstory thinning and reintroduction of fire (McCarty 1998). However, little is known about the impacts of such restoration activities on biotic and abiotic ecosystem attributes and on achieving restoration goals, nor the extent to which standard monitoring protocols (e.g., FIA) are sensitive to these changes. Long-term monitoring and evaluation are necessary to better understand current forest conditions and the effects of restoration treatments to guide future management decisions.

This research involved a replicated landscape scale experiment to restore oak savanna ecosystems at a site in central Iowa that had been encroached by shade tolerant species and transitioned into woodland vegetation. The restoration process included mechanical removal of encroaching vegetation and prescribed fire. The overall goal of this research was to complement FHM monitoring of the health of oak savanna ecosystems through the collection of process-level ecosystem indicators of restored and degraded savannas to identify sensitive indicators for long-term monitoring. We accomplished this goal by addressing the following specific objectives:

- Assess the effects of savanna restoration on stand structure, growth and productivity of remnant savanna oak trees;
- Determine patterns and success of oak seedling recruitment in response to restoration treatments;
- Document the response of the understory herbaceous layer to restoration treatments, particularly in terms of species composition and diversity;
- Assess the effects of restoration treatments on biophyiscal variables (e.g., light, soil moisture, soil properties).
- Establish FHM detection monitoring (DM) plots at the savanna restoration site for comparison with process-based data.

Methods, Results and Discussion

Site description and study design. The study was conducted on eight white oak (*Quercus alba*) savanna remnants near Saylorville Lake in Des Moines, Iowa, USA, ranging in size from 1.5 to 3.3 ha. Following several decades of fire suppression, these sites were encroached by non-savanna tree species (e.g., *Fraxinus americana*, *Ulmus sp.*, *Ostrya virginiana*), leading to canopy gap closure. Encroaching woody vegetation was removed by mechanical treatment in 2002-2004 from four randomly selected remnants. One transect was established along the length of each study site (100-200 m) for sampling of vegetation (see Asbjornsen and others 2005, Karnitz and Asbjornsen

[1] Associate Professor, University of New Hampshire, Department of Natural Resources and the Environment, 268 James Hall, Durham, NH 03824
[2] Assistant Professor, Michigan State University, Department of Plant Biology, 166 Plant Biology Building, East Lansing, MI 48824

2006, and Brudvig and Asbjornsen 2007 for details). Concurrently, 4 FIA phase 2 plots were established at each site. Phase 2 plots were arranged linearly, to coincide with sampling transects and to fit within savanna site boundaries. FIA-based data are detailed in Objective 5.

Objective 1- Assess the effects of savanna restoration on stand structure and growth and productivity of remnant savanna oak trees

Methods. Along each 100-200m transect, we conducted annual vegetation surveys from 2002-2006. We recorded species and diameter at breast height (dbh) for trees and species of all samplings and shrubs. Percent cover by understory vegetation, leaf litter, bare ground, and down woody material was also recorded (see Brudvig and Asbjornsen 2007 for details). In brief, along each transect we sampled trees in contiguous 10x10m plots, saplings in contiguous 10x4m plots, shrubs in 3m² circular plots located every 10m along the transects and understory data in 1x1m plots located every 10m along the transects. Full sampling details are described in Brudvig and Asbjornsen (2007). To assess the growth response of the remnant savanna trees, tree cores were extracted using an increment borer from large oak trees growing in restored and encroached sites in 2009. The cores were assessed for width and year, and results from the sites compared to assess change in annual mean increment growth and change in basal area across sites. (see Brudvig and others 2011 for details). We used analyses of variance (ANOVA) to determine the impacts of the removal treatment on stand structure and overstory tree response. We ran separate ANOVA's for each response variable (e.g., tree density, sapling density, etc.), using site-level means in our analysis and restoration treatment as the independent variable (n=4/treatment).

Results and Discussion. The savanna restoration treatment resulted in the reestablishment of the savanna structure comprised of overstory oak trees at relatively low density, reducing canopy cover from 84-89% to 8-52%, while stem densities for smaller size classes (<40 cm) were also reduced. Nevertheless, the understory was dominated by advanced regeneration of shade tolerant tree species, suggesting that encroached savannas represent an alternative stable state. Thus, in addition to understory removal, management interventions including prescribed fire will likely be needed to establish the understory herbaceous layer (Brudvig and Asbjornsen 2007). The dendrochronology assessment of growth response revealed that basal area of overstory oak trees increased by 59 percent following removal of encroaching vegetation. These results suggest that encroaching trees compete directly with savanna trees for key resources thereby reducing growth rates, but that even after long periods of suppressed growth, these savanna oaks have the potential to respond to release from competition through accelerated growth (Brudvig and others 2011).

Conclusion. Removal of encroaching vegetation from degraded savanna ecosystems is an effective approach for restoring savanna overstory structure and promoting growth of mature savanna oak trees. However, restoration of the understory herbaceous structure and composition will require additional restoration interventions such as prescribed fire. Without such interventions, these savannas will likely transition back to the alternative stable woodland state consisting of intercanopy gaps filled with non-savanna woody vegetation.

Objective 2 - Determine patterns and success of oak seedling recruitment in response to restoration treatments

Methods. Along each transect, we annually surveyed from 2002-2006 all saplings within 4 m wide belts, all shrubs within 3m^2 plots every 10 m along the transect, and all seedlings in 1 m^2 plots every 10 m along the transect (see Brudvig and Asbjornsen 2007). In addition, 10 "canopy" and 10 "canopy-gap" plots were established within each of the eight study sites, but outside the main 100-200m sampling transects. All canopy and canopy-gap plots were annually surveyed from 2002-2006 for *Q. alba* seedlings in the year before and for three subsequent years after restoration, by recording height, basal diameter, and number of leaves, after the removal treatment (see Brudvig and Asbjornsen 2008). Finally, we transplanted *Q. alba* seedlings every 1m along transects radiating from overstory *Q. alba* trees toward inter-canopy gaps (5-6 seedilngs/transect), as well as seedlings in inter-canopy gaps. For each seedling, we collected data on basal diameter, height, number of leaves, herbivory, and survival over a two-year period (Brudvig and Asbjornsen 2009a).

Results and Discussion. Following the removal treatment, seedlings of *Q. alba* exhibited a gradual increase in abundance over the 3 year post-treatment measurement periods. In contrast, seedlings of other species (e.g., *Ostrya virginiana, Fagus americana, Ulmus americana, Prunus sertotina, U. rubra)* did not vary in abundance after three years. We also observed a recruitment pulse in shrub density 2 years and sapling density 3 years after removal of encroaching vegetation, primary attributed to vigorous stump sprouting. Thus, regeneration is dominated by

encroaching species shortly after removal treatments, providing evidence for the existence of an alternative woodland stable state resulting from the savanna encroachment process (Brudvig and Asbjornsen 2007). However, *Q. alba* seedlings growing in canopy and canopy-gap locations exhibited clear differences, with canopy-gap seedlings displaying greater survival, as well as increases in height, basal diameter, and number of leaves relative to canopy (control) sites. These findings suggest that removal of woody encroachment can have positive impact on promoting regeneration of *Q. alba,* a critical component of ensuring the recruitment of young oaks into the canopy over longer time scales (Brudvig and Asbjornsen 2008). Growth and survival of transplanted seedlings increased with distance from overstory trees and were greatest in the gap areas of restored sites (Brudvig and Asbjornsen, 2009a).

Conclusion. Removal of encroaching vegetation from degraded savannas leads to rapid growth response in understory shade-tolerant (non-savanna species) shrubs and saplings, while at the same time creating gap environments that are more favorable to the establishment and growth of desirable *Q. alba* seedlings. Further work with prescribed fire and/or grazing may elucidate to what extent tree-herbaceous understory dynamics may be restored through restoration interventions in Midwestern oak savannas.

Objective 3 - Document the response of the understory herbaceous layer to restoration treatments, particularly in terms of species composition and diversity

Methods. We annually surveyed understory species composition and abundance in $1m^2$ plots located every 10 m along each transect from 2002-2006 (see Brudvig 2010). With these data, we calculated species richness (number of species), Simpson's diversity, and species evenness using standard protocols (Magurran 2004) at the local (1x1m) and site (sum of 1x1m plots/site) scales. We subsequently calculated beta richness and Simpson's diversity as the difference between site and local scale values (Brudvig 2010).

Results and Discussion. Following the removal treatment, understory species richness and Simpson's diversity increased at local and site scales. Species evenness and beta diversity and richness (indicators of spatial turnover) were unaffected. These changes were due to increased richness and cover of graminoids and woody species following encroachment removal. Restoration promoted savanna indicator species, as well as non-savanna species, including exotic species, at local and site scales.

Conclusion. Restoration by woody encroachment removal resulted in establishment and proliferation of savanna and non-savanna understory species. Future work might investigate the long-term effects of reintroduction of characteristic savanna understory species (not colonizing naturally following restoration) and prescribed understory fire on richness and cover of woody, exotic, and other non-savanna understory species.

Objective 4 - Assess the effects of restoration treatments on biophyiscal variables (e.g., light, soil moisture, soil properties)

Methods. At each site, we randomly selected 5 large, open-grown *Q. alba* trees, and established a randomly oriented transect radiating from the bole to 1.5x the distance to the canopy edge. Along each transect, we established 5-6 1 x 1-m 'understory' plots. Similarly, 5-6 'gap' plots were established at 3x the distance to the canopy edge. Between July 2004 and August 2006, we sampled the plots for vegetation, light (hemispherical photography), soil physical (texture) and chemical (pH, % organic matter, concentrations of nitrate N, total P, and K) properties, and soil moisture.

Results and Discussion. The restoration treatment of removing encroaching vegetation significantly altered biophysical gradients relative to the control sites. Restored sites exhibited a strong relationship between light and distance from overstory trees. Restored sites also had greater variability in soil moisture due to both higher levels immediately after rain and greater drying rates. With restoration, a positive relationship occurred between understory vegetation cover and distance from overstory trees, while species richness increased with distance from overstory trees in the final year. In contrast, there was little evidence for spatial patterns of soil nutrients, and more long-term monitoring may be needed to fully understand restoration impacts on savanna soil resource patterns. Common understory species were correlated with gradients of canopy cover and soil moisture associated with restoration plots, as well as with gradients of soil texture and N associated with both restoration and control plots. These findings suggest that an important consequence of removal of encroaching vegetation is the conversion of a

homogenized biophysical environment common to encroached savannas to more diverse patterns of environmental gradients typical of intact healthy savannas (Brudvig and Asbjornsen 2009b).

Conclusion. Despite decades of degradation as a result of fire suppression and understory encroachment, Midwestern oak savannas maintain high resiliency that enables them to respond positively to restoration inventions. The re-establishment of biophysical gradients in the understory environment, particularly related to light and moisture during the initial years following removal of encroaching vegetation, is a key aspect of promoting diversity and composition of understory plant species as part of the savanna restoration process.

Objective 5 - Establish FHM detection monitoring (DM) plots at the savanna restoration site for comparison with process-based data

Methods. Phase 2 FIA plots were surveyed in 2002 and 2004 at two control and two savanna restoration sites and 4 FIA plots were surveyed in 2006 and 2008 at four control and four savanna restoration sites (2 additional FIA plots were established in 2006). In each year, woody species were recorded using standard FIA methodology for seedling, sapling, and tree size classes. We analyzed these data with repeated measures ANOVA and these results were compared to data derived from the transect-based sampling methodology (Brudvig and Asbjornsen 2007; described above in Objectives 1 and 2).

Results and Discussion. FIA sampling conducted over the course of the study (2002-2008) illustrated patterns of reduced sapling and overstory tree densities and increased tree seedling densities following woody encroachment removal; however, replication was too low (n=2) to resolve these differences statistically (fig. 9.1). Conversely, FIA sampling during 2006 and 2008, with increased replication (n=4) was able to resolve these differences: increased seedling density and reduced sapling and tree density following restoration by woody encroachment removal (fig. 9.2). In general, these FIA derived data mirrored results of data derived from transect-based sampling, though it is difficult to draw any strong conclusions regarding the sensitivity of FIA phase 2 plots to temporal change, due to low sample size. For example, with n=2 phase 2 plots sampled every other year, we were unable to resolve the sapling recruitment pulse that was evident through the transect-based data.

Conclusion. Data from FIA phase 2 plots effectively documented coarse patterns in stand structure following oak savanna restoration (e.g., major reduction in overstory density), but were ineffective at resolving finer scale changes in stand structure following restoration (e.g., temporal changes and sapling recruitment pulse). This was likely due to low replication and it is possible that these changes would have been resolved with annual sampling at full (n=4) replication. Finally, standard FIA plot layout was not useful for our study sites, as sites were not wide enough to accommodate normal phase 2 plot arrangement. As such, rearrangement of subplots to fit within our sites was necessary.

Contact information for more information about the project and research
Heidi Asbjornsen: Email: heidi.asbjornsen@unh.edu; Tel: 603-862-1011
Lars Brudvig: Email: brudvig@msu.edu; Tel: 517-355-8262



Figure 9.1 – Effects of restoration (mechanical woody encroachment removal; conducted during 2002-2004) on oak savanna stand structure: density of (a) woody species seedlings, (b) saplings, and (c) overstory trees. Data were collected using four FIA Phase 2 plots/site (n=2 sites/treatment). Replication was too low to statistically resolve patterns. Values are mean ±SE.



Figure 9.2 – Effects of restoration (mechanical woody encroachment removal; conducted during 2002-2004) on oak savanna stand structure: density of (a) woody species seedlings, (b) saplings, and (c) overstory trees. Data were collected using four FIA Phase 2 plots/site (n=4 sites/treatment). This level of replication was sufficient for resolving differences between treatment groups for all strata in 2008 (p<0.05). Values are mean ±SE.

Literature Cited

Anderson, R.C. 1998. Overview of Midwestern oak savanna. Transactions of the Illinois Academy of Science. 86:1-18.

Asbjornsen, H.; Brudvig, L.A.; McMullen-Mabry, C.; Evans, C.W.; Karnitz, H.M. 2005. Defining appropriate reference conditions for restoring ecologically rare oak savanna ecosystems in the Midwest, USA. Journal of Forestry. 103(7):345-350.

Brudvig, L.A. 2010. Woody encroachment removal from Midwestern oak savannas alters understory diversity across space and time. Restoration Ecology. 18(1):74-84.

Brudvig, L.A.; Asbjornsen, H. 2007. Stand structure, composition and regeneration dynamics following removal of encroaching woody vegetation in Midwestern oak savannas, Iowa, USA. Forest Ecology and Management. 224:112-121.

Brudvig, L.A.; Asbjornsen, H. 2008. Patterns of oak regeneration in a Midwestern oak savanna restoration experiment. Forest Ecology and Management. 255:3019-3025.

Brudvig, L.A.; Asbjornsen, H. 2009a. Dynamics and determinants of *Quercus alba* seedling success following savanna encroachment and restoration. Forest Ecology and Management. 257:876-884.

Brudvig, L.A.; Asbjornsen, H. 2009b. The removal of woody encroachment restores biophysical gradients in Midwestern oak savannas. Journal of Applied Ecology. 46:231-240.

Brudvig, L.A**.**, H.M. Blunck, H. Asbjornsen, V.S. Mateos-Remigio, S.A. Wagner, and J.A. Randall. 2011. Influences of woody encroachment and restoration thinning on overstory savanna oak tree growth rates. Forest Ecology and Management 262:1409-1416.

Gobster, P. H.; Haight, R.G.; Shriner, D. 2000. Landscape change in the Midwest: An integrated research and development program. Journal of Forestry. 98(3): 9-14.

Karnitz, H.M.; Asbjornsen, H. 2006. Composition and age structure of a degraded tallgrass oak savanna in central Iowa, USA. Natural Areas Journal. 26(2):179-186.

Magurran, A.E. 2004. Measuring biological diversity. Blackwell Publishing, Malden, Massachusets.

McCarty, K. 1998. Landscape-Scale Restoration in Missouri Savannas and Woodlands. Restoration and Management Notes. 16(1): 22-32.

Nuzzo, V. A. 1986. Extent and status of Midwest (USA) oak savanna: Presettlement and 1985. Natural Areas Journal. 6(2): 6-36.

Chapter 10. Bacterial Leaf Scorch Distribution and Isothermal Lines (project NC-EM-08-02)

Gerard C. Adams[1], Mursel Catal[1], James Walla,[2] and Ann B. Gould[3]

Introduction

Bacterial leaf scorch (BLS) of shade trees is the common name for a disease caused by *Xylella fastidiosa*, a xylem-inhabiting bacterium that has fastidious nutritional requirements and is difficult to culture or verify by culturing. Forest trees including oak, sycamore, elm, planetree, sweetgum, mulberry and maple are species susceptible to *Xylella* infection (McElrone and others 1999) throughout the eastern and southeastern United States. It is not yet known how common and widespread BLS is in trees in the North Central and Plains States (IA, IL, IN, MI, MN, MO, WI and KS, NE. ND, SD, respectively). In New Jersey, BLS was first detected in populations of trees in the red oak group in several western counties 20 years ago and since has spread throughout the State, affecting as many as 44 percent of susceptible oaks in some communities (New Jersey Forest Service 2002). Population increases of *X. fastidiosa*, production of unidentified toxins (Hayward and Mariano 1997), xanthan-like gums, and biofilms in vessel elements lead to water stress symptoms (Simpson and others 2000), especially chlorosis followed by necrosis of leaf margins and interveinal areas, leaf curling, decreased seed production, delayed budbreak, early autumn dormancy, decline, dieback, and sometimes mortality (Barnardand others 1988, Lashomb and others 2002). Increasing incidence and distribution of BLS combined with drought will increase decline and mortality in susceptible hardwoods. Moisture stress increases the expression of symptoms of BLS. *Xylella* is vectored by various insects in the Homoptera family including sharpshooter leafhoppers and spittlebugs (Pooler and others 1997). Introduction of new vectors that are more efficient in transmitting the pathogen can increase the economic damage caused by the disease as occurred in California when the glassy-winged sharpshooter increased the incidence of the *X. fastidiosa*-induced disease, Pierce's disease, which has been threatening the grape crop. *X. fastidiosa* occurs in numerous strains which have only recently been well distinguished (Qin and others 2001). One strain causes citrus variegated chlorosis (CVC), a disease infecting citrus trees. Currently in Brazil about five million diseased trees are destroyed yearly, causing approximately $50 million in losses. Quarantines are in force in the United States to prevent introduction of the citrus strain. The regional strains of *X. fastidiosa* in forests and amenity shade trees of the North Central and Plains States do not appear to cause severe disease symptoms like those infecting grape and citrus.

Leaf scorch in trees can be caused by numerous unidentified abiotic causes as well as by the bacterial pathogen. A regional survey using detection of the bacterial pathogen provides a worthwhile evaluation of the proportion of scorch that can be attributed to the pathogen and the relative proportion attributable to environmental or unknown causes. This information is important to improving understanding of the causes of stress and decline in trees, particularly those stresses caused by unsuitable planting practices, and problems in urban soils and sites.

Having a measure of the incidence and distribution of BLS in the North Central and Plains States is worthwhile for establishing a baseline of current conditions. With a record of conditions, the influence of new or more effective vectors or of changes in climate warming can be documented more accurately. Because BLS is a factor in decline of trees, changes in distribution and incidence will impact forest health. If the changes are due to warming climate, decline in important forest species such as oaks and maples could be modeled and future trends in forest health could be predicted. Additionally, the host range of BLS in hardwoods and other woody plants is not yet well known, or known only for limited regions of the United States (McElrone and others 1999).

The planned objectives of this two-year project included:
Objective 1–Determine the incidence of BLS in species of *Quercus, Acer, Platanus, Ulmus, Morus, Tilia* and other hardwoods in the 11 North Central and Plains States.
Objective 2–Determine the distribution of BLS in the 11 North Central and Plains States.
Objective 3–Relate the occurrence of BLS to mapped landscape-scale physiographic, edaphic, and climatic data.

[1] Dept. Plant Pathology, Michigan State University, East Lansing, MI 48824-1311
[2] Dept. Plant Pathology, North Dakota State University, Fargo, ND 58105-5075
[3] Dept. Plant Biology and Pathology, Rutgers University, New Brunswick, NJ 08901-8520

Methods

Organization of the project began with conference calls and a web site initiated by the U.S.F.S. Forest Health Monitoring Specialist in the Northeastern Area State and Private Forestry unit, pathologist Manfred Mielke, Ph.D. Conference calls included state foresters that had previously worked in forest health monitoring. Once procedures were agreed upon, the methods were posted on the web site with description of the project and information on the etiology of the disease and illustrations of the symptoms. Additional volunteers were solicited by direct communication and by outreach and Extension articles. Volunteers included state Department of Agriculture employees, University Extension agents, state Department of Natural Resources employees, and private arborists, landscapers, and master gardeners. Cooperators and volunteers were advised to locate trees in their region of the 11 states showing leaf scorch during late July through October in 2008 and 2009. It was planned to sample urban and rural trees, and trees in forest stands. Sampling design was to sample from every symptomatic tree seen by the individual collector with a goal of obtaining 30 trees per year for each state by the total collectors in the state. Because of the scarcity of symptomatic trees, sampling was random for habitat, size, species and number. In some instances leaf scorch was evident by May but samples were collected usually in August to allow the titer of the pathogenic bacteria to increase in the samples (Titer is the term used to refer to the detectable concentration of the pathogen in the host tissue.). The sampling protocol was to collect two samples of scorched leaves per tree, old scorched leaves from one side of the tree and younger scorched leaves from the opposite side. Each sample was to include at least 2-5 leaves with symptoms attached to a shoot (approx. pencil width). After review of the number of samples and diversity of species collected in each state the first year, successive year shoots and leaves were to be double-bagged in a self-addressed stamped Tyvek® envelope for shipment. Approximate tree locations were recorded by GPS coordinates or street addresses. Diameter at breast height was approximated or measured and percentage of crown showing scorch was recorded. Information was recorded on or in the envelopes and the exterior of the envelopes was pre-stamped with the categories of information requested from the collector. The requested information included: name and address of the collector, collection date, state, county, city, and street address location information, GPS coordinates indicating datum and format used, genus and species of the host, stem diameter size class (dbh) estimated categories of sapling <5 inches (12.5 cm), pole 5-11 inches (12.5–27.5 cm), or large >11 inches (27.5 cm). Crown symptoms of percent of foliage affected by scorch symptoms, and percent dieback were recorded. For dieback, three approximated categories of low <5 percent, moderate 5-20 percent, or high >20 percent were used.

Envelopes were shipped the same day, or stored in a refrigerator at approximately 4˚ C until shipment. Many leaf samples were photographed to record differences in scorch symptoms. Then, samples were processed to extract DNA from petiole xylem tissues. Quality of DNA, and presence and quantity of *X. fastidiosa* DNA was determined using machinery and reagents of the quantitative polymerase chain reaction DNA amplification methodology (real-time PCR or qPCR). Two standard protocols were used: the SYBR® Green protocol (Applied BioSystems; used in the Adams laboratory) or the TaqMan® protocol (Applied BioSystems; used in the Gould laboratory) with *X. fastidiosa* specific primers (Gould, personal communication; Schaad and others 2002). For several samples, presence of *X. fastidiosa* also was determined with commercial enzyme linked immunosorbent assay (ELISA) technology (Agdia, Inc.) and also verified by qPCR. Three replicates of each sample were tested per assay. Detection sensitivity of qPCR methods ranged from 13.2 to 13,200,000 cells/mL. Quality assurance was checked and verified by sending a dozen or more samples between the two laboratories for comparison in double-blind assays (samples labeled and results matched to samples by a noninvolved student worker).

Positive and negative trees were mapped for distribution using MapSource® software (Garmin Ltd.), Google Maps®, and Google earth®. Climatic and physiographic isotherm lines were obtained from USDA Plant Hardiness zone maps. MapSource® distribution patterns were overlaid on black and white diagrams of the U.S. Forest Service divisions, the North Central and Plains states, and the 1990 and 2006 hardiness zone border lines were superimposed individually and in combination on the final maps constructed in Adobe Illustrator®, and correlations examined and discussed.

Results

During 2008 to 2009, approximately 471 trees were sampled that exhibited typical symptoms of leaf scorch. The volunteers collecting the samples were skilled at distinguishing scorch symptoms from insect damage, salt burn, nutrient deficiencies, anthracnose leaf diseases, leaf spots and other problems that can be confused with leaf scorch. Most of the host species collected were *Quercus* species, primarily *Q. rubra* with 89 samples submitted. Thirty sampless of *Q. palustris*, *Q. macrocarpa*, and *Vaccinium corymbosum* were collected also. In total, sixty-nine species of trees, shrubs and vines were ultimately submitted (table 10.1). A total of 106 collections of *Acer* spp. were also submitted. Many species of maple were collected in 2009 in Michigan following an unusual abiotic event where leaf scorch suddenly appeared in many trees in some counties without apparent relationship to weather or site conditions. The plant species that were determined to be infected with *X. fastidiosa* included 11 species, *Q. imbricaria*, *Q. macrocarpa, Q. palustris, Q. rubra, Q. bicolor* an unidentified *Quercus* sp., unidentified *Acer* sp., *Ulmus davidiana* var. *japonica, Morus rubra, Aesculus* sp., and *Fraxinus americana* 'Rosehill'. Fifteen collections of *Tilia* spp. were submitted but none were positive for BLS.

Sample collection in each State depended greatly on the interest and enthusiasm of volunteers. In 2008, the volunteers were primarily foresters in the Department of Natural Resources and tree enthusiasts in the Department of Agriculture in each State. In 2009, volunteers from the landscape industry, University extension service, and Master gardeners also participated. Samples were received from 14 States. Four States were outside the North Central and Plains states, with one sample each from Colorado and Montana, two from Oklahoma, and 9 from Utah. Of the 11 planned States, the following collections numbers were received: Illinois 18, Indiana 45, Iowa 0, Kansas 29, Michigan 143, Minnesota 18, Missouri 40, Nebraska 4, North Dakota 118, South Dakota 5, and Wisconsin 45. A remarkable diversity of species was collected in North Dakota. States that had BLS affected trees included IL, IN, KS, MI, MO, and WI (and OK). There were insufficient samples to verify whether BLS occurred in IA, NE, and SD. However, there is a record of BLS in Nebraska on mulberry (Sinclair and Lyon 2005). BLS-positive trees were not encountered in Minnesota or North Dakota. With 118 scorch samples from North Dakota, it is unlikely that BLS occurs there. The overall mean incidence of BLS-positive trees among 471 trees and woody shrubs exhibiting typical leaf scorch symptoms in late summer or fall was 5 percent (24 plants).

In figures 10.1 and 10.2, the distribution of the collected samples is illustrated by the dots within the boundaries of each State and the occurrence and location of BLS-positive trees are illustrated by the X markers within the States. The distribution of *X. fastidiosa* has been studied primarily in regards to occurrence of Pierce's disease of grapes which is common throughout southeastern North America and rare north of Tennesee (Anas and others 2008), although recently it has become a problem further north in Oklahoma (Smith and Dominiak-Olson 2009). BLS of hardwood trees has been commonly reported in southern and mid-Atlantic states (Purcell and Hopkins 1996). Winter temperatures with 2-3 days below -12˚ C reduce limit Pierce's disease (Anas and others 2008) and are believed to be detrimental to survival of *X. fastidiosa* in hardwoods. High numbers of samples and zero to low numbers of BLS-positive trees in North Dakota (0-positive), Michigan (1-positive), and Wisconsin (2-positive), may be the result of unfavorable winter weather as the northernmost States show lower incidence of BLS than the States south of Michigan. Incidence does appear to increase for more southern States, but sample numbers, experience of collectors, and number of collectors in the field, are undoubtedly interacting with data on determining frequency.

Maps with isotherms, representing the mean lowest winter temperatures over 30 years, are not available for the States we were studying. However, a good determination of isotherms over 10-24 years is the Plant Hardiness Zones Map prepared for the USDA. Each isotherm represents a 10˚ F difference in the average annual minimum temperature. The isotherms from the current USDA map prepared in 2006 (The National Arbor Day Foundation 2006)) are shown in figure 10.1 as solid lines and the 1990 Map isotherms as dashed lines both overlaid onto the occurrence and incidence markers for the collected plants of the 11 States. The BLS-positive trees occur in zone 6 (0 to -10˚ F), except two trees from Wisconsin that occur in zone 5 (-10 to -20˚ F). The warming of winter over the past decades is dramatically illustrated by the differences between the solid and hatched lines from the two zone maps on the occurrence and incidence data. An additional worthwhile comparison to construct would be to overlay the ecoregions map (Vogel and others 2005) on the occurrence and incidence data.

Table 10.1 – 2008-2009 Collections of plants with leaf scorch symptoms assayed by real-time qPCR.

Species and cultivars	Number of samples	Positive assays[a]
Acer fremanii 'Autumn Blaze'	1	No
Acer ginnala (Amur maple)	8	No
Acer negundo (Box elder)	9	No
Acer platanoides (Norway maple, inc., 'Crimson King', 'Variagated')	21	No
Acer rubrum (Red maple)	10	No
Acer saccharinum (Silver maple)	3	No
Acer saccharum (Sugar maple)	16	No
Acer tataricum (Tatarian maple)	1	No
Acer sp. unidentified	37	Yes (2)
Aesculus sp.	1	Yes (1)
Aesculus sp. Hybrid	1	No
Aesculus x carnea (Red buckeye, 'Briotii')	1	No
Aesculus glabra (Ohio buckeye)	8	No
Aesculus hippocastanum (Horse chestnut)	4	No
Aesculus octardra (Yellow buckeye)	1	No
Amelanchier alnifolia (Serviceberry)	1	No
Caragana arborescens (Siberian peashrub)	1	No
Carpinus caroliniana (American hornbeam)	1	No
Catalpa speciosa (Northern catalpa)	1	No
Celtis occidentalis (Common hackberry)	1	No
Cercis occidentalis (Western redbud)	1	No
Gymnocladus dioicus (Kentucky coffee tree)	1	No
Fraxinus americana (White ash, inc. 'Rosehill')	4	Yes (2)
Fraxinus mandshurica (Manchurian ash)	3	No
Fraxinus pennsylvanica (Green ash)	17	No
Juglans nigra (Black walnut)	1	No
Liquidambar styraciflua (American sweetgum)	1	No
Malus spp. (Flowering crabapple)	3	No
Malus domestica	1	No
Morus rubra (Mulberry)	4	Yes (1)
Parthenocissus quinquefolia (Virginia creeper)	1	No
Philliodendron amurense (Amur corktree)	1	No
Platanus x acerifolia (London planetree)	1	No
Platanus occidentalis (Sycamore)	1	No
Populus deltoids (Eastern cottonwood)	1	No
Populus sp. Hybrid	1	No
Populus tremula 'Erecta' (Columnar poplar)	2	No
Populus tremuloides (Quaking aspen)	3	No
Prunus serotina (Cherry)	1	No
Prunus virginiana (Chokecherry)	1	No
Pyrus sp. (Pear)	2	No
Pyrus ussuriensis 'Prairie gem'	4	No
Quercus alba (White oak)	25	No
Quercus acutissima (Sawtooth oak)	1	No
Quercus bicolor (Swamp white oak)	7	Yes (1)
Quercus coccinea (Scarlet oak)	1	No
Quercus ellipsoidalis (Northern pin oak)	1	No
Quercus imbricaria (Shingle oak)	3	Yes (1)
Quercus macrocarpa (Bur oak)	30	Yes (2)
Quercus palustris (Pin oak)	30	Yes (8)
Quercus robur Hybrid (*Q. robur* 'Fastigiata' x *Q. bicolor* 'Regal Prince')	1	No
Quercus rober Hybrid (*Q. robur* x *Q. macrocarpa*)	1	No

Species and cultivars	Number of samples	Positive assays[a]
Quercus rubra (Northern red oak)	89	Yes (2)
Quercus velutina (Black oak)	4	No
Quercus sp. unidentified	16	Yes (3)
Salix pentandra (Laurel leaf willow)	1	No
Sorbus aucuparia (European mountain-ash)	2	No
Syringa meyeri (Korean dwarf lilac)	1	No
Syringa reticulata (Japanese tree lilac)	3	No
Syringa villosa (Late or Villous lilac)	2	No
Syringa vulgaris (Common lilac)	3	No
Tilia americana (American linden, basswood)	12	No
Tilia cordata (Little-leaf linden)	3	No
Ulmus americana (American elm)	13	No
Ulmus davidiana var. *japonica* (Japanese elm)	4	Yes (1)
Ulmus parvifolia (Lacebark elm)	1	No
Vaccinium corymbosum (highbush blueberry)	29	No
Viburnum sp. (Viburnum)	1	No
Vitis sp. (Grape)	1	No

[a] 24 BLS (*Xylella fastidiosa*) positive assays, replicated three times, from 471 scorch samples, or 5% positive



Figure 10.1 – USDA Plant hardiness zone map from 1990 with the dashed horizontal lines (isotherms) illustrating the boundaries of growth zones 3-7 of expected average annual minimum temperatures: Zone 3 = -35 to -40˚C [-30 to -40˚F], zone 4 = -29 to -35˚C [-20 to -30˚F], zone 5 = -23 to -29˚C [-10 to -20˚F], and zone 6 = -18 to -23˚C [0 to -10˚F]. Zones are constructed from records of lowest winter temperatures or the area in the preceding fifteen years (approximately). The locations of our scorch samples are represented as circular push pins for BLS-negative trees and X-marks for BLS-positive trees. The geographical regions of the collections are shown, with Plain States (darker shading) and North Central States (lighter shading).



Figure 10.2 – Newest USDA plant hardiness zone map from 2006 with solid horizontal lines (isotherms) illustrating the boundaries of growth zones 3-7 of expected average annual minimum temperatures (zone 7 = -10 to 0˚F [-12 to -23˚C]). Lowest winter temperatures are warming since the 1990 map, for example, the 1990 isotherms place the lower half of Michigan in zone 5, while the 2006 isotherms place the lower half in zone 6. This is a change of approximately 5˚C warmer. We hypothesize that BLS incidence will be increasing northward with the warming climate.

Discussion

The survey and research were relatively successful in developing a distribution and incidence database, and a host range, as baselines for future studies. As the diagnostic tests used for detecting BLS become more frequently and widely used by the National plant diagnostic network, then geographical outliers and an expanding host range should begin to accumulate. Our knowledge of the pathogen, the diseases it causes, and the symptoms expressed in woody plants should increase considerably as the detection technology advances.

In this study, 5 percent of trees showing scorched leaves were BLS-positive out of 471 samples and 69 species. Plant Hardiness Zone 5 is the northernmost limit for BLS in this study and Nebraska (positive report in Sinclair and Lyon [2005]) is included in zone 5, as well. Zone 6 is the region where 92 percent of BLS-positive samples originated in this study. Zone 7 (10 to 0 F) includes the southern central States, such as Oklahoma where *X. fastidiosa* (Pierce's disease) occurs in grapevines. We are certain that BLS is unlikely to be present in North Dakota (zones 4 and 3) at a titer sufficient for the qPCR detection, as no BLS-positive samples were found out of 118 trees exhibiting scorch. We assume this is due to the winter cold affecting either the vectors or the trees. We are not certain, due to sample size, whether BLS occurs in Minnesota where winter temperature may also exclude it. Minnesota has territory in three hardiness zones (zones 5, 4, and 3), the warmest being zone 5. Since Wisconsin has BLS-positive trees in zone 5, it is possible that the lower third of Minnesota also may have some BLS-positive trees. The new Plant Hardiness Zones Map (The National Arbor Day Foundation 2006) readily demonstrates the gradual warming of the continent over the past few decades and shows that the plants' northern ranges are extending. We hypothesize that this extension is, and will be, effecting the distribution and incidence of BLS. Additionally, the incidence and distribution of BLS might be affected by the local variations of moisture, soil type, microclimates, winds, and other conditions affecting plant growth and health.

Improvement in the methodology for detection of *Xylella* is needed for trees with low titers of the bacterium, particularly trees in the northern States. Collections during 2008-2009 found two red oak trees in Wisconsin that were BLS-positive, however, detection was erratic sometimes giving positive assays and other times negative assays. Double-blind tests were conducted with Rutgers University on these samples using petioles (unprocessed) and DNA (processed) samples so that precision in extraction methods and assay sensitivity could independently be compared. The double-blind tests revealed that the samples (unprocessed or processed) had titers at the limit of detection by the current technology. The limit of detection is at approximately one cell of the pathogen in the

volume of processed extraction applied to the assay. The results revealed that the quality control was successful. The results also uncovered the possibility that the current assays may be failing to detect infections in the northern regions due to problems of low titer. One hypothesis needing testing is that many northern hardwoods may harbor the pathogen at titers below current detection. If this is the case, then increasing incidence of BLS with increasingly warm climate will be due to a buildup of titer, rather than advancing movement of vectors.

To improve our understanding of the epidemiology of BLS, more accurate detection methods should be developed. Because qPCR detection methods are already as sensitive as one cell per sample, increasing sensitivity by concentrating samples to increase pathogen cell numbers is a reasonable approach. Higher titers may exist in roots in northern climates and further research is warranted to verify this issue. Processing larger samples would yield more target for the pathogen but also increase competing host material which may or may not inhibit or mask detection. Two approaches to this potential problem would be separating pathogen target from host material or selectively increasing pathogen target while decreasing or subtracting host material. Processing greater masses of petiole tissue can be readily accomplished with reasonable numbers of samples. To separate pathogen target DNA from host DNA, pulse field gel electrophoresis (PFGE) (Qin and others 2001) or cesium chloride density centrifugation (Tran-Nguyen and Gibb 2007) have been successfully employed. A method of increasing the pathogen target while decreasing the amount of host competing target known as suppression subtraction hybridization (SSH) (Cimerman and others 2006) has been developed and successfully employed in similar pathogen-host extractions.

Diagnosis and detection by ELISA is quick and relatively sensitive and development of qPCR has improved sensitivity 10-fold. However, to economically process samples for qPCR assays numerous (10-20) samples need to be loaded on the machine at one time. Waiting for sufficient samples to be received however delays diagnosis which aggravates cooperators and discourages public participation. The solution is to combine the two assays, utilizing the less sensitive ELISA technique for expediting diagnosis and utilizing the more sensitive qPCR technique for increased accuracy.

Conclusions

In this study, 5 percent of trees showing scorched leaves were BLS-positive out of 471 samples and 69 species. Plant Hardiness Zone 5 is the northernmost isotherm for BLS in this study and Nebraska (positive report in Sinclair and Lyon [2005]) is included in zone 5, as well. The isotherm lines delimiting zone 6 encompassed 92 percent of BLS-positive samples. Zone 7 (10 to 0˚ F) includes the southern central States, such as Oklahoma, where *X. fastidiosa* occurs in grapevines.

Contact–Gerard C. Adams, e-mail gadams@msu.edu

Literature Cited

Anas, O., Harrison, U.J., Brannen, P.M., and Sutton, T.B. 2008. The effect of warming winter temperatures on the severity of Pierce's disease in the Appalachian Mountains and piedmont of the southeastern United States. Online: Plant Health Progress doi:10.1094/PHP-2008-0718-01-RS.

Barnard, E.L.; Ash, E.C.; Hopkins, D.L.; McGovern, R.J. 1988. Distribution of *Xylella fastidiosa* in oaks in Florida and its association with growth decline in *Quercus laevis*. Plant Disease. 82: 569-572.

Cimerman, A.; Arnaud, G.; Foissac, X. 2006. Stolbur phytoplasma genome survey achieved using suppression subtractive hybridization approach with high specificity. Applied & Environmental Microbiology. 72(5): 3274-3283.

Hayward, A.C.; Mariano, R.L.R. 1997. Mecanismos de virulência e patogenicidade de procariotos em plantas. Revisão Anual de Patologias de Plantas. 5: 199–234.

Lashomb, J.; Iskra, A.; Gould, A.B.; Hamilton, G. 2002. Bacterial leaf scorch of amenity trees: a wide-spread problem of economic significance to the urban forest. USDA Forest Service Northeastern Area S&PF, Forest Health Protection, Morgantown, WV: NA-TP-01-03.

McElrone, A.J.; Sherald, J.L.; Pooler M.R. 1999. Identification of alternative hosts of *Xylella fastidiosa* in the Washington, D.C. area using nested polymerase chain reaction (PCR). Journal of Arboriculture. 25: 258-262.

New Jersey Forest Service, C.F.P. 2002. New Jersey Bacterial Leaf Scorch Survey Report (P.L. 2001, c.8). Department of Environmental Protection Division of Parks and Forestry.

Pooler, M.R.; Myung, I.S.; Bentz, J. [and others]. 1997. Detection of *Xylella fastidiosa* in potential insect vectors by immunomagnetic separation and nested polymerase chain reaction. Letters in Applied Microbiology. 25:123-126.

Purcell, A. H., and D. L. Hopkins. 1996. Fastidious xylem-limited bacterial plant pathogens. Annual Review of Phytopathology 34: 131-151.

Qin, X.; Miranda, V.S.; Machado, M.A. [and others]. 2001. Evaluation of the genetic diversity of *Xylella fastidiosa* isolates from citrus and coffee in San Paulo, Brazil. Phytopathology. 91: 599-605.

Schaad, N.W.; Opgenorth, D.; Gaush, P. 2002. Real-time polymerase chain reaction for one-hour on-site diagnosis of Pierce's disease of grape in early season asymptomatic vines. Phytopathology. 92:721-728.

Simpson, A.J.G.; Reinach, F.C.; Arruda, P. [and others]. 2000. The genome sequence of the plant pathogen *Xylella fastidiosa*. Nature. 406: 151-159.

Sinclair, W.A.; Lyon, H.H. 2005. Diseases of Trees and Shrubs. 2nd edition. Comstock Publishing Assoc., Cornell University, Ithaca, NY: 556 pp.

Smith, D.L.: Dominiak-Olson, J. 2009. Pierce's Disease of Grape – A Growing Concern in Oklahoma. Pest E-alerts 8(30) October 6. http://entoplp.okstate.edu/Pddl/

The National Arborday Foundation. 2006. 2006 arborday.org Hardiness Zone Map. 100 Arbor Avenue, Nebraska City, NE 68410.

Tran-Nguyen, L.T.T.; Gibb, K.S. 2007. Optimizing phytoplasma DNA purification for genome analysis. Journal of Biomolecular Technology. 18: 104-112.

Vogel, K.P.; Schmer, M.R.; Mitchell, R.B. 2005. Plant adaptation regions: ecological and climatic classification of plant materials. Rangeland Ecology & Management. 58: 315-319.

Chapter 11. A Test of FIA's Down Woody Material Indicator for Regional Fuel Estimation in the Southern Appalachian Mountains (project SO-F-06-01)

G. Geoff Wang[1], Zhi-Ping Wang[1], Aaron D. Stottlemyer[2] and Thomas A Waldrop[3]

Introduction

Both the National Fire Plan (http://199.134.225.50/nwcc/t2_wa4/pdf/RuralAssistance.pdf) and the Healthy Forest Initiative (http://www.fs.fed.us/projects/hfi/2003/august/documents/hfi-fact-sheet.pdf) call for reduction of hazardous fuels. Consequently, estimations of forest fuel loading at various scales become necessary. The U.S. Forest Service Forest Inventory and Analysis (FIA) program is currently sampling down woody materials (DWM) at its phase 3 (P3) plots at the intensity of one plot every 96,000 acres. In this study, DWM is defined as a collection of fine woody material (FWM) (i.e., 1-hr, 10-hr, and 100-hr fuels), coarse woody material (CWM) (i.e., 1000-hr fuel), litter, and duff. Because multiple fuel complexes may exist at a much smaller scale (fig. 11.1), it is not clear if the FIA's current DWM sampling intensity would produce reasonable estimations of regional fuel loading.



Figure 11.1 – Five common fuel complexes in Southern Appalachians: A = undisturbed stands; B = burned stand; C = harvested stand; D = southern pine beetle damaged stand; E = wind damaged stands. (Photo Credit: U.S. Forest Service.)

Objectives

The objective of our study was to test whether the fuel estimations derived from the FIA P3 plots capture multiple and distinct fuel complexes in the southern Appalachian Mountains. Based on the test, the minimum sampling intensity for obtaining an adequate regional DWM estimation was suggested for the southern Appalachian Mountains.

[1] Department Forestry and Natural Resources, Clemson University, Clemson, SC 29634
[2] Wildlife Technology Department, Pennsylvania State University DuBois, DuBois , PA 15801
[3] U.S. Forest Service, Southern Research Station, Clemson, SC 29634

Methods

The study area in the southern Appalachian Mountains involved three national forests (Chattahoochee National Forest in northeastern Georgia, Nantahala National Forest in western North Carolina, Sumter National Forest in northwestern South Carolina) and one national park (Great Smoky Mountains National Park in southeastern Tennessee).

Data were collected from three different sources: data obtained from existent FIA P3 plots (FIA P3 Data), data collected by Brudnak and others (2007) through an intensive sampling (Intensive Sampling Data), and new data collected in this study (New Data). The most recent FIA P3 plots located within the studied national forests/park were acquired, with the year of sampling ranging from 2001 to 2005. Using a stratified random sampling method, Brudnak and others (2007) intensively sampled one subjectively selected 10 square mile area at each studied national forest /park by installing 193 to 297 plots (50 × 44 feet in size) and referencing slope location and aspect. In addition to the two sources of available data described above, we conducted additional sampling in fall 2007, with 20 plots in each national forest/park. Those plots were randomly selected within each forest and park, but subject to restriction of road access. CWM, FWM, litter, duff, and shrub and herb loadings were measured in all plots using the FIA P3 method. Estimates of various DWM components were calculated using the equations in Chojnacky and others (2004).

Biomass of DWM components is summarized using descriptive statistics. In order to determine an adequate sampling density, we calculated running averages of DWM estimates from plots that were sampled in the study. The change of DWM estimates with the increase of sampling size was visually inspected and a minimum sample size was interpreted when the estimates approached a stable value.

Results and Discussion

The amounts of total DWM estimated using the FIA P3 data were generally much less, by 47 to 73 percent depending on study area, than those estimated using the intensively sampled data (table 11.1). When individual DWM components were compared, 1000-hr fuel was estimated consistently and considerably lower, by 81 to 98 percent, based on the FIA P3 data when compared to the intensively sampled data. These discrepancies in 1000-hr fuel or CWD appeared extremely large, which was the main reason why the intensively sampled data resulted in much higher estimates of total DMW in each forest/park. The large discrepancies in CWM, however, could not be simply attributed to low sampling intensity of FIA P3 plots. We could not find other apparent reasons responsible for these discrepancies. However, it is possible that each10 square mile area selected for intensive sampling may have higher CWM than each forest/park.

In each national forest/park, the change of the running average of the total DWM with the number of plots diminished and approached a stable value before sampling size reached about 12 plots (fig. 11.2A). When considered over a large area (i.e., with the three national forests and the one national park combined), the running average of the total DWM approached a stable value with the number of sampling plots increased to about 30 plots (fig. 11.2B).

Conclusions

We found a large discrepancy between the FIA P3 estimates and those derived using the intensive sampling data of Brudnak and others (2007). These discrepancies are attributed to the extremely large difference in CWM estimates between the two methods, which could not be explained satisfactorily. FIA P3 sampling intensity (approximately one plot per 96,000 acres) is appropriate at a regional scale when fuel loading is averaged over a large area (>2 million acres). At a smaller scale (i.e., at individual county or individual national forest/park scale), the FIA P3 sampling intensity would likely be too sparse to generate reliable fuel loading estimates.

Table 11.1 – A comparison of the down woody material (DWM) estimates derived from the FIA P3 plots and the intensive sampling plots.

Sampled area[a]	Method	N	1-hr	10-hr	100-hr	1000-hr	Litter	Duff	Total
			----------	----------	----------	*tons per acre*	----------	----------	----------
Georgia	FIA[b]	6	0.22	0.79	1.50	1.08	2.06	2.17	7.81
	Intensive[c]	297	0.27	0.92	3.78	14.80	2.76	6.40	28.93
	%[d]		-19.99	-14.78	-60.20	-92.69	-25.54	-66.11	-73.00
North Carolina	FIA	7	0.14	0.97	1.91	5.37	4.02	7.04	19.45
	Intensive	250	0.34	0.95	3.65	28.52	2.92	6.23	42.63
	%		-59.45	1.37	-47.58	-81.18	37.49	12.96	-54.38
South Carolina	FIA	1	0.55	3.88	5.63	0.32	0.90	2.03	13.30
	Intensive	275	0.24	1.05	3.95	13.86	2.63	3.54	25.27
	%		130.55	268.64	42.54	-97.66	-65.83	-42.70	-47.35
Tennessee	FIA	9	0.28	0.86	1.48	2.16	2.45	4.18	11.41
	Intensive	193	0.38	0.90	3.77	19.48	3.20	5.05	32.78
	%		-26.32	-4.14	-60.78	-88.90	-23.56	-17.24	-65.20

[a] Sampled area indicates the national forest/park found in these States.
[b] FIA method can be found in Woodall and Williams (2005).
[c] Intensive sampled method can be found in Waldrop and others (2007).
[d] % = 100 x (FIA-Intensive)/Intensive, where the estimates using intensive data are assumed as criteria.



Figure 11.2 – The changes in mean DWM weight (y-axes) with increasing number of sampling plots (x-axes) in each national forest/park (A) (diamond = Chattahooche National Forest; square = Nantahala National Forest; triangle = Sumter National Forest; cross = Great Smoky National Park) or four areas combined (B).

Acknowledgements

This study was funded by the US Forest Service. We thank Jim Brown and Dale Starkey, Forester/Forest Health Monitoring Program Coordinators (Region 8), for their assistance. We express our great gratitude to Forest Inventory and Analysis, Southern Research Station in Knoxville, TN for providing the FIA P3 data.

Literature Cited

Chojnacky, D.C.; Mickler, R.A.; Heath, L.S.; Woodall, C.W. 2004. Estimates of down woody materials in Eastern US forests. Environmental Management 33, Supplement 1. S44-S55.

Brudnak, L.; Rideout-Hanzak, S.; Waldrop, T.A. 2007. Fuels on disturbed and undisturbed sites in the Southern Appalachian Mountains, USA. Canadian Journal of Forest Research. 37(6), 1134-1141.

Woodall, C.; Williams, M. 2005. Sampling protocol, estimation, and analysis procedures for the down woody materials indicator of the FIA program. Gen. Tech. Rep. NC-256. St. Paul, MN: U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, North Central Research Station. 47 p.

Acknowledgments

This research was supported in part through the project "Forest Health Monitoring, Assessment and Analysis" of Research Joint Venture Agreement 09-JV-11330146-087, the project "Forest Health Monitoring, Analysis and Assessment" of Research Joint Venture Agreement 10-JV-11330146-064, and the project "Forest Health Monitoring, Assessment, and Analysis" of Research Joint Venture Agreement 11-JV-11330146-090 between North Carolina State University (this institution is an equal opportunity provider) and the U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Southern Research Station, Asheville, NC. This research was supported by funds provided by the U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Southern Research Station, Asheville, NC.

The editors and authors of this report thank the following for their reviews and constructive comments: Fred Cubbage, Tom Hall, Dale Starkey, Borys Tkacz, and Stan Zarnoch.

Authors for Section I, Forest Health Monitoring Research

Mark J. Ambrose is a Research Assistant with North Carolina State University, Department of Forestry and Environmental Resources, Raleigh, NC 27695.

John W. Coulston is a Research Scientist with the U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Southern Research Station, Knoxville, TN 37919.

Katherine Johnson is a Biologist with the U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Northern Research Station, Newtown Square, PA 19073.

Frank H. Koch is a Research Ecologist with the U.S. Department of Agriculture Forest Service, Southern Research Station, Research Triangle Park, NC 27709 (formerly Research Assistant Professor with North Carolina State University, Department of Forestry and Environmental Resources, Raleigh, NC 27695).

W. Keith Moser is a Research Forester with the U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Northern Research Station, St. Paul, MN 55108.

Cassandra Olson is an Ecologist with the U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Northern Research Station, St. Paul, MN 55108.

Jeanine L. Paschke is a Geographic Information Systems Analyst with Sanborn, Fort Collins, CO 80526.

Kevin M. Potter is a Research Assistant Professor with North Carolina State University, Department of Forestry and Environmental Resources, Raleigh, NC 27695.

Kurt H. Riitters is a Research Scientist with the U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Southern Research Station, Eastern Forest Environmental Threat Assessment Center, Research Triangle Park, NC 27709.

Beth Schulz is a Research Ecologist with the U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Pacific Northwest Research Station, Anchorage, AK 99503.

Gretchen C. Smith is Forest Inventory and Analysis National Ozone Field Advisor with the University of Massachusetts, Department of Environmental Conservation, Amherst, MA 01003.

William D. Smith is a Research Scientist with the U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Southern Research Station, Eastern Forest Environmental Threat Assessment Center, Research Triangle Park, NC 27709.

Authors for Section II, Evaluation Monitoring Project Summaries

Gerald C. Adams is an Associate Professor with Michigan State University, Department of Plant Pathology, East Lansing, MI 48824.

Heidi Asbjornsen is an Associate Professor with the University of New Hampshire, Department of Natural Resources and the Environment, Durham, NH 03824.

Lars A. Brundvig is an Assistant Professor with Michigan State University, Department of Plant Biology, East Lansing, MI 48824.

Mursel Catal received his Ph.D. in plant pathology from Michigan State University, Department of Plant Pathology, East Lansing, MI 48824.

Ann B. Gould is an Associate Extension Specialist with Rutgers University, Department of Plant Biology and Pathology, New Brunswick, NJ 08901.

Aaron D. Stottlemeyer is an Instructor with Pennsylvania State University DuBois, Wildlife Technology Department, DuBois, PA 15801.

Thomas A. Waldrop is a Supervisory Research Forester with the U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Southern Research Station, Clemson SC 29634.

James A. Walla is a Research Scientist with North Dakota State University, Department of Plant Pathology, Fargo, ND 58105.

G. Geoff Wang is a Professor with Clemson University, Department of Forestry and Natural Resources, Clemson, SC 29634.

Zhi-Ping Wang was a Visiting Professor with Clemson University, Department of Forestry and Natural Resources, Clemson, SC 29634.

Disclaimer

The use of trade or firm names in this publication is for reader information and does not imply endorsement by the U.S. Department of Agriculture of any product or service.