AUBURN UNIVERSITY
FOREST HEALTH COOPERATIVE

RESEARCH REPORT 2013-04

HAZARD AND RISK MAPPING OF LOBLOLLY PINE (*PINUS TAEDA* L.) DECLINE IN THE SOUTHEASTERN UNITED STATES

by
Matthew Bryan Meyerpeter and Lori Eckhardt
Forest Health Cooperative, Forest Health Dynamics Laboratory, School of Forestry and Wildlife Sciences
Auburn University, AL

ABSTRACT

Loblolly Pine Decline is a disease complex that poses a threat to the forests and economy of the southeastern United States. This tree mortality is not new to the area, but scientists have just begun to understand the issue and proper management techniques are being assessed. Once the symptoms of Loblolly Pine Decline are visible, the forest stand is at risk of continued mortality. A comprehensive view of predisposing site factors needed to be developed as a tool to use in managing forests and investments. Previous research identified the symptomology, fungi, insect vectors, and predisposing factors involved. This project utilized slope and aspect data to further identify sites that may predispose stands to this decline, and created a comprehensive map for the southeastern United States, from Texas to North Carolina. The map can serve as a tool to understand loblolly pine sites that are already at risk for Loblolly Pine Decline and thus the proper allocation of resources for management practices. It can also serve as a guide for proper tree species placement on Loblolly Pine Decline Hazard sites to reduce future Loblolly Pine Decline.

INTRODUCTION

Loblolly Pine Decline is a disease complex that poses a threat to the forests and economy of the southern United States. Maps of Loblolly Pine Decline (LPD) Sites have been produced on small areas but not on the range on which the decline complex occurs. From 1999-2003 sites were mapped in central Alabama study areas that were associated with aspects and slopes with LPD symptomology of thin, sparse crowns with tufted, chlorotic needles (Eckhardt, 2003). The correlation of aspect and slope were of interest due to other examples where topography played a role in tree declines. Menard (2007) further mapped LPD risk sites in central Georgia, looking at areas within Red Cockaded Woodpecker (*Picoides borealis* Vieillot) habitat. Because of these trials (Eckhardt, 2003; Menard, 2007) the parameters for hazard sites of loblolly pine stands at risk were better understood. For example, aspect range from 337.5° to 67.5° for low risk, 67.6° to 112.5° and 292.6° to 337.4° for medium risk, 247.6° to 292.5° for high risk, and 112.6° to 247.5° for severe risk. Percent slope risk ratings range from 0 to 5% for low, 5.1 to 10% for medium, 10.1 to 15% for high, and >15% for severe risk (Eckhardt and Menard, 2008). Combining these two risk factors allows for the creation of a hazard rating system based on the slope and aspect parameters.

The areas that have been previously mapped cover parts of central Alabama and Georgia, where LPD has been reported (Eckhardt, 2003; Menard, 2007). Eckhardt (2003) mapped the Oakmulgee, Talladega, and Shoal Creek Ranger Districts. The Oakmulgee Ranger District is located in west-central Alabama and covers portions of Bibb, Hales, Perry, Dallas, Chilton, and Tuscaloosa counties, approximately 63,130 hectares. The Talladega Ranger District and Shoal Creek Ranger District are located in northeast Alabama. These two districts cover parts of Calhoun, Cherokee, Clay, Cleburne, and Talladega counties.

Loblolly Pine Decline has been detected throughout Alabama and Georgia, but there have been reports from eastern Texas to North Carolina through positive identifications at the Forest Health Dynamics Laboratory at Auburn University. The long rotation of timber does not lend itself to rapid changes in stand objectives. Due to the uncertainty that surrounds the extent of LPD, land managers need an accurate map to determine the potential risk of future outbreaks of LPD. Developing such a map will create a useful management tool that can be utilized by land managers attempting to mitigate current and future LPD in the southeastern United States.

OBJECTIVES

The objective of this research was to create a Loblolly Pine Decline hazard map based on predisposing slope and aspect stress parameters from previous research and field observations where decline has been reported. Once the hazard map was created a risk map was to be created using the most updated loblolly pine coverage layer available. The hazard and risk maps were then to be ground truthed using relevant parameters. These objectives were created in order to understand the amount of hazard across the southeast United States landscape. Furthermore, they were intended to quantify the amount of loblolly pine currently at varying levels of risk across the study area.

METHODS AND MATERIALS

Four Class Hazard Map Creation

Mosaic - The study was set up to span from eastern Texas, also known as the ‘Piney Woods’, to North Carolina. This 9 state expanse included 678 counties covering approximately 102,836,000 hectares. Such an increase in area led to larger computations and data acquisition. A Four Class Hazard Map was created for each of the 9 southern states to create a final Four Class Hazard Map for the southeastern States of interest. States were processed individually due to the large size of the 10m Digital Elevation Model (DEM) files. The 10m DEMs used for this project were part of the National Elevation Dataset (NED) created by the United States Geological Service (USGS) Earth Resources Observation and Science (EROS) data center. The NED is a collection of the best-available elevation data in a seamless mosaic. The DEMs were acquired from the

USGS Geospatial Data Gateway (GDG) located online at http://datagateway.nrcs.usda.gov/. Ten-meter DEMs were acquired for Alabama, Arkansas, Florida, Georgia, Louisiana, Mississippi, North Carolina, South Carolina and eastern Texas.

Digital Elevation Models were created by the USGS GDG using 7.5-minute elevation data at one-third arc-second resolution (approximately 10m). For some areas the 10m DEMs were created from resampled LIDAR (Light Detection and Ranging) or aerial photography. Photogrammetrical techniques used on aerial photography scanned the aerial photographs with mapping software to collect x, y, and z coordinates over large areas. This was done in combination with known (x, y, and z) coordinates used as control points. The elevation points from the derived Digital Terrain Model (DTM) were then stored as raster DEMs (Geospatial Data Gateway, 2012).

The DEMs were received either by DVD or FTP online; they were delivered in small parcels as they are stored with the Geospatial Data Gateway. For example the State of Alabama consisted of 2,813 files, 936 of those being TIFF image files that needed a mosaic process to form a contiguous 10m DEM for that state. The other files were data reference files for each TIFF file.

ERDAS IMAGINE® v. 9.3 was used for the mosaic processing of the individual TIFF files into a single state 10m DEM. The mosaic process used was Mosaic Direct located under the Data Preparation/'Data Prep' option, Mosaic Images\Mosaic Direct (Fig. 1). In the Mosaic Direct window the TIFF files for the desired state were selected as a group from their saved location. The TIFF files were then added with 'Add Images', an output location and name were specified and saved as an IMG image file. Once completed, this process created a mosaic image of the parceled 10m digital elevation models for each state (Fig. 2).

Fill Sinks - Each State mosaic image was processed through a 'Fill Sinks' model, downloaded from erdas.com, in ERDAS IMAGINE® 9.3. A sink in a DEM is a low point that cannot drain. The ERDAS® model identified the sinks by identifying elevations where the focal elevation point was the minimum elevation of a grid window surrounding that elevation point (Fig. 3). This process removed sinks in the DEM mosaic that were a result of error. The image mosaic was chosen for the input; a name and location were assigned for the output conditioned image. In the output window along with the name and location the Data Type was changed to 'Signed 16-bit' and no values were chosen to be ignored in the statistical calculations. Signed 16-bit was selected instead of 8-bit due to the change in elevation from the coastal portions of states to higher elevations. A 16-bit number is a binary number code that can store integer values that range from 0 to 32,767 including zero as a number. A signed number takes the first number and assigns it as positive or negative. A signed 16-bit can store integer values from -16,383 to +16,383. This range will cover the highest point on Mount Everest, in meters, to the deepest part in the Marianas Trench. The 'Fill Sinks' model also truncates DEM integer values to the tenth decimal place. Tenth decimal place was all that was desired for the computations as satellite imagery is not generally precise enough to measure past that point.

Slope and Aspect Calculations - Once the DEM parcels were combined into one mosaic image and conditioned through the 'Fill Sinks' model, the image was processed through separate ArcGIS® Arc Map™ 10 Spatial Analyst tools to obtain slope and aspect. The calculations of slope and aspect were later joined after further processing to create the Four Class Hazard Map.

To figure slope, the image was projected using ArcGIS® 10 Data Management Tools\Projections and Transformations\Rater\Project Raster (Fig. 4). The projection chosen was 'USA_Contiguous_Albers Equal_Area_Conic.prj' or Albers Equal Area (AEA). This projection of the state mosaic image was then used for slope calculation.

Slope was calculated using ArcGIS® 10 Spatial Analyst Tools\Surface\Slope (Fig. 5). A 'Fill Sinks' conditioned, AEA projected state DEM was input and an output location and name was assigned for the slope raster data set. Output measurement type was changed form 'DEGREE' to 'PERCENT_RISE' and the Z factor remained as the default of '1'.

Aspect was calculated using ArcGIS® 10 Spatial Analyst Tools\Surface\Aspect (Fig. 6). A 'Fill Sinks' conditioned state DEM, in the state's UTM projection, was input and an output location and name was assigned for the aspect raster data set.

Slope and Aspect Reclassification - Both slope and aspect calculations were reclassified into the four hazard categories based on previous research (Eckhardt and Menard, 2008). Reclassification was carried out using ArcGIS® 10 Spatial Analyst Tools\Reclass\Reclassify (Fig. 7). The previous slope and aspect calculations were reclassified to numerical categories of 1, 2, 3, and 4 which corresponded with the values in Table 2.1. Slope classification used the 'Manual Method' classification choice with 4 breaks of which the 'Break Values' were in percent. The percent break values were entered as 5.1, 10.1, 15.1, and the last value was the maximum elevation value in the calculation statistics for each state's DEM. Aspect classification used the 'Manual Method' as well with 6 breaks entered as degrees. The values were entered as 0, 67.5, 112.5, 247.5, 292.5, and 337.5 to achieve the desired aspect degree intervals.

Weighted Overlay - The Weighted Overlay tool (Fig. 8) in ArcGIS® 10 allowed two sets of the same data types, raster in this application, to be combined with a percent influence or 'weight' allotted to each data set. At this point in the process the reclassified slope raster dataset was in Albers Equal Area and the aspect was in the Geographical Coordinate System corresponding with each states UTM zone.

The AEA projected slope and UTM state zone aspect raster datasets were added to the 'Weighted overlay table' box for the Weighted Overlay, Spatial Analyst tool. Based on field observations it was determined that 60% influence would be assigned to aspect and 40% influence to slope. Percentages were based on aspect leading to more stress as the site is more prone to weather conditions on a constant basis and slope is tied to water retention ability during a rainfall event. The output retained the four class categories by default.

The product of the weighted overlay of an AEA slope and a UTM state zone aspect raster dataset was a UTM state zone Four Class Hazard Map (Fig. 9). At this stage, the maps were not defined by state boundaries and, using an extraction tool, were separated by state.

Extraction

Extract by State Mask - Each Four Class Hazard Map was extracted by its state boundary exported from the ESRI® United States shape file in ArcGIS® 10. All extractions were implemented with ArcGIS® 10 Spatial Analyst Tools\Extraction\Extract by Mask (Fig. 10). The 'input raster' assigned as the Four Class Hazard Map created in the previous step. The 'input raster or feature mask data' was the coinciding state boundary and an 'Output raster' named was assigned and saved to a location. This process resulted in an extracted Four Class Hazard Map by each state's boundary (Fig. 11).

Special State Extractions - Ten-meter DEMs were available for the majority of the southeast United States but not its entirety. A small part was unavailable in George County, Mississippi and many portions were not available in Florida (Fig 12). Florida and Mississippi Four Class Hazard Maps were clipped as a final process to remove areas of hazard that were not figured from DEMs (Fig. 13) using the Extract by Mask tool in ArcGIS® Arc Map™ 10.

Loblolly Coverage/Risk

Coverage - Forest Health Technology Enterprise Team (FHTET), a department of the United States Forest Service, provided a loblolly pine (*P. taeda* L.) coverage layer for the contiguous United States. The most recent coverage version, Beta 3, not available to the public, was provided for this project. The loblolly coverage was created by a 30m pixel model using the criteria whether loblolly pine was present or absent. The model did not take loblolly density into account. The 30m cells were then aggregated to a 240m pixel, each 240m consisting of sixty-four 30m cells. The coverage was delivered as a 0-100% frequency; the number of 30m cells with loblolly pine present was divided by the total possible number, 64, within the 240m pixel to achieve a frequency percentage (Jim Ellenwood-FHTET Modeler, personal communication). For the purposes of the risk map a 60% frequency was chosen based on Loblolly Pine Decline field observations.

The loblolly pine coverage layer was then extracted by a mask (Fig. 14) of the state borders for the chosen states; Alabama, Arkansas, Florida, Georgia, Louisiana, Mississippi, North Carolina, South Carolina, and Texas. The Southeast Loblolly Coverage was then separated by state using borders as masks to extract by mask (Fig. 14). For Texas and Florida only partial state areas were chosen due to the lower percentage loblolly range in those states (Fig. 15).

Loblolly at Risk - The Loblolly Coverage files for each state were in a raster file format and the Four Class Hazard Maps were extracted using the Loblolly Coverage as a mask (Fig. 16) by State. The Loblolly State Coverage raster files were converted to shape files for each state and used as masks in an extraction. The extraction resulted in a map by state of the hazard sites on which loblolly pine were located according to the FHTET Loblolly Coverage file (Fig. 16).

Area Calculations - The ArcGIS® 10 'Field Calculator' was used to calculate area in both hectares and acres and was done for each state's raster Four Class Hazard Map and Loblolly Risk Area Map. The attribute tables were accessed for each raster dataset and a new field was added for 'Hectares' and 'Acres' of the long integer 'Type'. The fields were created outside of an editing session then calculated inside an editing session and saved. The field calculator was used as mentioned and hectares were figured by the equation '[Count]/100' and area by '[Count]/40.47'. The 'Count' field was the number of 10 by 10m pixels, 100 m^2, in each of the four hazard categories. The calculations resulted in the number of hectares and acres in each of the four hazard categories per state for the Four Class Hazard Map and the Loblolly Risk Area Map. These calculations were processed on raster files before pyramids were built in order to obtain accurate calculations. Pyramids were built later to project all state maps as one.

Map Validation/Ground Truthing

Slope and Aspect Ground Truthing - Forest Inventory and Analysis (FIA) slope and aspect data were used as ground truth measures by United States Forest Service personnel. The reclassified slope and aspect datasets from this study were provided in raster datasets for use on ArcGIS® 10. A '.sql' or Structured Query Language statement was written with Oracle software to query the FIA database, extracting 'PLOT' and 'CONDITION'. A point file (shapefile/.shp) was created in ArcGIS® 10 using actual, not fuzzed or altered, X and Y coordinates. The point file was then exported and saved in the same projection as the state the file was created to truth. Spatial Analyst Tools\Extraction\Extract Values to Points (Fig. 17) was used, point features, PLOT and CONDITION data for each state, and raster by state were input to extract slope and aspect data by X and Y coordinates. This process was implemented for each state, creating a slope and aspect file for each state. The database files (.dbf) were converted into Microsoft Excel spreadsheets of slope and aspect per Southeast state with the X and Y coordinates for each FIA plot removed prior to receiving.

Using Microsoft Excel 2010, IF/THEN statements were created based on the predisposing hazard site conditions (Table. 1). The IF/THEN statements created a column stating whether the ground data matched the GIS derived data with an 'ok' or 'no good'. These 'ok' and 'no good' cells were calculated to receive a percent accuracy of the slope and aspect map readings compared to the FIA ground data. Tolerances were created for both slope and aspect to accommodate for errors that could have occurred in calculations and ground readings. No tolerance values were figured as well as +/- 1% for slope values and +/- 5, 10, and 15 degrees for aspect values.

Ecological Ground Truthing - Positive and negative identifications of ophiostomatoid fungi from the Auburn University Forest Health Cooperative Database made from sampled loblolly pine roots in research plots were plotted on the Loblolly Pine Decline Hazard Map. The plot GPS coordinates were stored in the database then plotted on the Loblolly Pine Decline Risk Map using ArcGIS® 10 'Go To XY' tool (Fig. 18) in the main toolbar. Once a point was plotted its risk level was assessed.

The field plots consisted of a center plot and three subplots, consistent with the United States Forest Service Forest Health Monitoring plot design (Fig. 19) (Dunn, 1999). The center and subplots have a radius of about 7.3m. When the GPS plot coordinates were plotted on the Loblolly Pine Decline Risk Map, the center 10m cell that contained the point was considered to be plot center. This assumption had to be made as most of the points did not fall in the center of a 10m pixel due to GPS error and plot location. The 10m cells on the 10m resolution raster file were delineated by a Fishnet created in using ArcGIS® 10 Data Management Tools\Feature Class\Create Fishnet (Fig. 20). This 'Fishnet' put a geo-referenced grid down on the 10m raster file which was needed in areas that consisted of the same color pixels.

The 7.3m radius of each plot overlapped 9 pixels on the 10m raster (Fig. 21). These 9 pixels were averaged to achieve the risk rating of the plot. Numbers were assigned to the color pixels based on their risk level to achieve the average plot risk. Green/Low Risk =1, Yellow/Medium Risk = 2, Orange/High Risk = 3, and Red/Severe Risk = 4 (Fig 22).

RESULTS

The southeast United States was mapped from east Texas, the 'Piney Woods', to North Carolina consisting of seven entire states, the northern half of Florida and east Texas. It covered 678 counties across 9 states and approximately 102,836,000 hectares. The Four Class Hazard Map (Alabama Fig. 23, Table 2; Arkansas Fig. 24; Table 3; Florida Fig. 25, Table 4; Georgia Fig. 26, Table 5; Louisiana Fig. 27, Table 6; Mississippi Fig. 28, Table 7; North Carolina Fig. 29, Table 8; South Carolina Fig. 30, Table 9; East Texas Fig. 31, Table 10) consisted of 49,190,997 ha in the Low hazard class, 20,306,790 ha in the Medium class, 26,761,872 ha in the High class and 6,854,100 ha in the Severe hazards class (Fig. 32, Table 11). The Loblolly Pine Risk Map (Alabama Fig. 33, Table 12; Arkansas Fig. 34; Table 13; Florida Fig. 35, Table 14; Georgia Fig. 36, Table 15; Louisiana Fig. 37, Table 16; Mississippi Fig. 38, Table 17; North Carolina Fig. 39, Table 18; South Carolina Fig. 40, Table 19; East Texas Fig. 41, Table 20) consisted of 13,203,103 ha in the Low hazard class, 7,700,494 ha in the Medium class, 9,819,890 ha in the High class and 2,346,953 ha in the Severe hazards class (Fig. 42, Table 21).

<u>Ground Truthing</u>

The ground truthing of the slope and aspect ratings was processed on the slope and aspect raster files that were reclassified into categories of 1, 2, 3, and 4 based on previous research (Table 1). The state raster files were the last step before the Weighted Overlay was processed in ArcGIS® Arc Map™ 10 to create the Four Class Hazard Map. The +/- %1 slope tolerance (Table 22) and +/- 5, 10, and 15% aspect tolerance (Table 23) were selected to allow for errors in both field work and large area GIS computations. The range of possible slope (%) assessed was small with three of the classes falling below 15% slope and one class above 15% (Fig. 43). To compute the Four Class Hazard Map accuracy nearly 60,000 points, for both slope and aspect, for all 9 states were examined and processed together. Ground truthing was the percent accuracy of the Four Class Hazard Map for all eight sets of tolerance criteria (Table 24).

The ecological ground truthing plotted positive and negative identifications of LPD and the ophiostomatoid fungi associated with the tree mortality. A total of 243 plots were used from the Forest Health Cooperative database, spanning the southeast United States. Plots were located in Alabama, Georgia, Mississippi, and Texas. The plot risk was assessed as a percentage of the plots that fell in the various risk levels. Of the positive identifications recovered from the laboratory, 86% were in the Medium, High, and Severe Risk categories, 14% in Low Risk. The negative plots were figured on a percentage basis with 25% being in the Low Risk category. The overall ecological ground truthing accuracy of the LPD Hazard Map was 86%, calculated from the percentage of positive plots above Low Risk (Table 25).

There were 44 plots that did not fall on the LPD Risk Map. Therefore, the ecological ground truthing for these plots were administered on the LPD Hazard Map. These 44 misses or 18.1% of the 243 plots, speak to the accuracy of the loblolly coverage used to create the LPD Risk Map. The missed plots were comprised of enough loblolly pine that they met the 60% coverage criteria set as the coverage layer constraint.

DISCUSSION and CONCLUSION

This development of Loblolly Pine Decline hazard and risk maps for the entire southeastern United States has the potential to save millions of dollars. The hazard map created in this study will allow land managers to better understand the potential tree mortality in their stands as they carry them to full rotations. These would include the proper planting of stems per acre, number of thinnings, and species selection are all key issues that will assist a land manger when using the map. These maps will ultimately allow land managers, both large and small, to better accomplish their objectives.

In this study the states were processed individually for reason of file size computations. This was an important note as the final Four Class Hazard Map was to span the southeast United States from Texas to North Carolina. The individual states appeared seamless as was expected because they were each a DEM mosaic processed as a whole. Once the individual maps were joined in one workspace the seamless look of the individual states was also present between states. This homogenous, interstate flow of the map indicated that the same processes were sequentially implemented for each state. The methods outlined in the work were properly followed for each state resulting in a successful joining of the individual state maps. Individuals from the United States Forest Service's Forest Health Technology Enterprise Team (FHTET) stressed this in conversations and seminars as an important aspect of large area maps.

The slope and aspect accuracy assessment numbers were derived from 60,000 ground truth points using FIA data from the United States Forest Service. This amount of ground truthing resulted in, at the high end, 70% accuracy. The tolerances for the accuracy assessment allowed less than 5% error for both slope and aspect. For 100% slope, or 45°, only 1% error was tolerated. The highest aspect tolerance of 15° allowed approximately 4% error. These tolerances were strict for a reason, if the tolerances became too large then hazard levels could overlap and adjacent levels would have been accepted as either. This was especially true for the slope values as they were a small fraction of the possible slope values and close intervals. Even without strict error tolerances the 70% accuracy was favorable for a map covering this large of an area. The strict tolerances added to the strength of the hazard map accuracy.

To increase the robustness of the LPD hazard map ecological ground truthing was implemented using positive and negative LPD fungal plot identifications from the Forest Health Cooperative database. Using positive and negative LPD fungal points made sense to further validate the hazard map by way of an ecological assessment. An overall accuracy of 86% was figured from the percentage of positive plots that fell on Medium, High, and Severe Hazard sites (Table 25). While only 25% of the negatives plots fell in the Low Hazard category there was reason. The plots that fell in the Medium, High, and Severe Hazard categories were located on sites of minimal or no disturbance. The hazard of these sites can still be correct but with minimal or no disturbance the loblolly pine are at little increased risk. The lack of increased risk from minimal or no disturbance in a disturbance driven decline complex validates the negative identification of fungi from the tree roots. This high of an accuracy assessment further validates the criteria and methods from which the LPD hazard map was created.

The 44 plots that did not fall on the risk map, out of 243 plots attempted, helps to assess the accuracy of the Beta 3 loblolly pine coverage. Based on the database plots an 81.9% accuracy was derived. This extra truthing adds to the LPD risk map, giving validity to the models which created the coverage layer used as a mask to extract the risk map from the hazard map.

Future positive identifications of Loblolly Pine Decline from the Forest Health Dynamics Laboratory and Forest Health Cooperative at Auburn University will be able to be added to the map to make it more robust. Added information from topographical and ecological standpoints will enhance the LPD hazard and risk maps as management tools and continue to assist in the comprehension of this complex decline.

REFERENCES

Adeaga, O. 2005. Flood Hazard Mapping and Risk Management in Part of Lagos N.E. Department of Geography, University of Lagos, Nigeria.1-7 p.

Allen, L.H. 1994. Letter to Gulf States Paper Corp. from North Carolina State University, Raleigh. NCSFNC. 2 p.

Al-Adamat, R.A.N., Foster, I.D.L., and Baban, S.M.J. 2003. Groundwater vulnerability and risk mapping for the Basaltic aquifer of the Azraq basin of Jordan using GIS, Remote sensing and DRASTIC. Applied Geography. 23: 303-324.

Barras, S.J., and Perry, T. 1971. *Leptographium terebrantis* sp. nov. associated with *Dendroctonus terebrans* in loblolly pine. Mycopathologia et Mycologia applicata 43(1): 1-10.

Borchert D., Fowler, G., and Jackson, L. 2007. Organism pest risk analysis: risks to the conterminous United States associated with the woodwasp, *Sirex noctilio* Fabricius, and the symbiotic fungus, *Amylostereum areolatum*, (Fries: Fries) Boidin. USDA-APHIS-PPQ-CPHST-

PERAL. Rev.1, 2007. Available at: http://www.aphis.usda.gov/plant health/plant pest info/sirex/downloads/sirex- pra.pdf.

Brown, H.D., and McDowell, W.E. 1968. Status of loblolly pine die-off on the Oakmulgee District, Talladega National Forest, Alabama. U.S. Forest Service, Division of Forest Pest Control, Rpt. No. 69-2-28.

Büchele, B., Kreibich, H., Kron, A., Thieken, A., Ihringer, J., Oberle, P., Merz, B., and Nestmann, F. 2006. Flood-risk mapping: contributions towards an enhanced assessment of extreme events and associated risks. Natural Hazards Earth System Sciences, 6: 485-503.

Byram, T.D., Mullin, T.J., White, T.L., and van Buijtenen, J.P. 2005. The Future of Tree Improvement in the Southeastern United States: Alternative Visions for the Next Decade. Southern Journal of Applied Forestry. 29(2): 88-95.

Campbell, W.A., and Copeland, O.L. 1954. Littleleaf disease of shortleaf and loblolly pines.Circular No. 940, USDA, Forest Service, Washington D.C.

Carnegie, A.J., Matsuki, M., Haugen, D.A., Hurley, B.P., Ahumada, R., Klasmer, .P, Sun, J., and Iede, E.T. 2006. Predicting the potential distribution of *Sirex noctilio* (Hymenoptera: Siricidae), a significant exotic pest of *Pinus* plantations.Annals of Forest Science; 63:119–128.

Clinton, W.J. 1999. Executive Order 13112 of February 3,1999: Invasive species. Federal Register; 64(25):6183–6186.

Coder, K.D. 2006. *Pinus taeda* loblolly pine. Warnell School of Forestry & Natural Resources, UGA. Outreach Publication: SFNR06-26. 2 p.

Corley, J.C., Villacide, J.M., and Bruzzone, O.A. 2007. Spatial dynamics of a *Sirex noctilio* woodwasp population within a pine plantation in Patagonia, Argentina. Entomologia Experimentalis et Applicata; 125:231–236.

de Groot, P., Nystrom, K., and Scarr T. 2006. Discovery of *Sirex noctilio* (Hymenoptera: Siricidae) in Ontario, Canada. Great Lakes Entomologist; 39:49–53.

Drohan, P.J., Stout, S.L., and Petersen, G.W. 2002. Sugar maple (*Acer saccharum* Marsh.) decline during 1979 - 1989 in northern pennsylvania. For. Ecol. Manag. 170:1-17.

Dunn, P.H. 1999. Forest Health Monitoring Field Methods Guide, U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Washington, DC. 120p.

Eckhardt, L.G. 2003. Biology and ecology of *Leptographium* species and their vectors as components of loblolly pine decline. Ph.D. dissertation, Louisiana State University, Baton Rouge.

Eckhardt, L.G., and Menard, R.D. 2008. Topographic features associated with loblolly pine decline in central Alabama. For. Ecol. Manag. 255: 1735-1739.

Eckhardt, L.G., Webber, A.M., Menard, R.D., Jones, J.P., and Hess, N.J. 2007. Insect- Fungal Complex Associated with Loblolly Pine Decline in Central Alabama. For. Sci. 53:84-92.

Edger, J.G., Kile, G.A., and Almond, C.A. 1976. Tree decline and mortality in selectively logged Eucalypt forests in central Victoria. Aust. For. 39(4): 288-303.

Edmond, R.D., Agee, J.K., and Gara, R.I. 2000. Forest Health and Protection. The McGraw-Hill Companies, Inc., U.S. P.366-367.

Geospatial Data Gateway. 2012. http://datagateway.nrcs.usda.gov/. Accessed 5/2012.
Grímsdóttir, H. 2008. Avalanche hazard mapping and risk assessment in Iceland. International Snow Workshop, Icelandic Meteorlogical Office, Avalanche Research Center, Whistler, 2008. IS-400.

Haboudane, D., Bonn, F., Royer, A., Sommer, S., and Mehl, W. 2002. Land Degredation and erosion risk mapping by fusion of spectrally-based information and digital geomorphometric attributes. International Journal Remote Sensing vol. 23 no. 18:3795-3820.

Harrington, T.C., 1987. New combinations in *Ophiostoma* of *Ceratocystis* species with *Leptographium* anamorphs. Mycotaxon 28(1): 39.

Haugen, D.A., Bedding, R.A., Underdown, M., and Neumann, F.G. 1990. National strategy for control of *Sirex noctilio* in Australia. Australian Forest Grower, 13.

Hawk, E.Q. 1934. Economic history of the South. Prentice Hall, Inc., New York.

Hess, N.J., 1997. Trip report to Shoal Creek Ranger District and Oakmulgee Ranger District. Forest Health Protection, Alexandria, LA. File code: 3400, November 18, 1997. 3 p.

Horner, W.E., and Alexander, S.A. 1983. *Verticicladiella procera* in pine seed orchards in the south. Phytopathology 73(5): 835. *abstract*.

Horsley, S.B., Long, R.P., Bailey, S.W., Hallett, R.A., and Hall, T.J. 2000. Factors associated with the decline-disease of sugar maple on the Allegheny Plateau. Can. J. For. Res. 30:1365-1378.

Ishimura, A., Shimizu, Y., Rahimzadeh-Bajgiran, P., and Omasa, K. 2011. Remote sensing of Japanese beech forest decline using an improved Temperature Vegetation Dryness Index (iTVDI). iForest. 4:195-199.

ISSG - Invasive Species Specialist Group. 2012. Database queried for current *Sirex noctilio* distribution. www.issg.org. Accessed 7/2012.

Ja, M.J., Han, L.S., and Young, W.S. 2011. Cork oak (*Quercus suber* L.) forest decline in Tunisia: A linkage between physiological adaptation and stress. Scientific Research and Essays vol. 6(6) pp. 1143-1146.

Jacobs, K., and Wingfield, M.J. 2001. *Leptographium* species: tree pathogens, insect associates and agents of bluestain, pp. 1-207. American Phytopathological Society. Press, St. Paul, MI.

Johnson, S.R. 1947. Timber management plan, Cahaba Working Circle, Talladega National Forest, Alabama. R-8 period 7-1-46 to 6-30-56. Intern. Doc. Montgomory, AL: U.S., Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, National Forests in Alabama. 16p.

Jurskis, V. 2005. Eucalypt decline in Australia, and a general concept of tree decline and dieback. For. Ecol. Manag. 215: 1-20.

Klepzig, K.D., Raffa, K.F., and Smalley, E.B. 1991. Association of an insect-fungal complex with red pine decline in Wisconsin. For. Sci. 37: 1119-1139.

Manion, P. D. 1981. Tree disease concepts. Prentice-Hall, Inc. NJ.

Manion, P.D. 1991. Tree disease concepts, 2nd Ed. Prentice Hall, Inc. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey. 402 p.

Manion, P.D., and Lachance, D. 1992. Forest decline concepts. American Phytopathological Society Press, St. Paul, Minnesota. 1 p.

Matusick, G. 2010. Pathogenicity and virulence of root-inhabiting ophiostomatoid fungi on Pinus species of the southeastern United States. Ph.D. Dissertation. Auburn, AL: Auburn University.

Menard, R.D. 2007. An assessment of the risk mapping system for the use of managing loblolly pine decline sites within red-cockaded woodpecker habitat. Master’s Thesis Louisiana State University, Baton Rouge, LA.

Mitchell, C.C., Delaney, D.P., and Balkcom, K.S. 2008. A historic summary of Alabama’s Old Rotation (circa 1896): The world’s oldest, continuous cotton experiment. Agronomy Journal Vol. 100 Issue 5:1493-1498.

Moore, G., Kershner, B., Tufts, C., Mathews, D., Nelson, G., Spellenberg, R., Thieret, J.W., Purinton, T., and Block, A. 2008. National Wildlife Federation Field Guide to Trees of North America. New York: Sterling. p.73. ISBN 1-4027-3875-7.

Noson, L. 2002. Hazard and Risk Assessment. Regional Workshop on Best Practices in Disaster Mitigation (Plan). P. 69-94.

Oak, S.W., and Tainter, F.H. 1988. Risk prediction of loblolly pine decline on littleleaf disease sites in South Carolina. Plant Dis. 72:289-293.

Roth, E.R. 1954. Spread and intensification of the littleleaf disease of pine. J. For. 52:592-596.

Roth, E.R., Buchanan, T.S., and Hepting, G.H. 1948. A five year record of littleleaf on thirty-one plots. USDA For. Pathology Special Release No. 32.

Roth, E.R., and Preacher, P.H. 1971. Alabama loblolly pine die-off evaluation. Report No. 72-2-9. U.S. Dep. Agric. For. Serv. Southeastern area, state and private forestry forest pest management group. Pineville, LA. 8 pp.

Schultz, R.P. 1997. Loblolly pine: the ecology and culture of loblolly pine (*Pinus taeda* L.). U.S. Department of Agriculture, Agriculture Handbook 713. Washington, DC. Chapter 1. 1-16 pp.

Schultz, R.P. 1999. Loblolly - the pine for the twenty-first century. U.S. Department of Agriculture, New Forests 17. Kluwer Academic Publisher: Netherlands. 71-88 pp.

Skelly, J.M. 1993. A closer look at forest decline: A need for more accurate diagnostics. Forest decline concepts. *Edited by* P.D. Manion and D. Lachance. American Phytopathological Society Press, St. Paul, Minnesota, U.S.A. 85-107 pp.

Smith, R.H. 2007. History of the Boll Weevil in Alabama, 1910-2007. Alabama Agricultural Experiment Station. Bulletin no. 670. pp.1-14.

Strickland, A.E. 1994. The Strange Affair of the Boll Weevil: The Pest as Liberator. Agricultural History, Vol. 68, No. 2, Spring pp.157-168.

Tainter, F.H., Benson, D.M., and Fraedrich, S.W. 1984. The effect of climate on growth, decline and death of the northern red oaks in the western North Carolina Nantahala Mountains. Castanea 49:127-137.

Thomas, A.L., Gerout, J.C., Landmann, G., Dambrine, E., and King, D. 2002. Relation betweenecological conditions and fir decline in a sandstone region of the Vosges mountains (northern France). Ann. For. Sci. 59:265-273.

Trimble, S.W. 1974. Non-induced Soil Erosion on the Southern Piedmont. Soil Conservation Society of America.

van Westen, C.J., Montoya, L., Boerboom, L., and Coto, E.B. 2002. Multi-Hazard Risk Assessment Using GIS in Urban Areas: A Case Study for the City of Turrialba, Costa Rica. Regional Workshop on Best Practices in Disaster Mitigation. P. 120-140.

Venturato, A.J., Arcas, D., Titov, V.V., Mofjeld, H.O., Chamberlin, C.C., and González, F.I. 2007. Tacoma, Washington, Tsunami Hazard Mapping Project: Modeling Tsunami Inundation from Tacoma and Seattle Fault Earthquakes. NOAA Technical Memorandum OAR PMEL-132.

Yemshanov, D., Koch, F.H., Ben-Haim, Y., and Smith, W.D. 2010. Robustness of Risk Maps and Survey Networks to Knowledge Gaps About a new Invasive Pest. Risk Analysis, Vol. 30, No. 2: 261-276.

Yemshanov, D., Koch, F.H., Mckenney D.W., Downing, M.C., and Sapio, F. 2009. Mapping Invasive Species Risks with Stochastic Models: A Cross-Border United States-Canada Application for *Sirex noctilio* Fabricius. Risk Analysis, Vol. 29, No. 6: 868-884.

Zipfel, R.D., de Beer, W., Jacobs, K., Wingfield, B.D., and Wingfield, M.J. 2006. Multi-gene phylogenies define *Ceratocystiopsis* and *Grosmannia* distinct *Ophiostoma*. Stud. Mycol. 55: 75-97.



Fig. 1. ERDAS IMAGINE® 9.3 Data Preparation Mosaic Images steps using Mosaic Direct.



Fig. 2. Alabama 10m Digital Elevation Model mosaic image with three parcel zoom.



Fig. 3. 'Fill Sinks' ERDAS® 9.3 model, top red circle is input and bottom is output.



Fig. 4. ArcGIS® 10 Project Raster tool.



Fig. 5. ArcGIS® 10 Spatial Analyst: Slope tool.



Fig. 6. ArcGIS® 10 Spatial Analyst: Aspect tool.



Fig. 7. ArcGIS® 10 Spatial Analyst: Reclassify tool.

Table 1. Slope and Aspect reclassified category values.

Predisposing Hazard Factors	
Slope	Aspect
1: 0 – 5.1%	1: 337.5° – 67.5°
2: 5.1 – 10.1%	2: 67.6° – 112.5° and 292.6 – 337.4°
3: 10.1 – 15.1%	3: 274.6° – 292.5°
4: > 15.1%	4: 112.6° – 247.5°



Fig. 8. ArcGIS® 10 Spatial Analyst: Weighted Overlay tool.



Fig. 9. Top left a reclassified aspect raster data set and top right a reclassified slope raster processed through ArcGIS® Arc Map™ 10 Weighted Overlay tool to produce the Four Class Hazard Map raster data set (Alabama).



Fig. 10. ArcGIS® 10 Spatial Analyst: Extract by Mask tool.



Fig. 11. State border used as a mask to extract State Four Class Hazard Map from unclipped State Four Class Hazard Map (Alabama).



Fig. 12. Available 10m Digital Elevation Models shown in green for the study area of the southeast United States.



Fig. 13. Florida Four Class Hazard Map processed through ArcGIS® 10 Extraction by Mask tool using available 10m digital elevation model image as mask.



Fig. 14. The contiguous United States Loblolly Coverage reduced to the Southeast Loblolly Coverage then each State Loblolly Coverage selected (Alabama).



Figure 15. Southeast Loblolly Pine range with the areas of use for Texas and Florida demarcated



Fig. 16. Individual State Loblolly Coverage used as a mask on State Four Class Hazard Map to extract Loblolly Risk Areas by State (Alabama).



Fig. 17. ArcGIS® 10 Spatial Analyst: Extract Values to Points tool.



Fig. 18. ArcGIS® 10 Go To XY tool.



Fig. 19. Center plot and subplot Forest Health Monitoring layout.



Fig. 20. ArcGIS® 10 Data Management Tools: Create Fishnet tool.



Fig. 21. Alabama Loblolly Pine Decline Risk Map with zoom of plotted point (Severe Risk).



Fig. 22. Risk sites with plotted point and plot circle, top: High Risk, bottom left: Medium Risk, and bottom right: Low Risk.



Fig. 23. Alabama Four Class Hazard Map with a zoom in of Marshall County.

Table 2. Alabama Four Class Hazard Map area calculations by class in hectares and acres.

Alabama Hazard Site Area				
Low	Medium	High	Severe	
4,397,919	3,182,964	4,378,961	1,426,200	Hectares
10,867,108	7,864,997	10,820,265	3,524,091	Acres



Fig. 24. Arkansas Four Class Hazard Map with a zoom in of Yell County.

Table 3. Arkansas Four Class Hazard Map area calculations by class in hectares and acres.

Arkansas Hazard Site Area				
Low	Medium	High	Severe	
7,032,372	2,734,882	3,747,354	1,372,216	Hectares
17,376,753	6,757,802	9,259,584	3,390,700	Acres



Fig. 25. Florida Four Class Hazard Map with a zoom in of Calhoun County.

Table 4. Florida Four Class Hazard Map area calculations by class in hectares and acres.

Florida Hazard Site Area				
Low	Medium	High	Severe	
3,140,648	743,506	919,539	54,046	Hectares
7,760,434	1,837,178	2,272,151	133,545	Acres



Fig. 26. Georgia Four Class Hazard Map with a zoom in of Emanuel County.

Table 5. Georgia Four Class Hazard Map area calculations by class in hectares and acres.

Georgia Hazard Site Area				
Low	Medium	High	Severe	
7,047,833	3,054,756	4,084,941	1,008,609	Hectares
17,414,957	7,548,200	10,093,752	2,492,238	Acres



Fig. 27. Louisiana Four Class Hazard Map with a zoom in of Winn County.

Table 6. Louisiana Four Class Hazard Map area calculations by class in hectares and acres.

Louisiana Hazard Site Area				
Low	Medium	High	Severe	
8,381,799	1,744,490	2,054,096	233,074	Hectares
20,711,142	4,310,577	5,075,603	575,918	Acres



Fig. 28. Mississippi Four Class Hazard Map with a zoom in of Rankin County.

Table 7. Mississippi Four Class Hazard Map area calculations by class in hectares and acres.

Mississippi Hazard Site Area				
Low	Medium	High	Severe	
5,674,857	2,679,424	3,253,004	715,345	Hectares
14,022,380	6,620,765	8,038,064	1,767,594	Acres



Fig. 29. North Carolina Four Class Hazard Map with a zoom in of Lee County.

Table 8. North Carolina Four Class Hazard Map area calculations by class in hectares and acres.

North Carolina Hazard Site Area				
Low	Medium	High	Severe	
4,397,919	3,182,964	4,378,961	1,426,200	Hectares
10,867,108	7,864,997	10,820,265	3,524,091	Acres



Fig. 30. South Carolina Four Class Hazard Map with a zoom in of Laurens County.

Table 9. South Carolina Four Class Hazard Map area calculations by class in hectares and acres.

South Carolina Hazard Site Area				
Low	Medium	High	Severe	
4,295,658	1,394,912	1,878,646	420,616	Hectares
10,614,425	3,446,780	4,642,071	1,039,328	Acres



Fig. 31. East Texas Four Class Hazard Map with a zoom in of Rusk County.

Table 10. East Texas Four Class Hazard Map area calculations by class in hectares and acres.

East Texas (Piney Woods) Hazard Site Area				
Low	Medium	High	Severe	
4,821,992	1,588,892	2,066,370	197,794	Hectares
11,914,978	3,926,098	5,105,930	488,742	Acres



Fig. 32. Southeast United States Four Class Loblolly Pine Decline Hazard Map.

Table 11. Southeast United States Four Class Hazard Map area calculations by class in hectares and acres.

Southeast Loblolly Pine Decline Hazard Area				
Low	Medium	High	Severe	
49,190,997	20,306,790	26,761,872	6,854,100	Hectares
121,549,285	50,177,394	66,127,685	16,936,247	Acres

Fig. 33. Alabama Loblolly Pine Decline Risk Map.

Table 12. Alabama Loblolly Pine Decline Risk Map area calculations by class in hectares and acres.

Alabama Loblolly Pine Risk Area				
Low	Medium	High	Severe	
1,406,400	1,488,884	1,981,525	700,629	Hectares
3,475,167	3,678,983	4,896,281	1,731,230	Acres



Fig. 34. Arkansas Loblolly Pine Decline Risk Map.

Table 13. Arkansas Loblolly Pine Decline Risk Map area calculations by class in hectares and acres.

Arkansas Loblolly Pine Risk Area				
Low	Medium	High	Severe	
1,326,379	589,816	833,463	179,345	Hectares
3,277,437	1,457,416	2,059,459	443,155	Acres



Fig. 35. Florida Loblolly Pine Decline Risk Map.

Table 14. Florida Loblolly Pine Decline Risk Map area calculations by class in hectares and acres.

Florida Loblolly Pine Area Risk				
Low	Medium	High	Severe	
106,937	53,688	67,778	8,408	Hectares
264,238	132,661	167,477	20,775	Acres



Fig. 36. Georgia Loblolly Pine Decline Risk Map.

Table 15. Georgia Loblolly Pine Decline Risk Map area calculations by class in hectares and acres.

Georgia Loblolly Pine Risk Area				
Low	Medium	High	Severe	
2,133,506	1,342,831	1,715,106	412,885	Hectares
5,271,821	3,318,090	4,237,970	1,020,225	Acres



Fig. 37. Louisiana Loblolly Pine Decline Risk Map.

Table 16. Louisiana Loblolly Pine Decline Risk Map area calculations by class in hectares and acres.

Louisiana Loblolly Pine Risk Area				
Low	Medium	High	Severe	
1,425,540	867,496	1,034,115	159,269	Hectares
3,522,460	2,143,554	2,555,264	393,547	Acres



Fig. 38. Mississippi Loblolly Pine Decline Risk Map.

Table 17. Mississippi Loblolly Pine Decline Risk Map area calculations by class in hectares and acres.

Mississippi Loblolly Pine Risk Area				
Low	Medium	High	Severe	
1,767,852	1,453,300	1,729,991	461,004	Hectares
4,368,302	3,591,054	4,274,750	1,139,124	Acres



Fig. 39. North Carolina Loblolly Pine Decline Risk Map.

Table 18. North Carolina Loblolly Pine Decline Risk Map area calculations by class in hectares and acres.

North Carolina Loblolly Pine Risk Area				
Low	Medium	High	Severe	
1,622,277	553,250	733,791	131,140	Hectares
4,008,591	1,367,063	1,813,173	324,043	Acres



Fig. 40. South Carolina Loblolly Pine Decline Risk Map.

Table 19. South Carolina Loblolly Pine Decline Risk Map area calculations by class in hectares and acres.

South Carolina Loblolly Pine Risk Area				
Low	Medium	High	Severe	
1,899,762	665,845	858,344	192,780	Hectares



Fig. 41. East Texas Loblolly Pine Decline Risk Map.

Table 20. East Texas Loblolly Pine Decline Risk Map area calculations by class in hectares and acres.

East Texas Loblolly Pine Risk Area				
Low	Medium	High	Severe	
1,514,450	685,384	865,777	101,493	Hectares
3,742,155	1,693,560	2,139,304	250,786	Acres



Fig. 42. Southeast United States Loblolly Pine Decline Risk Map.

Table 21. Southeast United States Loblolly Pine Decline Risk Map area calculations by class in hectares and acres.

Southeast Loblolly Pine Risk Area				
Low	Medium	High	Severe	
13,203,103	7,700,494	9,819,890	2,346,953	Hectares
32,624,420	19,027,661	24,264,646	5,799,237	Acres

Table 22. Southeast United States Four Class Hazard Map reclassified slope accuracy assessment (%).

Slope Accuracy (%)		
State	**+/- 0% Criteria**	**+/- 1% Criteria**
Alabama	54	62
Arkansas	58	65
Georgia	66	72
Louisiana	74	79
Mississippi	53	61
North Carolina	71	76
South Carolina	70	78
Texas	66	71

Table 23. Southeast United States Four Class Hazard Map reclassified aspect accuracy assessment (%).

Aspect Accuracy (%)				
State	**Tolerance +/- 0 degrees**	**+/- 5 degrees**	**+/- 10 degrees**	**+/- 15 degrees**
Alabama	57	60	63	66
Arkansas	65	66	67	69
Georgia	64	67	69	70
Louisiana	67	69	71	73
Mississippi	54	57	60	62
North Carolina	63	65	68	70
South Carolina	67	69	71	72
Texas	57	58	60	61



Fig. 43. Grade or percent slope, also in degrees, figured from rise over run.

Table 24. Southeast United States Four Class Hazard Map accuracy assessment (%).

Map Accuracy (%)				
Slope: Y Aspect: X	**Tolerance +/- 0 degrees**	**+/- 5 degrees**	**+/- 10 degrees**	**+/- 15 degrees**
Tolerance +/- 0%	63	64	65	66
Tolerance +/- 1%	65	66	68	69

Table 25. Ecological ground truthing results, plots based on fungal presence or absence.

Ecological Ground Truth Plot Results				
Hazard Level	**Positive Plots**	**%**	**Negative Plots**	**%**
Low	25	14	17	25
Medium	70	40	28	41
High	52	30	19	28
Severe	28	16	4	6
Totals	175	100	68	100