



Monitoring Whitebark Pine in the Greater Yellowstone Ecosystem

2014 Annual Report

Natural Resource Data Series NPS/GRYN/NRDS—2015/796





ON THIS PAGE

Salt Range in Wyoming.
Photograph by: Erin Shanahan

ON THE COVER

High country in the Greater Yellowstone Ecosystem
Photograph by: Rachel Simons

Monitoring Whitebark Pine in the Greater Yellowstone Ecosystem

2014 Annual Report

Natural Resource Data Series NPS/GRYN/NRDS—2015/796

Authors

Greater Yellowstone Whitebark Pine Monitoring Working Group
Bozeman, Montana 59715

Prepared by

Erin Shanahan
Greater Yellowstone Inventory and Monitoring Network
National Park Service
2327 University Way, Suite 2
Bozeman, Montana 59715

Editor

Nina Chambers
Northern Rockies Conservation Cooperative
P.O. Box 2705
Jackson, WY 83001

May 2015

U.S. Department of the Interior
National Park Service
Natural Resource Stewardship and Science
Fort Collins, Colorado

The National Park Service, Natural Resource Stewardship and Science office in Fort Collins, Colorado, publishes a range of reports that address natural resource topics. These reports are of interest and applicability to a broad audience in the National Park Service and others in natural resource management, including scientists, conservation and environmental constituencies, and the public.

The Natural Resource Data Series is intended for the timely release of basic data sets and data summaries. Care has been taken to assure accuracy of raw data values, but a thorough analysis and interpretation of the data has not been completed. Consequently, the initial analyses of data in this report are provisional and subject to change.

All manuscripts in the series receive the appropriate level of peer review to ensure that the information is scientifically credible, technically accurate, appropriately written for the intended audience, and designed and published in a professional manner.

Data in this report were collected and analyzed using methods based on established, peer-reviewed protocols and were analyzed and interpreted within the guidelines of the protocols. This report received formal peer review by subject-matter experts who were not directly involved in the collection, analysis, or reporting of the data, and whose background and expertise put them on par technically and scientifically with the authors of the information.

Views, statements, findings, conclusions, recommendations, and data in this report do not necessarily reflect views and policies of the National Park Service, U.S. Department of the Interior. Mention of trade names or commercial products does not constitute endorsement or recommendation for use by the U.S. Government.

This report is available from <http://science.nature.nps.gov/im/units/gryn/index.cfm> and the Natural Resource Publications Management website (<http://www.nature.nps.gov/publications/nrpm/>).

Please cite this publication as:

Greater Yellowstone Whitebark Pine Monitoring Working Group. 2015. Monitoring whitebark pine in the Greater Yellowstone Ecosystem: 2014 annual report. Natural Resource Data Series NPS/GRYN/NRDS—2015/796. National Park Service, Fort Collins, Colorado.

Contents

- Figures.....iv
- Tables.....iv
- Abstract.....v
- Acknowledgmentsvi
- List of Acronyms.....vii
- Introduction 1
 - Interagency Whitebark Pine Monitoring Program..... 1
 - Monitoring Objectives..... 1
- Study Area 3
- Methods.....5
 - Time-Step Assignment5
 - Full Survey: White Pine Blister Rust and Mountain Pine Beetle Surveys (BR & MPB).....5
 - Mountain Pine Beetle Only/Mortality Survey (MPB only)6
 - Recruitment and Understory Individuals.....6
 - Data Management.....6
- Results.....7
 - Time-step Considerations for Whitebark Pine Health and Status7
 - Monitored Transects7
 - White Pine Blister Rust Infection on Panel 3.....7
 - Infection Transition.....7
 - Mortality on Panel 38
 - Recruitment and Understory Individuals.....8
- Discussion.....9
- Literature Cited 14

Figures

Figure 1. Location of whitebark pine survey transects, Greater Yellowstone Ecosystem.	3
Figure 2. Panel sampling revisit schedule that includes full surveys for blister rust (BR) and mountain pine beetle (MPB) and mountain pine beetle/mortality only surveys (MPB only). This table denotes the designated time series for each Time-Step assignment (Time0 [T0]: 2004-2007, Time1 [T1]: 2008-2011, Time2 [T2]: 2012-2015).	5
Figure 3. Size class and mortality influencing agents observed for 33 dead tagged trees in Panel 3.	8
Figure 4. Preliminary map of the ratio of whitebark pine trees within each transect as alive, dead, or with presence of blister rust infection from surveys 2012-2014. The infection status ranges from a tree with a single canker on a branch to a tree with a bole canker.	10
Figure 5. Location of transects throughout the Greater Yellowstone Ecosystem with and without evidence of mountain pine beetle infestation as of 2014.	11
Figure 6. Location of transects throughout the Greater Yellowstone Ecosystem affected by wildland fire as of 2014.	12

Tables

Table 1. Blister rust infection transition among live tagged trees on Panel 3 transects in 2010 and again in 2014.	7
--	---

Abstract

Whitebark pine (*Pinus albicaulis*) occurs at high elevations and in subalpine communities in the Pacific Northwest and northern Rocky Mountains. It is a key component in the upper ranges of these ecosystems where it provides a variety of ecological roles, including regulating snowpack and providing high-energy food sources to birds and mammals. As a stone pine species, it produces cones with wingless seeds and relies primarily on birds for seed dispersal.

In mixed and dominant stands, whitebark pine occurs in over two million acres within the six national forests and two national parks that make up the Greater Yellowstone Ecosystem (GYE). Currently, whitebark pine is impacted by multiple ecological disturbances. White pine blister rust (*Cronartium ribicola*), mountain pine beetle (*Dendroctonus ponderosae*), wildfires, and warming temperatures all pose significant threats to the persistence of healthy whitebark pine populations on the landscape. Substantial declines in whitebark pine populations have been documented throughout its range. In 2004, an interagency whitebark pine long-term monitoring program was established. The objectives of the whitebark pine monitoring program are to detect and monitor changes in the health and status of whitebark pine populations across the GYE due to infection by white pine blister rust, attack by mountain pine beetle, and damage by other environmental and anthropogenic agents. This report is a summary of data collected in 2014 on Panel 3 of four total sample panels, and marks the eleventh year of monitoring.

Acknowledgments

We thank our current field technicians Tyson Roth, Alyssa Becker, Kenda Herman, and Suzanne Stevenson. We thank former Greater Yellowstone Network ecologist Rob Bennetts for his contribution to the sample design and development of the monitoring protocol, and Steve Cherry from Montana State University for ensuring statistical validity to the sampling regime. We also thank Nancy Bockino, Eric Reinertson, Klinton Powell, Phil Strehle, Cathie Jean, Ellen Jungck, Mary Frances Mahalovich, and Andy Pils for their advice and field and logistic support. Base funding for this program is provided by the NPS Greater Yellowstone Inventory & Monitoring Network. Additional funding and in-kind support for this program is provided by the U.S. Forest Service (USFS) Gallatin National Forest, USFS Forest Health Monitoring, USFS Evaluation Monitoring; U.S. Geological Survey Interagency Grizzly Bear Study Team; the Greater Yellowstone Coordinating Committee; the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service; and from Yellowstone and Grand Teton National Parks.

Members of the Greater Yellowstone Whitebark Pine Working Group include:

Jodie Canfield, Forest Biologist
USDA Forest Service
Gallatin National Forest

Gregg DeNitto, Forest Pathologist
USDA Forest Service
Forest Health Protection

Karl Buermeyer, Subcommittee Chair
USDI Greater Yellowstone Coordinating Committee
Whitebark Pine Subcommittee

Frank van Manen, Study Team Leader
USDI Geological Survey
Interagency Grizzly Bear Study Team

Kathi Irvine, Statistician
USDI Geological Survey

Kristin Legg, Program Manager
Rob Daley, Data Manager
Erin Shanahan, Field Ecologist/Crew Leader
USDI National Park Service
Greater Yellowstone Inventory and Monitoring Network

Kelly McCloskey, Vegetation Ecologist
USDI National Park Service
Grand Teton National Park

Dan Reinhart, Vegetation Resources Program Manager
USDI National Park Service
Yellowstone National Park

Dave Roberts, Department Head
Montana State University
Department of Ecology

List of Acronyms

BR	blister rust
CI	confidence interval
DBH	diameter at breast height
GRYN	Greater Yellowstone Inventory & Monitoring Network
GYCC	Greater Yellowstone Coordinating Committee
GYCCWPS	Greater Yellowstone Coordinating Committee Whitebark Pine Subcommittee
GYE	Greater Yellowstone Ecosystem
GYWPMWG	Greater Yellowstone Whitebark Pine Monitoring Working Group
IGBST	Interagency Grizzly Bear Study Team
MPB	mountain pine beetle
MSU	Montana State University
NPS	National Park Service
RZ	Recovery Zone (grizzly bear)
SE	standard error
USFS	United States Forest Service
USGS	United States Geological Survey

Introduction

Whitebark pine (*Pinus albicaulis*) occurs in the Pacific Northwest and northern Rocky Mountains where it influences biodiversity and ecosystem functions in high-elevation forests and alpine communities. Declines in the whitebark pine population have occurred throughout its historical range due to upsurges in insect and pathogen outbreaks, wildfires, and warming temperatures. The recent population decreases in the Greater Yellowstone Ecosystem (GYE), predominantly attributed to the mountain pine beetle outbreak, are of significant concern to the numerous federal and state agencies tasked with the preservation and restoration of whitebark pine on the landscape. With this 11th year of data collection on the health of whitebark pine in the GYE, the long-term Interagency Whitebark Pine Monitoring Program continues to provide science-driven resources to help guide management activities and regional policy decisions.


This annual report provides a summary of the data collected in 2014 as part of the long-term Interagency Whitebark Pine Monitoring Program for the GYE.

Interagency Whitebark Pine Monitoring Program

Under the auspices of the Greater Yellowstone Coordinating Committee (GYCC), the National Park Service (NPS) Inventory and Monitoring Program, and several other agencies, a collaborative, long-term monitoring program was started to track and document the health and status of whitebark pine across the GYE. This alliance resulted in the formation of the Greater Yellowstone Whitebark Pine Monitoring Working Group (GYWPMWG), which consists of representatives from the U.S. Forest Service (USFS), NPS, U.S. Geological Survey (USGS), and Montana State University (MSU).

A protocol for monitoring the health and status of the whitebark pine population in the GYE was developed between 2004 and 2007 by the GYWPMWG. After rigorous

peer review, the Interagency Whitebark Pine Monitoring Protocol for the Greater Yellowstone Ecosystem was approved in 2007 and updated in 2011 (GYWPMWG 2011). The complete protocol is available at: <https://irma.nps.gov/App/Reference/Profile/660369> (accessed April 16, 2014).



ERIN SHANAHAN

Alpine lake in the Grey's River drainage, Bridger Teton National Forest.

Monitoring Objectives

Generally, the objectives of the whitebark pine monitoring program are to detect and monitor changes in the health and status of the whitebark pine population across the GYE due to infection by white pine blister rust (*Cronartium ribicola*), attack by mountain pine beetle (*Dendroctonus ponderosae*), and impacts by other environmental and anthropogenic agents.

Specifically, the Interagency Whitebark Pine Monitoring Protocol (GYWPMWG 2011) addresses the following four objectives:

Objective 1 - Estimate the proportion of live whitebark pine trees (>1.4 m tall) infected with white pine blister rust, and estimate the rate at which infection of trees is changing over time.

Objective 2 - Within transects having infected trees, determine the relative severity of infection of white pine blister rust in whitebark pine trees >1.4 m tall.

Objective 3 - Estimate survival of individual whitebark pine trees >1.4 m tall, explicitly taking into account the effects of white pine blister rust infection rates and severity, mountain pine beetle activity, and fire.

Objective 4 - Assess and estimate survival rates of understory whitebark pine ≤ 1.4 m tall as influenced by overall species composition and species density, determine the proportion of trees ≤ 1.4 m tall infected with white pine blister rust, and estimate the rate at which infection of trees is changing over time. Methods for this objective are being tested and will be finalized following additional peer review.



ERIN SHAHMAN

Islands of whitebark pine and associated alpine communities in the Grey's River drainage, Bridger Teton National Forest.

Study Area

The GYE study area includes six national forests and two national parks (the John D. Rockefeller Jr. Memorial Parkway is included with Grand Teton National Park; Figure 1). The target population is all whitebark pine trees in the GYE. The sample frame includes stands of whitebark pine approximately 2.5 hectares or greater within and outside of the grizzly bear recovery zone (RZ). A total of 10,770 mapped whitebark polygons or stands were identified in the

mapping process with 2,362 located within the RZ and 8,408 located outside of the RZ. Stands within the RZ were derived from the cumulative effects model for grizzly bears, while outside the RZ, the sample frame includes whitebark stands mapped by each of the six separate USFS units (Dixon 1997; pers. com. L. Landenburger 2012). Areas that burned after 1970 were excluded from the sample frame.




Figure 1. Location of whitebark pine survey transects, Greater Yellowstone Ecosystem.



Whitebark pine crew members hiking above Barstow Lake to a monitoring transect in the Grey's River drainage, Bridger Teton National Forest.

Methods

Details of the sampling design and field methodology can be found in the Interagency Whitebark Pine Monitoring Protocol for the GYE (GYWPMWG 2011) and in the 2007 and 2011 annual reports (GYWPMWG 2008 and 2012). The basic approach is a two-stage cluster design in which stands of whitebark pine are the primary units, and 10x50 meter transects within stands are the secondary units. Initial establishment of permanent transects took place between 2004 and 2007; during this period, 176 permanent transects in 150 whitebark pine stands were established and all individual whitebark pine trees >1.4 m tall were permanently marked in order to estimate changes in white pine blister rust infection and survival rates over an extended period. The sample of 176 transects is a probabilistic sample that provides statistical inference to the GYE.

In 2008, individual transects were randomly assigned to one of four panels; each panel consists of approximately 44 transects. This is the number of transects that can be realistically visited in a given field season by a two-person field crew. Sampling every four years is sufficient to detect change in blister rust infection (GYWPMWG 2011); however, sites in each panel were surveyed every other year from 2008 through 2013 to incorporate the dynamic nature of the recent mountain pine beetle epidemic. These extra surveys focused on mountain pine beetle indicators (Figure 2). Both surveys record tree status as live, dead, or recently dead.

Time-Step Assignment

In order to evaluate step-trends in white pine blister rust infection, infection transition, and overall mortality, every four-year revisit period is classified as a time-step (T#) interval. Time-step 0 (T0) consists of the 176 transects established in the period from 2004 to 2007 and is considered the baseline. Time-step 1 (T1) is composed of Panels 1 through 4 that were revisited between 2008 and 2011. Time-step 2 (T2) was initiated in 2012 and will be completed in 2015 once all four panels are revisited (Figure 2).

Full Survey: White Pine Blister Rust and Mountain Pine Beetle Surveys (BR & MPB)

During a full survey visit, the presence or absence of white pine blister rust infection is recorded for all live trees in the transect. A tree is considered infected if either aecia or cankers are present. For a canker to be conclusively identified as resulting from white pine blister rust, at least three of five ancillary indicators need to be present (GYWPMWG 2011). Ancillary indicators of white pine blister rust included flagging, rodent chewing, oozing sap, roughened bark, and swelling (Hoff 1992). For each live tree, observers record whether pitch tubes and frass are present from mountain pine beetle activity. Pitch tubes are small, popcorn-shaped resin masses produced by a tree as a means to stave off a mountain pine

Survey Schedule		Time0	Time1				Time2				Continued monitoring 2016 forward
Sample Panel	Sites per panel	2004 thru 2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	
1	43	initial surveys for all 176 transects	BR & MPB		MPB only		BR & MPB				
2	45			BR & MPB		MPB only		BR & MPB			
3	44		MPB only		BR & MPB		MPB only		BR & MPB		
4	44			MPB only		BR & MPB		MPB only		BR & MPB	

Figure 2. Panel sampling revisit schedule that includes full surveys for blister rust (BR) and mountain pine beetle (MPB) and mountain pine beetle/mortality only surveys (MPB only). This table denotes the designated time series for each Time-Step assignment (Time0 [T0]: 2004-2007, Time1 [T1]: 2008-2011, Time2 [T2]: 2012-2015).

beetle attack. Frass or boring dust is created during a mountain pine beetle attack and can be found in bark crevices and around the base of an infested tree. A section of bark is removed from dead trees to observe and record whether J-shaped galleries exist, which indicate that adult mountain pine beetle and their larvae occupied the tree (GYWPMWG 2011).

Mountain Pine Beetle Only/ Mortality Survey (MPB only)

For mountain pine beetle only/mortality surveys, data are collected on mountain pine beetle indicators and tree health status. As described above, each live tree is examined for pitch tubes and frass, while all dead trees are investigated for J-shaped galleries.

ERIN SHANAHAN



Recruitment and Understory Individuals

There are three indices of whitebark pine recruitment derived from the transect surveys: the number of trees ≤ 1.4 m tall, the number of trees that grow to >1.4 m tall, and the number of live trees, regardless of height, that show signs of reproductive activity. During a full survey visit, all whitebark pine trees ≤ 1.4 m tall on a given transect are counted and observed for white pine blister rust infection. Once a tree has reached a height greater than 1.4 m, it is permanently tagged and assessed in a manner consistent with all other live, marked trees in the sample frame. In addition, three nested circular plots at the beginning, center, and end of the transect (1/300th acre for each circle), are evaluated for the occurrence and infection status of whitebark pine ≤ 1.4 m tall and species composition (GYWPMWG 2012). Finally, all live, tagged trees are assessed for indication of past or present reproduction as evident by the presence of cones or cone scars.

Data Management

Prior to analysis, all data are subjected to rigorous quality assurance and quality control (QA/QC) procedures as outlined in the protocol (GYWPMWG 2011). Due to minor retroactive updates to the master database as part of ongoing quality controls, there may be an insignificant amount of variability (typically $<1\%$ difference) when comparing data reported in previous years. All computational analyses and corresponding charts and graphs were produced using Microsoft Excel and the statistical computing language R (R Development Core Team 2011).

Active mountain pine beetle attack.
Sweetwater Gap, Bridger Teton National
Forest.

Results

Time-step Considerations for Whitebark Pine Health and Status

Status and trend assessments are more meaningful after many years of monitoring with comparable data accumulated over time (Witwicki 2012). For the Whitebark Pine Monitoring Program, more intensive evaluation of monitoring data is scheduled at four-year intervals after all 176 transects are resurveyed. Comparisons between years based on a single panel revisit are misleading, because each panel is composed of an entirely different set of transects. Data summaries from transects surveyed in 2014 (Panel 3) do not reflect the entire sample of transects, and therefore, do not represent the estimated status or long-term trend of the overall GYE population of whitebark pine. The reader is cautioned not to draw wide-reaching conclusions from the summary of data collected in 2014.

Monitored Transects

In 2014, 43 of the 44 transects assigned to Panel 3 and one transect from Panel 2 were resurveyed between June and September by a two-person NPS crew. The Panel 2 transect was not visited in its regular panel schedule due to logistical issues in the fall of 2013. In addition, we were unable to survey one transect from Panel 3 on the Bridger Teton National Forest due to a roadway obstruction. This marks the second revisit to Panel 3 in our time-step series (second panel resurveyed in T2) for full survey data collection (blister rust and mortality).

White Pine Blister Rust Infection in the GYE

Based on the ratio estimator derived from the live trees remaining at the end of T1 (2011) on Panels 1 through 4, our results indicate that the proportion of trees infected with blister rust in the GYE ranges between 20% to 30% (3% SE; Shanahan et al. 2014). This range illustrates the variability of infection across the study area and captures the extremes of the confidence intervals.

White Pine Blister Rust Infection on Panel 3

Approximately 1,055 live tagged trees in 43 transects from Panel 3 were examined for blister rust infection in 2014. This number includes the new trees (17) added during the 2014 survey to Panel 3. Results from a Wilcoxon Signed-Rank test comparing the proportion of trees infected with blister rust in each stand (n=43 stands) for Panel 3 suggest no evidence of a difference in the proportion of live trees >1.4 m tall infected with blister rust between T1 and T2 (P-value=0.1937). There were a total of 8 live trees from the Panel 2 transect. The 8 trees were not included as part of this analysis.

Infection Transition

Of the 923 live trees that were surveyed in Panel 3 transects in 2010 and again in 2014, approximately 70% (647) had no evidence of blister rust infection, 17% (155) were infected in both years, 7% (65) transitioned from no evidence of infection to infected, and 6% (56) went from infected to uninfected (Table 1). A transition from

Table 1. Blister rust infection transition among live tagged trees on Panel 3 transects in 2010 and again in 2014.

Number of Live Tagged Whitebark Pine Trees and Blister Rust Infection Transition for Panel 3 Trees Between T1 (2010) and T2 (2014).				
Transition	Remained Uninfected	Remained Infected	Uninfected to Infected	Infected to Uninfected
Number of Live Trees	647	155	65	56

infected to uninfected could be the result of factors such as observer error, an earlier-documented infection based on indicators that upon resurvey no longer meet the established standards of three indicators in the same location, or infected branches that self-pruned.

Mortality on Panel 3

In 2014, we observed a total of 33 newly dead tagged trees from Panel 3. Of the 33 dead trees, 42% or 14 trees were >10 cm in diameter at breast height (DBH) with approximately 29% (4) of those having evidence only of mountain pine beetle infestation. The remaining 71% (10) of the >10 cm size class died with signs of fire; blister rust; a combination of fire, mountain pine beetle, and/or blister rust; or with other factors, such as wind damage, animal damage, or unknown (Figure 3).

Recruitment and Understory Individuals

While transects are experiencing varying degrees of mortality, they are also experiencing varying degrees of recruitment.

Once a whitebark pine tree within the transect boundary reaches a height >1.4 m tall, it is permanently tagged and included in the live tree sample. In 2014, we tagged a total of 17 new trees. In addition, 2,166 understory whitebark pine trees (≤ 1.4 m tall) were counted on 43 of the Panel 3 transects. This equates to a density of about 50 small trees per transect.

A total of 129 recruitment plots (three per transect) were completed on Panel 3. Results from the initial establishment of the recruitment plots will be summarized when all four panels have been surveyed at the end of the 2015 field season. Analysis of overall recruitment change (step trend) will be conducted at the end of T3 (2019), which will be the first possible comparison interval.

Currently, there are 623 reproducing live, tagged trees across the 4 panels. The majority of the reproducing trees have a DBH between 10 cm and 30 cm. Based on monitoring observations, trees ≤ 2.5 cm DBH had evidence of reproduction. It will be informative to track how this metric changes as more data are collected in future years, particularly with the waning mountain pine beetle outbreak.




Figure 3. Size class and mortality influencing agents observed for 33 dead tagged trees in Panel 3.

Discussion

White pine blister rust infection remains widespread and variable across the ecosystem with an estimated 20% to 30% infection rate among whitebark pine trees in the GYE (Figure 4).

Similar to white pine blister rust infection, the mountain pine beetle infestation is widespread and varies in severity throughout the GYE. Of the 176 established transects, 126 had recorded evidence of mountain pine beetle infestation, while 50 had no observed evidence of mountain pine beetle infestation by the end of 2014 (Figure 5).

Whereas mountain pine beetle exhibit a selective preference for larger-DBH trees (Amman et al. 1977), wildland fire is indiscriminant, with mortality occurring across all size classes. Since 2008, approximately 250 tagged trees on 15 transects have been affected by wildland fire. The majority of these burns have been stand-replacing fires. Of the 33 trees that were newly dead on Panel 3, 8 had been affected by wildland fire (Figure 6).

Preliminary analysis suggests no change in blister rust infection on Panel 3 transects between the 2010 and 2014 survey periods. Analysis and interpretation of overall blister rust infection will be investigated following the collection of all four panels at the end of 2015. Our data suggest that the rate of mortality of tagged trees has decreased significantly on the transects as compared to mortality levels from previous years.

In 2015, we will survey Panel 4 transects, which will mark the completion of the second time-step. We will continue to collect data on Objective 4 of the protocol to assess and

monitor the recruitment of whitebark pine understory individuals. In addition to the regular whitebark pine monitoring in 2014, we successfully established four permanent whitebark pine/limber pine monitoring plots and evaluated 86 rapid assessment plots on Bureau of Land Management lands in four regions of Wyoming. As part of the 2015 field season, we will begin to collect data on rapid assessment plots in conjunction with permanent monitoring plots on the Bridger Teton National Forest. And finally, we will continue to collaborate with other research efforts that are taking place in the ecosystem as well as participate on the Greater Yellowstone Coordinating Committee Whitebark Pine Subcommittee.

This long-term monitoring program provides critical information that will help determine the likelihood of whitebark pine persisting as a functional and vital part of the ecosystem. In addition, data from this program are currently being used to inform managers, guide management strategies and restoration planning, support other whitebark pine research, and substantiate conservation efforts throughout the GYE. A summary report of the first step-trend analysis was recently published through the NPS, Natural Resource Report series and is available from the Greater Yellowstone Inventory and Monitoring Network (<http://science.nature.nps.gov/im/units/gryn/>; accessed April 21, 2015). The interagency protocol has also been a valuable resource for a variety of agencies embarking on five-needle pine monitoring, including the Greater Yellowstone Coordinating Committee's Whitebark Pine Strategy for the Greater Yellowstone Area (GYCCWPS 2011).




Figure 4. Preliminary map of the ratio of whitebark pine trees within each transect as alive, dead, or with presence of blister rust infection from surveys 2012-2014. The infection status ranges from a tree with a single canker on a branch to a tree with a bole canker.




Figure 5. Location of transects throughout the Greater Yellowstone Ecosystem with and without evidence of mountain pine beetle infestation as of 2014.




Figure 6. Location of transects throughout the Greater Yellowstone Ecosystem affected by wildland fire as of 2014.



ERIN SHANAHAN

Aftermath of the Bug Creek fire, Double Cabin drainage, Shoshone National Forest.

Literature Cited

- Amman, G. D., M. D. McGregor, D. B. Cahill, and W. H. Klein. 1977. Guidelines for reducing losses of lodgepole pine to the mountain pine beetle in unmanaged stands in the Rocky Mountains. USDA For. Serv. Gen. Tech. Rep. INT-36, 19 p. Intermt. For. and Range Exp. Stn., Ogden, Utah.
- Dixon, B. G. 1997. Cumulative effects modeling for grizzly bears in the Greater Yellowstone Ecosystem. Thesis, Montana State University. 143 pages plus appendices. Bozeman, Montana.
- Greater Yellowstone Whitebark Pine Monitoring Working Group (GYWPMWG). 2012. Monitoring whitebark pine in the Greater Yellowstone ecosystem: 2011 annual report. Natural Resource Data Series NPS/GRYN/NRDS—2012/278. National Park Service, Fort Collins, Colorado.
- Greater Yellowstone Whitebark Pine Monitoring Working Group (GYWPMWG). 2011. Interagency whitebark pine monitoring protocol for the Greater Yellowstone Ecosystem, version 1.1. Greater Yellowstone Coordinating Committee, Bozeman, Montana.
- Greater Yellowstone Whitebark Pine Monitoring Working Group (GYWPMWG). 2008. Monitoring whitebark pine in the Greater Yellowstone Ecosystem: 2007 annual report. pages 50-56 in C. C. Schwartz, M. A. Haroldson, and K. West, editors. Yellowstone grizzly bear investigations: Annual report of the Interagency Grizzly Bear Study Team, 2007. U.S. Geological Survey, Bozeman, Montana.
- Greater Yellowstone Coordinating Committee Whitebark Pine Subcommittee (GYCCWPS). 2011. Whitebark pine strategy for the Greater Yellowstone Area. Greater Yellowstone Coordinating Committee. Bozeman, Montana.
- Hoff, R. J. 1992. How to recognize blister rust infection on whitebark pine. USDA Forest Service, Intermountain Research Station, Research Note INT-406, Ogden, Utah.
- Landenburger, L., R. L. Lawrence, S. Podruzny, and C. C. Schwartz. 2008. Mapping regional distribution of a single tree species: Whitebark pine in the Greater Yellowstone Ecosystem. *Sensors* 8(8):4983-4994.
- R Development Core Team. 2011. R: A language and environment for statistical computing. R Foundation for Statistical Computing, Vienna, Austria. <http://www.R-project.org>.
- Shanahan, E., K. M. Irvine, D. Roberts, A. Litt, K. Legg, and R. Daley. 2014. Status of whitebark pine in the Greater Yellowstone Ecosystem: A step-trend analysis comparing 2004-2007 to 2008-2011. Natural Resource Technical Report NPS/GRYN/NRTR—2014/917. National Park Service, Fort Collins, Colorado.
- Witwicki, D. 2012. Integrated upland monitoring in Black Canyon of the Gunnison National Park and Curecanti National Recreation Area: annual report 2010 (non-sensitive version). Natural Resource Technical Report NPS/NCPN/NRTR—2012/542. National Park Service, Fort Collins, Colorado.

The Department of the Interior protects and manages the nation's natural resources and cultural heritage; provides scientific and other information about those resources; and honors its special responsibilities to American Indians, Alaska Natives, and affiliated Island Communities.

NPS 101/128651, 136/128651 May 2015

National Park Service
U.S. Department of the Interior



Natural Resource Stewardship and Science

1201 Oak Ridge Drive, Suite 150
Fort Collins, Colorado 80525

www.nature.nps.gov

EXPERIENCE YOUR AMERICA™