# Implications of Alternate Silvicultural Strategies in Mountain Pine Beetle Damaged Stands

Technical Report For Forest Science Program Project Y051161

**K. David Coates**
**and**
**Erin C. Hall**

**Prepared by:**

K. David Coates, Research Silviculturist
and
Erin C. Hall, Assistant Research Silviculturist

British Columbia Forest Service
Forest Sciences
Bag 6000
Smithers, BC  V0J 2N0

Corresponding author:  K. David Coates
E-mail:  dave.coates@gov.bc.ca
Tel:  250-847-6386

**Prepared for:**

Bulkley Valley Centre for Natural Resources
Research & Management
Smithers, BC

**Prepared:**  April 2005

# Contents

## List of Figures

## List Of Tables

# Abstract

In this project, we incorporated a robust snag dynamics submodel into SORTIE-ND, a version of the spatially explicit, individual tree model SORTIE (Pacala et al. 1996; Coates et al. 2003), to predict impacts of silviculture strategies on mountain pine beetle (MPB) attacked stands.

For modelling purposes we selected four stand types from the SBSdk subzone to represent MPB susceptible stand types: *Pine Minor Spruce*, *Mixed Pine–Spruce*, *Spruce Minor Pine*, and *Pine Dominant*. We estimated light transmission by lodgepole pine snags, developed a model to predict snag fall down rates, and assumed levels of pine mortality, natural regeneration rates, and under-planting densities.

Simulation results showed that the light environment in the understory of recently killed lodgepole pine stands is too low for survival of pine seedlings. This is a very different regeneration environment than found after wildfire. Beetle killed pine snags block considerable light for at least 10 years after their death. After these first years, the growth rate of pine under the snags accelerates until it approaches the growth rate anticipated from pine in open conditions. This change in growth rate reflects the shift in light conditions as snags deteriorate with increasingly open conditions being created.

We were unable to predict the extent of natural regeneration in the four selected stand types due to lack of data to parameterize the recruitment submodel, however, we have a 2005/07 FSP funded study to address this short-coming. None-the-less, shading by MPB killed snags is severe in the first years after MPB attack and may greatly limit regeneration success.

SORTIE-ND predictions of growth of pine or spruce plantations after total salvage were very similar to TASS predictions (based on TIPSY v3.2 runs). SORTIE-ND subalpine fir plantations grew slower than those projected by TASS.

Three of the four selected stand types had variable levels of residual spruce in the overstory, the understory, or both. Simulation results showed that, after pine mortality, the spruce in these stand types released and grew well, resulting in well stocked stands with good basal areas. Two of the stand types recovered to pre-attack basal areas within 50 years, the third by 80 years. These stand types can help mitigate mid-term (30-50 years) timber supply shortages if left unsalvaged or protected during partial salvage. The *Pine Dominant* stand type with little residual spruce did not recover; either salvage and planting or under-planting would be required.

Modeling planting of the *Pine Dominant* stand type with either spruce or subalpine fir shortly after MPB attack showed substantial yield increase at 100 years. The benefit of under-planting stand types with a greater residual spruce component depends on the distribution of canopy and understory trees at the time of planting.

Delaying under-planting until pine snags transmit more light to the understory (5-15 years after attack) may result in higher survival and subsequent volume development. This effect highlights the importance of considering changing overstory conditions when developing prescriptions to mitigate the effect of the mountain pine beetle. However when considering under-planting, the improved light environment must be balanced against the safety hazards posed by snags and the increased levels of brush and other competing natural regeneration that will also take advantage of steadily improving light levels.

## 1.0    Introduction

Various silvicultural strategies can be applied in mountain pine beetle (MPB) damaged stands. Full salvage and planting is being employed widely.  Other strategies include salvage with protection of advance regeneration and surviving residual canopy trees (with or without supplemental fill planting).  Many areas will not be salvaged logged, but future yield predictions for such stands are required.

There will be many different permutations of residual stand conditions across mountain pine beetle damaged forests.  Forest managers need models that predict future growth after different management strategies.  Stand development in complex structured mixed species stands is difficult to predict with traditional growth and yield models.

A significant challenge to modeling stand dynamics after mountain pine beetle attack is the role of the lodgepole pine snags.  Snag dynamics is not an issue after total salvage followed by planting.  Traditional growth and yield models (e.g., the Tree and Stand Simulator (TASS)) can be used to predict stand growth after complete salvage and planting.  Vast areas, however, will not be salvaged or will be only partially salvaged leaving variable levels of snags and residual trees.  These stands may be complex in structure.  The impact snags will have on understory development is unknown.  Our first objective for this project was to develop a snag submodel for SORTIE-ND.  SORTIE-ND is a re-engineered version of the spatially explicit, individual tree model SORTIE (Pacala et al. 1996; Coates et al. 2003).  Here, we use the new snag submodel combined with our previous Forest Science Funded project that developed adult tree growth functions for Sub-Boreal Spruce tree species (FII Project R04-003 "Growth Prediction of Canopy Trees in Complex Structured Mixed-Species Stands") to model stand dynamics after MPB attack.

We have used SORTIE-ND to model stand development without salvage in four stand types found in mountain pine beetle attacked forests, to predict survival of lodgepole pine natural regeneration, and to explore the effectiveness of different under-planting prescriptions. These simulations allow us to explore how different stand types will be affected by MPB attack and how natural regeneration and under-planting of different species will respond to beetle attack.  In addition, the importance of considering the temporal nature of silvicultural strategies is explored.

## 2.0 SORTIE-ND Model Structure

SORTIE-ND retains the basic structure of the original model, but has been extensively upgraded in object-oriented programming.  The core model is in C++ and Java software is used for the user interface.  SORTIE-ND is a stand-level, spatially explicit, individual-tree forest dynamics model.  Forest dynamics is the change of forest composition and structure over time.  The spatio-temporal development of forests may be described as changes of tree populations due to birth and colonization, growth and death of trees.  The SORTIE-ND model structure uses field experiments and testing of alternate hypotheses to best parameterize the demographic processes and tree growth relationships found in the model (Kobe and Coates 1997; Wright et al. 1998, 2000; Canham et al. 1999, 2004; LePage et al. 2000).  SORTIE-ND extrapolates from measurable fine-scale and short-term interactions among individual trees to large-scale and long-term dynamics of forest communities.

## 3.0    Objectives

Objectives for this project were:

1. Development of a snag submodel for SORTIE-ND, including:

   - Determination of light transmission values of three snag classes.

   - Determination of snag fall down rate.

   - Development of code for SORTIE-ND.

2. Prediction of understory light environments in mountain pine beetle damaged stands.

3. Examination of the effect of MPB killed stands on survival of naturally regenerated lodgepole pine.

4. Comparison of results of SORTIE-ND and TASS for tree growth following full salvage and plant prescriptions.

5. Prediction of development of unsalvaged stand types after MPB attack.

6. Determination of consequences of under-planting unsalvaged stand types after MPB attack.

7. Examination of implications of delaying planting in MPB damaged stands.

## 4.0    Methods

### 4.1    Development of a snag submodel for SORTIE-ND

The development of a snag submodel for SORTIE-ND required the definition of snag decay classes, the parameterization of light transmission coefficients for snags and the estimation of snag fall down rates.

We defined three snag decay classes:

Class 1:  Newly dead tree, where the shape of the crown is clearly defined by fine branches or twigs remaining on larger branches.

Class 2:  Most fine branches are lost; the crown shape is less well defined but can be interpreted from larger branches.

Class 3:  Only sparse large diameter branches remain.

Light transmission values for each individual snag class were determined following the methods described in Canham et al. (1999).

To incorporate snag fall down rates, we examined the literature for information on snag fall down rates over time after tree death.  There was limited information available.  We then developed a predictive model that can be parameterized based on snag mortality data.  Using available data, local knowledge and our own understanding of snag mortality rates we parameterized the model.

The plots established by the Provincial Ecology Program for ecological classification of the sub-boreal spruce (SBS) zone were used to identify the range of stand types susceptible to mountain pine beetle in northwestern British Columbia.  We examined stand types in the SBSdk and SBSmc2 subzones (Banner et al. 1993).  We selected four stands from the SBSdk subzone to represent the major MPB susceptible stand types.  Figures 1a and 1b provide graphical representations of these stand types prior to attack.  These stands were:

1. *Pine Minor Spruce*:  A lodgepole pine stand on a mesic site consisting of 83% pine and 17% spruce (by basal area).  This stand represents a mature pine stand with a well-developed cohort of immature spruce.

2. *Mixed Pine–Spruce*:  A stand consisting of 57% pine and 43% spruce (by basal area).  This stand type contains both mature pine and spruce with a well-developed layer of understory spruce.

3. *Spruce Minor Pine*:  This stand consists primarily of spruce (83% of the basal area) with a minor component of pine in the overstory.  This diverse stand type contains mature spruce and pine, immature spruce and scattered large veteran spruce.

4. *Pine Dominant*:  A pure lodgepole pine type from a SBSdk 03 site was chosen to represent pine out-wash sites.

Across the spectrum of stand types described by the ecology program, differences between SBSmc2 overstories and the SBSdk overstories are relatively minor.  Nearly 60% of the mesic and submesic SBSmc2 stand types containing a lodgepole pine component did not contain a subalpine fir component.  Therefore we used the SBSdk canopy types to test growth of under-planted subalpine fir as well.

## Pine minor Spruce Stand



|        | Density | Basal Area |
|--------|---------|------------|
| Spruce | 332     | 7.6        |
| Pine   | 523     | 39.8       |
| Total  | 855     | 47.4       |

## Mixed Pine and Spruce Stand



|        | Density | Basal Area |
|--------|---------|------------|
| Spruce | 848     | 19.1       |
| Pine   | 269     | 24.2       |
| Total  | 1117    | 43.3       |

**Figure 1a.** Overstory composition of the *Pine Minor Spruce* and *Mixed Pine–Spruce* stand types. The tables below each figure present the density (stems/ha) and basal area (m$^2$/ha) of each stand.

## Spruce minor Pine Stand



|         | Density | Basal Area |
|---------|---------|------------|
| Spruce  | 474     | 38.799     |
| Pine    | 81      | 7.8        |
| Total   | 555     | 46.6       |

## Pine dominant Stand



|      | Density | Basal Area |
|------|---------|------------|
| Pine | 994     | 55.5       |

**Figure 1b.** Overstory composition of the *Spruce Minor Pine* and *Pine Dominant* stand types. The tables below each figure present the density (stems/ha) and basal area (m$^2$/ha) of each stand.

To mimic severe mountain pine beetle damage, we assumed 100% kill of the larger pine trees in each stand type and 90% kill of the smaller pine trees. This pattern of damage was intended to mimic the cumulative result of several years of successive mountain pine beetle attack rather than one single year of attack.

We used SORTIE-ND version 6.03 to test the results of objective 1 and to examine objectives 2 through 7. We used a 1-year time step and simulations varied from 20 to 100 years depending upon the objective.

## 4.2    Prediction of understory light environments in MPB damaged stands

To address objective 2, we designed a set of three runs that would allow us to compare the growth of immature pine under a live canopy, under a mountain pine beetle attacked canopy, and in full open conditions. The first run consisted of the immature pine grown under the live *Pine Dominant* canopy. The second began with the same stand composition but incorporated a beetle attack with 95% mortality of the overstory. The third run modeled the growth of the immature pine without the influence of an overstory. All runs assessed the growth of 1500 stems/ha of 6-8 cm DBH lodgepole pine. Stand growth was tracked for 50 years in each simulation.

## 4.3    Examination of the effect of MPB killed stands on survival of naturally regenerated lodgepole pine

To test the survival of natural regeneration of lodgepole pine under a mountain pine beetle attacked canopy, we designed two simulations:

1. 10,000 stems/ha of pine seedlings established 1 year after a severe beetle attack in the *Pine Dominant* stand type.

2. 10 000 stems/ha of pine seedlings established 10 years after a severe beetle attack in the *Pine Dominant* stand type.

For both scenarios we modeled stand development for 20 years.

## 4.4    Comparison of results of SORTIE-ND and TASS for tree growth following full salvage and plant prescriptions

To compare the predictions of SORTIE-ND to TASS we modeled complete salvage and plant prescriptions. We simulated the growth of individual stands of lodgepole pine, interior spruce, and subalpine fir planted at densities of 1600 stems/ha. We used Tipsy version 3.2 for the interpolation of yield tables from TASS to model runs for mesic sites in the Lakes TSA.

## 4.5    Prediction of development of unsalvaged stand types after MPB attack

To predict the development of the four major stand types after mountain pine beetle attack and without management intervention we modeled the stand types for 100 years.

## 4.6    Determination of consequences of under-planting unsalvaged stand types after MPB attack

To model the consequences of under-planting, we developed a set of simulations to assess the effect of under-planting stands with interior spruce and subalpine fir. We simulated planting in each stand type one year post-mountain pine beetle attack. Planting immediately after attack was chosen to mimic conventional planting strategies and minimise the risks to tree planters associated with planting under snags.

## 4.7 Examination of implications of delaying planting in MPB damaged stands

To model the implications of delaying planting under beetle damaged stands, we simulated under-planting interior spruce under the *Pine Dominant* stand with a 95% level of mortality due to mountain pine beetle. We delayed under-planting by 2, 4, 6, 8, and 10 years post-MPB attack.

## 5.0    Results

### 5.1    Snag Submodel

We have estimated light transmission coefficients and residency time by snag decay class for the four major tree species in the SBSdk and SBSmc2 subzones (Table 1; Poulin et al., *in prep*).  We estimate class 1, 2 and 3 lodgepole pine snags will transmit 37.6, 61.4 and 87.8% of full sunlight, respectively (Table 1).

| Snag Class | Age of Snags in Each Class | Light Transmission Coefficients (0-1) | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Subalpine Fir | Interior Spruce | Lodgepole Pine | Trembling Aspen |
| 1 | 0-7 | 0.423 | 0.446 | 0.376 | 0.695 |
| 2 | 8-17 | 0.554 | 0.502 | 0.614 | 0.755 |
| 3 | 17+ | 0.713 | 0.673 | 0.878 | 0.833 |

**Table 1.**  Light transmission coefficients for snags of major sub-boreal spruce tree species.

We were unable to locate any data for snag fall down rates of beetle killed lodgepole pine trees in the sub-boreal spruce zone.  We developed a Weibull equation to model the functional relationship for snag fall rate from data provided in Keen (1955), model (1):

$$S = EXP(-(a*T)\verb|^|b)$$

where *S*= probability of snag survival, *T*=time since death, *a* is a scale and *b* a shape parameter of the Weibull function.  We thank Peter Ott, Statistician, BC Ministry of Forests, Victoria, BC for assistance.  We used the 'cumulative density function' for year x and subtracted from it the 'cumulative density function' from the previous year to give us a probability of fall for individual snags:

Yearly probability of fall = (1-EXP(-((a*year x)^b))) - (1-EXP(-((a*year x-1)^b)))

Note that for the end of year 1 one calculates the Weibull function once, no subtraction, i.e.,

Probability of fall after 1 year = (1-EXP(-((a*1)^b)))

Based on available data, local knowledge (observations of Patience Rakochy during extensive surveys of MPB damaged stands in 2004), and our own understanding of snag mortality rates we determined the following snag fall down rate parameters for the SBS: a = 0.05 and b = 2.5.

### Limitations to analysis

No studies are available that track the changes in lodgepole pine snags over time with respect to increasing light transmission or snag fall down rates.  We have used three snag classes to approximate increasing light transmission of snags, while we realise that snags are continually changing.  We have based our predictions of the time frame in which snags move from one class to the next on our observations and the observations of Patience Rakochy and others.

## 5.2    Prediction of understory light environments in MPB damaged stands

Incorporating the snag submodel into SORTIE-ND results in effectively modeling changes in light environments as snags deteriorate over time.  Figure 2 illustrates the changes in light transmission through an overstory with varying proportions of snags.  Figure 3 presents the distribution of light levels at three specific periods of time after mountain pine beetle attack. At 1 and 5 years post-MPB attack there is little difference in light environments as few snags have fallen and the deterioration of the snags is limited.  At 10 years post-MPB attack, a more significant increase in light levels is evident due to both a shift in snag class and fall down of an increasing numbers of snags.



**Figure 2.**  Change over time of understory light levels (as percent of full sun) under a *Pine Dominant* canopy with varying levels of MPB attack.

**Figure 3.** Light levels the first, fifth, and tenth year after mountain pine beetle attack.

To test the impact of snags on mortality and growth of a lodgepole pine understory, we conducted three simulations that compared the growth of immature pine under an unaffected pine canopy, under a mountain pine beetle attacked canopy and in open conditions (Figure 4). The results illustrate that under a beetle attacked canopy, pine trees do not grow as well as in open conditions but do not grow as poorly as under a live pine canopy. In open conditions pine mortality is low and basal area increases by 43 m$^2$/ha. Under a live pine canopy, the understory pine grow poorly, with limited increase in yield (0.7 m$^2$/ha) and high mortality. The growth of pine under snags reflects the influence and expected changes in snag structure. That is, initially post-MPB attack, there is relatively little difference in light transmission between live pine and MPB attacked pine. Even over the first few years as dead needles fall light transmission is relatively similar due to the presence of fine branches and the low rate of snag fall. Therefore, in the first five to eight years understory pine growth and mortality are similar under snags as under a live canopy. After these first few critical years, the growth rate of pine under the snags accelerates until it approaches the growth rate anticipated from pine in full open conditions. This change in growth rate reflects the shift in light conditions as snag deteriorate and fall with increasingly open conditions being created. Overall, under the canopy of snags, lodgepole pine yield increases by 29 m$^2$/ha.

**Figure 4.** Predicted change in density and basal area of immature pine (1500 stems/ha, DBH 6-8 cm) under three canopy conditions:  clearcut with no overstory, MPB attacked stand with 95% mortality, and live mature pine canopy.  Under a beetle attacked stand, growth and survival of the immature pine significantly improves over time reflecting the deterioration of snags and progressive increase in understory light levels.

## 5.3    Examination of the effect of MPB killed stands on survival of naturally regenerated lodgepole pine

As shown by the test of immature pine under differing canopy environments, changes to the light environment in which a tree grows have significant implications for growth and mortality. Kobe and Coates (1997) have quantified the relationship between the probability of mortality and recent growth rates for juvenile trees and Wright et al. (1998) have studied the effect of light levels upon seedling and sapling growth.  Using these functional relationships, we linked light level to probability of mortality for lodgepole pine, interior spruce and subalpine fir.  At the light levels predicted by SORTIE-ND for 1, 5, and 10 years after a severe MPB attack with 95% mortality, lodgepole pine trees have an exceptionally high probability of mortality (Figure 5).



**Figure 5.**  Juvenile mortality as a function of percent full sun (measured using global light index).  SORTIE-ND predicts average light levels in the understory of severely MPB damaged stands to begin at 8% of full sun and increase to 21% full sun in the first ten years following MPB attack.  This translates to very high annual probabilities of mortality for lodgepole pine (from 76% to 27% respectively).  Immediately post-MPB attack, subalpine fir and hybrid spruce have relatively high annual probabilities of mortality (13% and 25% respectively). However within 10 years, light levels increase sufficiently such that the probability of mortality of both species drops and most seedlings are likely to survive.

The results of our tests of lodgepole pine regeneration survival are presented in Figure 6. All 10,000 stems/ha of pine regeneration, which we established 1 year post-MPB attack died within thirteen years. We also tested establishing 10,000 stems/ha 10 years post-MPB attack; about 300 stems/ha of these trees survived another ten years later (Figure 6). These results confirm that the light environment under lodgepole pine snags following MPB attack is extremely limiting for survival of lodgepole pine seedlings. In addition, the light environment continues to remain highly limiting 10 to 20 years post-MPB attack.



**Figure 6.** Survival of lodgepole pine regeneration under a MPB attacked pure pine stand. 10,000 stems/ha of natural regeneration were modeled 1 year and 10 years after MPB attack. Of the 10,000 stems/ha of natural regeneration originating 1 year post-MPB attack only 2 stems/ha were alive after 10 years (0.02% survival). Of the natural regeneration that originated 10 years post-MPB attack, 300 stems/ha remained after 10 years (3% survival).

Limitations to analysis

Survival of lodgepole pine is highly sensitive to light levels. We use snag classes rather than a continuous function which might lead to an under-prediction of available light near the end of each snag class residency time. If we are predicting lower light under snags than is actually occurring then it is possible that our predictions of seedling mortality will be too high. Light levels in the first 15 years after MPB attack appear to be critically important.

The severe level of mountain pine beetle attack used in our simulations (95% mortality in one year) may not be typical. Rather, mortality occurs differentially over several years. Simplification of severe attack into 95% mortality in one year results in an under-estimation of the length of time in which natural regeneration grows under dark canopy environments.

Despite these limitations, our results are consistent with observations from foresters across the MPB affected area that there is a severe lack of natural pine regeneration under mountain pine beetle attacked stands.

## 5.4 Comparison of results of SORTIE-ND and TASS for tree growth following full salvage and plant prescriptions

TASS has been extensively developed to model single species even-aged stands and is widely accepted across British Columbia. Figures 7a, 7b, and 7c present the results of comparisons of SORTIE-ND to TASS for density, basal area, and average DBH for three tree species established at 1,600 stems/ha after total salvage of MPB damaged stands.

Juvenile growth rates of three species in SORTIE-ND (less than 5 cm DBH, based on available light) are a little faster than predicted by TASS. SORTIE-ND adult growth rates (based on neighbourhood crowding and shading) for immature adult trees (roughly 5-20 cm DBH) reflect the highly competitive environment at this time and result in slightly slower growth rates than TASS. As a result, growth rates of individual trees and stand-scale basal area development in SORTIE-ND and TASS converge by about 40-50 years. Growth rates of larger adult individual lodgepole pine and interior spruce trees are very similar in SORTIE-ND and TASS (Figures 7a and b, average DBH panels). The SORTIE-ND prediction of larger adult tree subalpine fir growth is a little lower than that of TASS (Figure 7c, average DBH panel). Overall, SORTIE-ND and TASS predicted growth rates are quite similar. SORTIE-ND has been specifically designed to model complex structured stands, not even-age single-species plantations. It is encouraging that SORTIE-ND produces similar results to TASS in single-species plantations.

**Figure 7a.** Comparison of SORTIE-ND and TASS predictions of density, basal area, and average DBH for an even-aged lodgepole pine plantation with initial density of 1600 stems/ha. Over 100 years SORTIE-ND and TASS predictions of growth are similar.

**Figure 7b.** Comparison of SORTIE-ND and TASS predictions of density, basal area, and average DBH for an even-aged interior spruce plantation with initial density of 1600 stems/ha. Over 100 years SORTIE-ND and TASS predictions of growth are similar.

**Figure 7c.** Comparison of SORTIE-ND and TASS predictions of density, basal area, and average DBH for an even-aged subalpine fir plantation with initial density of 1600 stems/ha. Over 100 years the SORTIE-ND predictions of growth rates are lower.

## 5.5    Development of major stand types after mountain pine beetle attack

We modeled the effect of severe mountain pine beetle damage on the four major stand types described previously (Figures 1a and b).  Despite poor natural regeneration conditions, the three stands containing a spruce component (all but *Pine Dominant*) recovered well from the attack (Table 2).  At 50 years after MPB attack, stand basal area of two of the three stands with residual understory and overstory spruce had exceeded that of the pre-attack stands (*Mixed Pine-Spruce* and *Spruce Minor Pine*, Table 2).  By about 80 years the *Pine Minor Spruce* type had recovered to pre-attack basal areas (Figure 8a).

The *Mixed Pine-Spruce* type continued to grow well over time reaching a stand basal area of 68 $m^2$/ha and merchantable profiles at 100 years (Table 2 and Figure 8b).  The pure *Pine Dominant* type with little spruce residual component was unable to recover after MPB attack (Table 2).

| Stand Type | Pre-MPB | 50 years post-MPB | | | 100 years post-MPB | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Spruce | Pine | Total | Spruce | Pine | Total |
| *Pine Minor Spruce* | 47.4 | 33.4 | 1.9 | 35.2 | 45.9 | 1.1 | 47.0 |
| *Mixed Pine-Spruce* | 43.3 | 51.9 | 0.9 | 52.7 | 67.1 | 0.5 | 67.6 |
| *Spruce Minor Pine* | 46.6 | 53.7 | 0.2 | 53.9 | 53.9 | 0.1 | 54.0 |
| *Pine Dominant* | 55.5 | 0.0 | 3.9 | 3.9 | 0.0 | 1.3 | 1.3 |

**Table 2.**  Basal area ($m^2$/ha) of the four major stands pre-attack, 50 and 100 years post-attack with no management intervention.  Detailed pre-attack stand conditions are shown in Figures 1a and 1b.  Figure 8a tracks basal changes over time and Figure 8b shows stand diameter distributions at 100 years post-MPB attack for stands with an initial spruce component.

These results highlight the importance of targeting salvage operations toward stands with a low spruce component (e.g., the *Pine Dominant* type) as these stands will not likely regenerate and recover without management intervention.  If stands with a substantial understory spruce component are scheduled to be salvaged our results highlight the importance of protecting the residual spruce so these stands will become merchantable as early as possible.  Note that the *Spruce Minor Pine* type reaches maximum yield at approximately 50 years post-attack.  This is due in part to the initial component of large spruce in the mid-30 cm DBH classes (Figure 1b).

The stand development pattern of the *Mixed Pine-Spruce* type (that performed the best over 100 years) can be explained by the large number of smaller diameter spruce present in the stand pre-MPB attack (Figure 1a).  Stands with structure similar to the *Spruce Minor Pine* and *Mixed Pine-Spruce* types can play a critical role in reducing the expected mid-term (30-50 years) timber supply shortage when unsalvaged or when the spruce are protected from damage during salvage.

**Figure 8a.** Basal area growth of four stand types in the 100 years following severe mountain pine beetle attack. Stands with a spruce component recover reasonably well following MPB attack. The *Pine Dominant* stand lacking a spruce component does not recover within 100 years.

**Figure 8b.** Stand composition of the three stand types with spruce components 100 years after MPB attack. These stands have recovered well and the spruce have grown to a merchantable size. Note that the *Pine Minor Spruce* stand has higher levels of natural regeneration in the understory than the other two stands. This is likely due to the lower density of spruce initially present in the stand. This lower density of live trees post-MPB resulted in higher light levels and therefore greater survival and growth of spruce natural regeneration.

### 5.6 Determination of consequences of under-planting unsalvaged stand types after MPB attack.

One possible prescription to mitigate the impact of the mountain pine beetle is to under-plant affected stands. Figure 9 shows the impact to basal area of under-planting the four stand types with interior spruce and subalpine fir. Table 3 summarizes the survival of the under-planted seedlings at 20 years, and Table 4, the differences in yield at 100 years related to under-planting.

| Stand Type | Spruce | Subalpine Fir |
|---|---|---|
| Pine Minor Spruce | ~ 350 sph | 1012 sph |
| Mixed Pine-Spruce | ~ 75 sph | 911 sph |
| Spruce Minor Pine | ~ 75 sph | 882 sph |
| Pine Dominant | ~ 323 sph | 988 sph |

**Table 3.** Density of surviving spruce and subalpine fir 20 years after planting (at 1,600 stems/ha) immediately after severe MPB attack in the four major stand types.

| Stand Type | No Planting | Species Under-Planted | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Spruce | | Subalpine Fir | |
| | | Basal Area | % change due to planting | Basal Area | % change due to planting |
| Pine Minor Spruce | 47.0 | 55.0 | 17% | 56.7 | 21% |
| Mixed Pine-Spruce | 67.6 | 65.7 | -3% | 66.6 | -1% |
| Spruce Minor Pine | 54.0 | 59.2 | 10% | 58.2 | 8% |
| Pine Dominant | 1.3 | 39.4 | 2875% | 36.6 | 2668% |

**Table 4.** Stand basal area (m2/ha) at 100 years post-MPB attack after under-planting either spruce or subalpine fir and percent change in basal area compared to stands with no under-planting.

Planting either subalpine fir or spruce substantially increased the yield of stands after 100 years compared to no management intervention. Although survival significantly differs between spruce and subalpine fir, yield values are relatively similar. This is due in part to the trade-off between lower density and increased growing space. In addition, this difference may also be partly attributed to the lower growth rates of subalpine fir compared to interior spruce presently incorporated into SORTIE-ND. These results also reflect the difference in shade tolerance between spruce and subalpine fir shown in Figure 5. Under the same light conditions, subalpine fir has the highest survival rate. Spruce seedlings survive under the lodgepole pine snags but mortality is higher and 67% more seedlings die.

**Figure 9.** Yield, in terms of basal area, resulting from under-planting the four major stand types with spruce or subalpine fir.  Under-planting improves the yield of three of the four major stand types; yield of the *Mixed Pine–Spruce* stand is not significantly changed. Although all of the stand types with a spruce component recovered reasonably well without under-planting, under-planting is required to significantly improve the yield of the *Pine Dominant* stand type.  Differences in total yield between under-planting spruce or subalpine fir are not large.  However, due to higher initial mortality of the interior spruce, the individual tree size of the under-planted spruce after 100 years is much higher.

The benefit of under-planting stand types with a greater residual spruce component depends on the distribution of canopy and understory trees at the time of planting. The *Pine Minor Spruce* stand type with a low density of immature spruce realized an improved yield due to under-planting both species. This increase is likely due to the low initial stocking of residual spruce. Yield also increased on the *Spruce Minor Pine* type when under-planted with spruce or fir. This increase can be attributed to the under-planted trees contributing to the stand basal area as the older, larger spruce fall out of the stand.

## 5.7 Examination of implications of delaying planting in MPB damaged stands

As snags deteriorate following mountain pine beetle attack, the light environment for natural regeneration or planted seedlings is expected to steadily improve (refer to Figures 2 and 3). However when considering under-planting, the improved light environment must be balanced against the increased safety hazards posed by snags and the increased levels of brush and other competing natural regeneration that will also take advantage of steadily improving light levels. We simulated the effect of delaying planting of spruce under the *Pine Dominant* stand for 2, 4, 6, 8 and 10 years after beetle attack. Table 5 shows that, as the light environment under the deteriorating snags improves, survival and yield of spruce seedlings significantly increases. This effect highlights the importance of considering the effect of time and changing overstory conditions when developing prescriptions to mitigate the effect of the mountain pine beetle.

| Planting Delay | Planting Survival at 20 years (stems/ha) | Basal Area at 100 years (m$^2$/ha) |
|:---:|:---:|:---:|
| 2 | 237 | 47.0 |
| 4 | 452 | 50.5 |
| 6 | 758 | 57.2 |
| 8 | 1134 | 60.4 |
| 10 | 1297 | 60.8 |

**Table 5.** Effect of changing planting delay on planted spruce survival at 20 years and yield after 100 years (*Pine Dominant* stand).

## 6.0    Conclusions and Management Implications

There is significant interest among foresters in northern B.C. as to the impact of the mountain pine beetle on stands that are not harvested and potential opportunities to mitigate the impact.  SORTIE-ND, with the inclusion of the new snag submodel, is ideally suited to exploring these questions.  We modeled a variety of silvicultural strategies aimed at exploring the implications of MPB attack on understory light environments, natural regeneration survival and growth, and other silviculture treatments.

Developing the snag submodel for SORTIE-ND required the definition of snag classes, assessing light transmission values for each snag class, and developing an equation that models snag fall down rates.  Faced with a lack of detailed snag analysis post-MPB this model simplifies the continually changing nature of snag dynamics.  However, the results predicted by SORTIE-ND, when incorporating the snag submodel, mirror field observations of professionals throughout the mountain pine beetle affected area.  In addition, they confirm past studies that have examined the relationship of light level to seedling mortality rates. Modeling the understory light environment under MPB attacked stands reveals low light levels for an extended period of time.  This results in very high levels of lodgepole pine natural regeneration mortality.

We were unable to predict the extent of natural regeneration in the four stand types due to lack of data to parameterize the recruitment submodel.  A 2005/2007 FSP funded study will address this shortcoming.

The comparison of SORTIE-ND to TASS predictions revealed extraordinarily similar results for lodgepole pine and interior spruce growth.  Given the different approaches used by the two models this was a very encouraging result.  SORTIE-ND predicted somewhat lower subalpine fir growth rates for adult trees than TASS.  This suggests the yield results from SORTIE-ND should be suitable for inclusion in Timber Supply Analysis calculations for complex structured stands after MPB damage.

Mountain pine beetle attacked stands with a well-developed immature spruce component recover quickly after attack without salvage.  Within 50 years these stands have reached merchantable size and provide a reasonable yield (the *Mixed Pine-Spruce* and *Spruce Minor Pine* types).  If salvage of the dying and dead lodgepole pine in these stands is desired, salvage should target the pine while protecting the spruce.  These stand types can help mitigate mid-term (30-50 years) timber supply shortages if protected during partial salvage or left unsalvaged.  However, the *Pine Dominant* type stands will require management intervention in the form of under-planting or salvage and planting.  Delaying under-planting for 5 to 15 years after initial MPB attack may result in much higher survival and growth of interior spruce or subalpine fir.

## 7.0     Literature Cited

Banner, A., W. MacKenzie, S. Haeussler, S. Thomson, J. Pojar and R. Trowbridge. 1993. A field guide to site identification and interpretation for the Prince Rupert Forest Region. (Land Management Handbook 26). BC Ministry of Forests: Victoria, BC.

BC Ministry of Forests. 2001. Mensuration data from the provincial ecology program. (Forest Science Program Working Paper 62/2001). BC Ministry of Forests: Victoria, BC.

Canham, C.D., LePage, P. and Coates, K.D. 2004. A neighbourhood analysis of canopy tree competition: Effects of shading versus crowding. Canadian Journal of Forest Research, 34: 778-787.

Canham, C.D., Coates, K.D., Bartemucci, P. and Quaglia, S. 1999. Measurement and modeling of spatially-explicit variation in light transmission through interior cedar-hemlock forests of British Columbia, Canadian Journal of For. Research, 29: 1775-1783.

Coates, K.D., Canham, C.D., Beaudet, M. Sachs, D.L. and Messier, C. 2003. Use of a spatially explicit individual-tree model (SORTIE/BC) to explore the implications of patchiness in structurally complex forests. For. Ecol. Management, 186 (1-3): 297-310.

Keen, F.P. 1955. The rate of natural falling of beetle-killed ponderosa pine snags. Journal of Forestry, 53: 720-723.

Kobe, R.K., and Coates, K.D. 1997. Models of sapling mortality as a function of growth to characterize interspecific variation in shade tolerance of eight tree species of northwestern British Columbia. Canadian Journal of Forest Research, 27: 227-236.

LePage, P.T., Canham, C.D., Coates, K.D., Bartemucci, P. 2000. Seed source versus substrate limitation of seedling recruitment in interior cedar-hemlock forests of British Columbia. Canadian Journal of Forest Research, 30: 415-427.

Pacala, S. W., Canham, C. D., Saponara, J., Silander, Jr., J. A., Kobe, R. K., Ribbens, E. 1996. Forest models defined by field measurements: II Estimation, error analysis, and dynamics. Ecol. Mon., 66: 1-43.

Poulin, J., Coates, K.D., Messier, C. 200_. Light transmission of snags in boreal forests. *In* preparation.

Wright, E.F., K.D. Coates, C.D. Canham and P. Bartemucci. 1998. Species variability in growth response to light across climatic regions in northwestern British Columbia. Canadian Journal of Forest Research, 28: 871-876.

Wright, E.F., Canham, C.D., Coates, K.D. 2000. Effects of suppression and release on sapling growth for eleven tree species of northern interior British Columbia. Canadian Journal of Forest Research, 30: 1571-1580.