

WHITE PAPER



USDA Forest Service

Pacific Northwest Region

Umatilla National Forest

WHITE PAPER F14-SO-WP-SILV-47

Active Management Of Quaking Aspen Plant Communities In The Northern Blue Mountains: Regeneration Ecology And Silvicultural Considerations¹

David C. Powell; Forest Silviculturist
Supervisor's Office; Pendleton, OR

Initial Version: **NOVEMBER 2007**

Most Recent Revision: **MARCH 2014**

Introduction.....	2
Comments about aspen's distribution.....	2
Comments about aspen biology	3
Figure 1 – Geographical distribution of quaking aspen for Blue Mountains section	4
Figure 2 – Large aspen stand in the East Williams Creek area, Wet Mountains	5
Comments about aspen regeneration	6
Figure 3 – Genetic variation in quaking aspen.....	7
Figure 4 – Auxin and cytokinin relationships for quaking aspen ecosystems.....	8
Comments about aspen ecology.....	9
Figure 5 – Aspen at Elk Flat occurs in three ecological settings reflecting soil moisture conditions ..	11
Figure 6 – Aspen communities in the Blue Mountains tend to occur as a meadow fringe	12
Figure 7 – Geographical extent of a large forest fire occurring about 1850.....	13
Figure 8 – Selected vigor issues associated with the Elk Flat aspen communities	14
Figure 9 – Aspen provides a variety of ecosystem services	15
Comments about aspen management.....	16
Comments about conifer removal.....	17
Figure 10 – Deteriorated aspen clone on the Heppner Ranger District.....	18
Comments about planting aspen	19
Comments about aspen fencing	19
Figure 11 – Example of a fencing alternative being evaluated by the Walla Walla RD	20

¹ White papers are internal reports; they receive only limited review. Viewpoints expressed in this paper are those of the author – they may not represent positions of the USDA Forest Service.

Comments about potential fuel loading	20
Forest Plan context for aspen management	21
Table 1: Estimated amounts of standing dead and live woody biomass	22
Comments about Elk Flat history	23
Figure 12 – Contemporary image providing a similar aspen perspective as a 1913 photograph	24
Figure 13 – Forest health issues associated with quaking aspen	25
Aspen deterioration evaluation for Elk Flat aspen communities	26
Enclosure 1: Charles Johnson email message	27
Enclosure 2: Elizabeth Crowe stand review	28
Enclosure 3: 1992 aspen viability review	30
Enclosure 4: 1999 insect and disease evaluation	33
Enclosure 5: 2003 insect and disease evaluation	36
Enclosure 6: Historical mapping sources	39
Aspen references and literature cited	44
Appendix: Silviculture white papers	59
Revision history	61

INTRODUCTION

On September 20, 2007, I accompanied a Walla Walla Ranger District interdisciplinary team to review aspen plant communities in the Elk Flat area. These communities have special significance as perhaps the single largest concentration of aspen in the Blue Mountains.

This white paper provides specific observations about aspen communities at Elk Flat, aspen ecology and management in general, and it elaborates on comments I made during the field trip. The white paper has three objectives:

1. After returning from the field trip, I was able to locate reports from ecologists, entomologists, and a pathologist that were prepared after previous field reviews of the Elk Flat aspen area; I scanned this material and included it here as enclosures.
2. In many instances, the biology and ecology of quaking aspen is quite different from that of our conifer species, and I would like to discuss how these differences could influence our future stewardship of the Elk Flat area and its aspen communities.
3. I would like to make you aware of historical mapping sources that could help characterize what the Elk Flat area used to be like and perhaps help decide whether its aspen communities have been deteriorating through time.

COMMENTS ABOUT ASPEN’S DISTRIBUTION

Quaking aspen (*Populus tremuloides* Michx.) is the most widely distributed forest tree species in North America; it occurs in temperate and boreal forests ranging from northeastern Canada west to northwestern Alaska, and then south in the montane and subalpine vegetation zones of the Rocky Mountains. Outlier populations of quaking aspen are found as far south as northern Mexico (Howard 1996, Jones 1985).

When considering the range of its close relative from Asia, Europe, and North Africa – the European aspen (*Populus tremula*) – aspen undoubtedly has the broadest distribution of any tree species in the world (Perala 1990).

Although aspen's global distribution is impressive, the Blue Mountains occur near the periphery of its range in western North America (Perala 1990). When consulting the "Atlas of United States Trees" (Little 1971), aspen's distribution for the Blue Mountains is shown as four discrete concentrations bearing little semblance to its actual distribution or extent in our local area (fig. 1).

For the Umatilla National Forest, a GIS analysis would undoubtedly show that the average size of aspen-dominated stands is half an acre or less. This presents a stark contrast to the situation elsewhere in the western United States, particularly for Utah, Colorado, and northwestern Wyoming, where aspen forest occupies substantial portions of the landscape.

In central or northwestern Colorado, for example, an aspen stand covering 50 acres is considered normal or even smaller than average (fig. 2), and yet the spatial extent of aspen in the Elk Flat area (estimated to be 50 acres) is traditionally characterized as the largest aspen stand in the Blue Mountains province.

A typical reaction to the Elk Flat aspen communities is provided by Elizabeth Crowe, a previous associate Area Ecologist, when she noted that "Elk Flats has the largest extended collection of aspen stands I've seen on National Forest land in the Blue Mountains" (enclosure 2).

Although we don't know for certain why aspen currently occurs as such small stands in the Blue Mountains, I suspect our contemporary aspen communities have retreated to their moist-site refugia in response to a century of ungulate browsing, fire exclusion, and conifer invasion.

Recent concerns about a possible decline in quaking aspen forests identified that "aspen clones in the southwestern United States, as well as in other areas on the edge of aspen's range, are of particular concern to forest managers because drastic reductions in aspen acreage have occurred (Bartos 2000) in these areas" (Guyon 2006). Since the Blue Mountains also occur near the edge of aspen's range, Guyon's (2006) statement applies equally well to our aspen stands.

COMMENTS ABOUT ASPEN BIOLOGY

Aspen is a deciduous, broadleaved tree species, a group often referred to as hardwoods. Aspen is unique among the major western tree species, and even among our native broadleaves, in that it reproduces almost exclusively from root sprouts called suckers.

Unlike many other broadleaved species, mature aspen trees do not produce "true sprouts" from stumps or stem bases, although small aspen trees occasionally produce basal stem sprouts. When clumped aspen occur, this is often their genesis – small aspen trees were wounded early in life, and they responded to the injury by producing basal stem sprouts.




Figure 1: Geographical distribution of quaking aspen for the Blue Mountains section, as depicted in the “Atlas of United States Trees” (Little 1971). Little’s atlas was prepared for the entire United States,² so its broad-scale information is likely to be inaccurate for fine-scale areas such as the Blue Mountains.

This regeneration trait is a major difference between aspen and other common broadleaved species – black cottonwood, water birch, mountain alder, and bitter cherry reproduce vegetatively using **sprouts** produced from the lower stem area of mature trees, whereas vegetative reproduction for aspen occurs almost exclusively as **suckers** from the root system.

Reproducing primarily from root suckers results in another unique situation for aspen: a clonal life history allowing a very long potential age for any individual clone. For this interesting evolutionary strategy, the genetically unique organism consists of a root system called the genet, and it produces successive generations of root suckers called the ramets, which then develop into mature trees (Perala 1990).

Although an individual cohort of aspen ramets is relatively short-lived (60 to 100 years), especially in contrast to the multi-century longevity of many of its conifer associates, the underground genet may be thousands of years old. Some clones in the intermountain west might approach 10,000 years of age (and perhaps more than a million years according to Barnes 1975), thus producing a hundred or more generations of ramets from one root system.

² Digitized tree range maps from Elbert Little’s “Atlas of United States Trees” are provided for 35 species occurring in the Blue Mountains section at this website: <http://www.fs.fed.us/r6/uma/nr/silv/range-maps.shtml>



Figure 2: Large aspen stand in the East Williams Creek area, Wet Mountains, San Carlos Ranger District, Pike and San Isabel National Forests. For many areas in Utah, Colorado, and northwestern Wyoming, quaking aspen occurs in large stands, although an individual stand commonly contains more than one clone. In the Blue Mountains, aspen tends to occur as very small stands covering a fraction of an acre.

It is believed that an ancient aspen clone has existed for perhaps thousands of years in the Morsay Creek drainage of the North Fork John Day Ranger District (Shirley and Erickson 2001).

Since aspen trees are a clone connected together by a parent root system, a clone is either male or female, but not both. Aspen is a dioecious species with clones being either male or female, rather than being monoecious with both reproductive structures produced on the same tree (or clone). This illustrates another difference between aspen and conifers because all of the major conifers of the Blue Mountains are monoecious.

Another clonal feature is that many tree characteristics vary markedly from one clone to another, such as leaf shape and size, bark color, branching habit, autumn leaf color, disease resistance, and so forth. Since clones intermingle, variations in one or more of these characteristics can often be used to accurately identify different clones in the field, and to do so without incurring the cost of genetic testing such as isoenzyme analysis (fig. 3).

COMMENTS ABOUT ASPEN REGENERATION

Hopefully, the aspen biology discussion successfully communicated that aspen is a uniquely interconnected tree species, and the sharing of a common root system results in aboveground stems exhibiting a remarkable degree of uniformity when compared with the high amount of phenotypic variation typically observed for our conifer species.

The interconnectedness of aspen results in some unusual considerations when attempting to promote or enhance aspen regeneration. Sucker production from a clone's root system is suppressed by a plant growth hormone called auxin (Schier 1973). Auxin is produced by the aerial parts of the tree, including the stem. In forestry terminology, the hormonal control exerted by a stem over the root system is called "apical dominance" (Schier et al. 1985).

When auxin movement into roots is halted or reduced by cutting, burning, girdling, killing, or defoliating the stems, auxin levels in the roots decline rapidly. Auxin acts to suppress sucker production, whereas another growth hormone called cytokinin is produced by the root system and it acts to promote sucker initiation and development. High ratios of cytokinin to auxin favor sucker initiation, but low ratios inhibit it (Schier 1973, 1975; Schier et al. 1985).

This constant tension between two growth hormones, one inhibiting suckers and the other stimulating them (fig. 4), has an important influence on the circumstances under which we can expect to obtain a new cohort of aspen trees.

After a change in hormone balance triggers a new aspen cohort, carbohydrate reserves stored in the root system (starches, etc.) supply the energy needed for sucker initiation and early development. An elongating sucker is entirely dependent upon the parent root system until it emerges from the soil and can begin photosynthesizing on its own (Schier and Zasada 1973, Tew 1970).

Low carbohydrate reserves allow fewer root buds to initiate into suckers, or it results in some of the elongating suckers not being able to reach the soil surface, and either outcome contributes to a sparse stand of aspen regeneration (Schier et al. 1985).

A land manager could decide to actively intervene in a stand's development by killing the overstory aspen trees, thus preventing further auxin production, in order to promote a new cohort of young aspen stems. This approach involves risk, however, because carbohydrates produced by overstory trees nourish the root system, so if killing the overstory aspen trees does not promote suckering, then both the root system and the clone might be lost from this tactic.

This root suckering discussion is provided because aspen seldom regenerates from seed. Even when male and female clones occur in close proximity, which is not a foregone conclusion in the Blue Mountains where aspen occurs in isolated stands and a stand does not always contain more than one clone, the seed catkins are produced in early spring when snow is still on the ground, and aspen seeds deteriorate rapidly after being dispersed (McDonough 1985).



Figure 3: Genetic variation in quaking aspen. Stems in a clone will exhibit a relatively consistent expression of any trait under genetic (rather than environmental) control. Leaf shape and size, bark color, branching habit, autumn leaf color, and disease resistance are examples of traits for which genetic control has been described (Barnes 1975, Cottam 1954). The clone above exhibits poor self pruning of dead branches, and this trait is obvious enough to separate this clone from adjacent ones in the same area. Note that self pruning and live branching are separate traits: some clones have short live branching (upper third of stems only) and good self pruning of dead branches, while others exhibit short live branching and poor self pruning of dead branches. Bark color is supposedly an indicator of clone vigor (Shepperd 1981), but my experience is that bark color is often a genetic trait, with yellow-barked clones (upper right) easily separated from white- or green-barked clones (lower right) in stands where different clones intermingle. Delineation of clones on the basis of phenotypic traits is not foolproof; isoenzyme analysis is often more reliable (Morgenstern 1996).








Figure 4: Auxin and cytokinin relationships for quaking aspen ecosystems (diagrams reproduced from Miller 1996). Many aspects of the regeneration ecology of quaking aspen are controlled by plant growth hormones. Auxin appears to have a predominant regulating role, although gibberellin, cytokinin, abscisic acid, ethylene, and other hormones are also involved (Kozłowski and Pallardy 1997). Auxins, which are produced by aerial parts of the tree, exert control over the root system. Photosynthate, consisting of carbohydrates and other organic compounds created during photosynthesis, moves downward with auxins toward the root system through a tree's phloem. Plant growth hormones called cytokinins are produced by the root system. Cytokinins and water move upward toward the foliage through a tree's xylem (lower image). The ratio of auxins to cytokinins controls sucker production in aspen stands: high ratios of cytokinins to auxins favor sucker initiation (upper left), whereas high ratios of auxins to cytokinins inhibit aspen suckering (upper right).



In western Canada where seed viability has been studied, aspen seeds remained viable for only 2 to 4 weeks (McDonough 1985), and this short viability period provides another difference between aspen and our native conifers, all of which have much longer seed viability than aspen. This means that aspen seed dispersed onto a snowpack might not remain viable long enough for conditions to change in favor of seed germination (unless wind moves it off the snowpack).

COMMENTS ABOUT ASPEN ECOLOGY

At Elk Flat, aspen is primarily associated with three ecological settings:

1. A riparian setting located in wet basins or on wet flats (this is the quaking aspen/bluejoint reedgrass plant community type)
2. A transitional ‘fringe’ setting found along the edges of meadows, and
3. An upland setting where existing conifer density typically exceeds aspen density (fig. 5).

In many examples of the aspen/conifer type at Elk Flat, aspen occurs solely as skeletons (down gray stems clearly recognizable as aspen) because living aspen is no longer present in these stands.

Throughout the western United States where aspen and conifers coexist, the vegetation pattern often features a mosaic of forest and small meadows (fig. 6). The succession in these areas is generally from meadow to forest, but destruction of a forest stand by wildfire frequently sets the area back to meadow (Daniel et al. 1979, page 284; Schimpf et al. 1980). I believe the Elk Flat area might fit this successional model.

“Where aspens occur on the margins of a stand, they advance into the meadow by means of root suckers, provide shade, reduce gopher concentrations, and give a favorable seedbed and growing conditions for the establishment of the conifers” (Daniel et al. 1979; pages 284, 286). For a variety of reasons, many conifers currently exist within the Elk Flat aspen communities.

“Tolerance is a forestry term for expressing the relative capacity of a tree to compete under low light and high root competition. Tolerant trees reproduce and form understories beneath canopies of less tolerant trees or even beneath their own shade. Intolerant trees reproduce successfully only in the open or where the canopy is greatly broken. A knowledge of tolerance and its implications for competitiveness and growth is fundamental to good silviculture and should support every management decision” (Daniel et al. 1979).³

When considering how the tree species at Elk Flat have been rated according to tolerance, we find that subalpine fir is classed as very tolerant, Engelmann spruce and grand fir are tolerant, Douglas-fir and western white pine are intermediate, ponderosa pine and lodgepole pine are intolerant, and western larch and quaking aspen are very intolerant (Daniel et al. 1979, table 13-2).

³ Daniel et al. (1979) use tolerance in a broader sense than just shade tolerance. After root-trenching studies described by Zon (1907), tolerance was used to refer to a species’ ability to tolerate both shade and root competition.

These tolerance ratings support my contention that Elk Flat aspen communities owe their existence to two ecosystem processes:

1. Stand-initiating disturbance events such as wildfire, which function as “destruction” agents and initiate a new plant succession beginning with meadow (fig. 7); and
2. Forest stand dynamics, where succession and other life history traits of individual tree species control how post-disturbance plant communities evolve through time.

As an intolerant species, aspen will only regenerate and develop successfully in open environments. Aspen’s suckering ability allows it to quickly produce a profuse amount of reproduction ideally suited for exploiting meadows or open, early-successional conditions. But to thrive or just develop acceptably, aspen suckers require an environment relatively free of competition from other tree species,⁴ particularly from conifers and other species more tolerant than aspen.

Since all of the conifers in the Elk Flat aspen communities are more tolerant than aspen (including western larch), they represent a significant competition risk to the long-term health and vigor of the Elk Flat aspen stands (fig. 8). This means that as plant succession progresses, aspen’s initial competitive advantage wanes because shading, soil acidity, and other environmental conditions gradually evolve in favor of the tolerant conifers (Bartos and Amacher 1998, Cryer and Murray 1992).

Although human society has decided to suppress the primary disturbance process responsible for maintaining aspen communities at Elk Flat (stand-initiating wildfire), we could choose to mimic a fire effect by removing conifers from successional advanced aspen stands. If we decide to pursue this course of action, it should be implemented before aspen is completely lost from the Elk Flat area.

Intervening to sustain aspen at Elk Flat acknowledges that for the evergreen-dominated forests of western North America, aspen provides more value for aesthetics and biological diversity than would be expected from its relatively minor abundance on the landscape. Some have suggested that aspen functions as a keystone species, providing essential ecosystem services for a very large suite of plants and animals (Rogers et al. 2007, Shepperd et al. 2006).

In my opinion, the aspen stands at Elk Flat provide ecosystem values that are disproportionately greater than aspen’s limited abundance on the Walla Walla Ranger District (fig. 9).

⁴ Note that competition between aspen suckers seems to have little inhibitory effect on stand development. As a very intolerant species, aspen is an effective self-thinner, and research has shown that manual thinning of dense aspen regeneration is not only unnecessary but might actually be counterproductive by contributing to disease spread. This is another difference between aspen and conifers because early thinning of young conifer stands can be very important, particularly for intolerant conifers with high susceptibility to stagnation. Stagnation seldom, if ever, occurs in aspens (Perala et al. 1999), and in other intolerant western broadleaved tree species.



Figure 5: Aspen at Elk Flat occurs in three ecological settings representing a continuum of soil moisture conditions: a riparian type on wet flats (upper); a meadow fringe type (right); and an upland aspen/conifer type. The riparian setting has been classified as the quaking aspen/bluejoint reedgrass (POTR/CACA) plant community type (Crowe and Clausnitzer 1997). The lush herbaceous cover in the upper image consists of sedges adjacent to a shallow, meandering stream channel, and bluejoint reedgrass just beyond the sedge zone. POTR/CACA sites have fine-textured soils that are often saturated for a portion of the growing season (Crowe and Clausnitzer 1997). Aspen and bluejoint reedgrass can tolerate poorly drained soils because they are shallow-rooted and regenerate vegetatively (Powell 1988). Although aspen tolerates poor drainage for short periods, it prefers unsaturated conditions (Comeau et al. 1996). Poor soil drainage is probably the main factor causing sparse aspen density on POTR/CACA sites (as is shown above). The meadow fringe type may also be relatively lush, but it is not dominated by wet-site indicators such as riparian sedges, rushes, or bluejoint reedgrass. The upland aspen/conifer type is not shown here.





An aspen clone on the Bear Valley (now Blue Mountain) Ranger District of the Malheur National Forest. Note that this aspen stand occupies a relatively small acreage, as is typical for the Blue Mountains, and that it occurs as a fringe type around a meadow where the plant composition consists of graminoids and willow clumps.



An aspen clone in the Jarboe Meadow area of the Walla Walla Ranger District, Umatilla National Forest. Once again, this aspen stand occupies a small acreage and occurs primarily as a meadow fringe. In this instance, the meadow is wetter than the Bear Valley example, with the plant composition featuring wet-site plants such as false hellebore and cowparsnip.

Figure 6: Aspen communities in the Blue Mountains tend to occur most often as a meadow fringe, suggesting that plant succession in these areas is generally from meadow to forest, and that destruction of a forest stand by wildfire frequently sets the area back to meadow (Daniel et al. 1979, Schimpf et al. 1980). Aspen's affinity for meadow margins is at least partly due to its soil tolerances: although aspen can tolerate heavy soils with high water tables or anaerobic conditions for short periods (see fig. 5; Comeau et al. 1996, Landhausser et al. 1998, Perala 1990), it prefers meadow margins because they tend to have lighter soils and better drainage than meadow interiors. For proper root function, aspen requires unsaturated soils at least seasonally.




Figure 7: Maps showing geographical extent of a large forest fire occurring about 1850 (in the GIS map to the right, the 62 road, the Wenaha-Tucannon Wilderness boundary, and Elk Flat are shown for orientation purposes). The fire perimeters (right) were digitized from a map compiled by Thompson and Johnson 1900 (left), and included with a report called “The Forests of Oregon” by Henry Gannett in 1902. A large fire of more than 68,000 acres is shown in white on the original map (left, upper center) and in green on the GIS map (right). Note that the calculated fire size (68,144 acres) includes only the single, large fire area; not the adjacent smaller fires also depicted with green shading. A large fire in this general area was described in an early examination report for the proposed Wenaha Forest Reserve (Kent 1904): “Practically every portion of the reserve has suffered more or less from fire. The largest and most important of these was one which came from the present Umatilla Indian Reservation about fifty years ago, burned up the river Umatilla, into the reserve, then turned north along the west slope across the heads of the Walla Wallas, and reached as far as the head of the Wenaha.” The large fire depicted here (right) apparently occurs within the area Kent described, but it is obviously smaller than what would be expected from his narrative.

I believe the large fire described in Kent’s report might have been responsible for the last significant episode of aspen regeneration at Elk Flat, almost 160 years ago now. If my assumption is correct, then the advanced degree of deterioration exhibited by Elk Flat aspen stands is not surprising because this fire-free interval (160 years) exceeds the upper limit of the 20-130 year fire frequency proposed by Noble and Slatyer (1980) as being necessary for maintaining aspen plant communities in the northern Rocky Mountains. Fire-free periods exceeding 130 years result in quaking aspen becoming inconspicuous in mixed forests containing both aspen and conifers, and this result is expected because aspen’s competitive advantage over conifers (vegetative reproduction) is lost without moderately frequent disturbance events of stand-initiating intensity (Noble and Slatyer 1980, Sheppard and Smith 1993).




Figure 8: Selected vigor issues associated with the Elk Flat aspen communities. In the late 1990s, a persistent outbreak of satin moth affected the Elk Flat aspen stands. Satin moth resulted in either complete defoliation (upper right) or a “lollipop” appearance caused primarily by limited refoliation after satin moth feeding moderated (above). The satin moth outbreak imparted an unhealthy appearance to the Elk Flat aspen stands; it is possible that satin moth functioned as a death knell in this instance (as forest tent caterpillar has been known to do in the Rockies). Satin moth biology and impacts are comprehensively described in two of the insect and disease evaluations (enclosures 4 and 5). Another major influence on aspen health and vigor is a dense ingrowth of shade-tolerant conifers (lower right, with Bill Collar trying valiantly to protect a veteran aspen from the unrelenting conifer onslaught). Grand fir, subalpine fir, and Engelmann spruce are the three conifer species of most concern as aspen competitors, and all three are abundant in the Elk Flat area.





Figure 9: Aspen provides a variety of ecosystem services. Quaking aspen is aesthetically attractive (upper half: Elk Flat area on September 30, 1997), particularly since it occurs in an evergreen-dominated region where the limited amounts of fall color from shrubs, broadleaf trees, and a deciduous conifer (western larch) are widely appreciated. Aspen provides many values for wildlife and biodiversity – elk use aspen’s bark as a food source during winter (lower left, showing the distinctive stem pattern caused by chronic elk barking injuries) and to rub the velvet off their antlers; cavity-nesting birds make extensive use of aspen because of its thin bark and high frequency of stem decay caused by white trunk rot (*Phellinus tremulae*), thus making cavity excavation easier (lower right).

COMMENTS ABOUT ASPEN MANAGEMENT

My comments in this Aspen Management section apply only to the “meadow fringe” and “upland aspen/conifer” types described in the Aspen Ecology section (and see fig. 5). It is assumed that no active management activities would occur in the “riparian” type at Elk Flat.

As discussed during the field trip, auxin produced by the overstory aspen not only controls whether new suckers are produced by the clone’s root system, but it also influences the vigor of any existing suckers, and this occurs primarily by suppressing sucker height growth rates.

As an example of this situation, it is common in the Blue Mountains to see two-layer aspen stands featuring an open cohort of overstory aspen, and a relatively sparse cohort of short aspen suckers. This two-layer structure demonstrates that the auxin/cytokinin ratio is a continuum, and that the amount of aspen suckering varies in response to overstory mortality because it controls how much auxin is produced (fig. 4). As overstory mortality causes reduced auxin production, limited amounts of aspen suckering occur and this ultimately results in a two-layer structure.

The suckers in a two-layer stand generally have low vigor, and although some of the reduced vigor is caused by chronic ungulate browsing or conifer encroachment, much of it reflects continuing influence from auxin produced by overstory aspen trees (fig. 4).

In light of the fact that overstory aspen trees use auxin to suppress aspen suckers, some Blue Mountain land managers have considered root-trenching treatments as one option for releasing aspen reproduction, so it can grow more quickly to a resilient size class. When used elsewhere in the western United States, trenching was accomplished using a crawler tractor with a ripper attachment (Shepperd 1996).

Trenching is an intuitively attractive treatment option for at least four reasons:

- By severing the connection between parent roots and the suckers, it would release the understory aspen from auxin suppression without having to kill the overstory trees to do so;
- It would allow the live overstory aspen trees, which are valuable for aesthetics, wildlife habitat, and other benefits, to coexist with an understory cohort of aspen suckers;
- Removing auxin suppression would allow sucker height growth to approach its ecological site potential (3 to 6 feet per year is not unrealistic for ideal conditions); and
- If high rates of sucker height growth could be promoted, then young aspen stems would move more quickly into a height zone where they are immune to ungulate herbivory.

Trenching was occasionally discussed as a possible aspen rejuvenation treatment at meetings of the Hardwoods Network (an ad hoc group of hardwoods devotees), but I am unaware if it was actually implemented in the Blue Mountains and, if so, whether it was successful.

Although auxin production from overstory aspen is one factor affecting sucker vigor (fig. 4), and I believe its influence is often overlooked, it is by no means the only constraint on sucker development. Encroachment by conifers (Jones et al. 2005, Kaye et al. 2005) and browsing by ungulates (McCain et al. 2003, Ripple and Beschta 2005, White et al. 1998) are two other factors influencing aspen sucker vitality.

COMMENTS ABOUT CONIFER REMOVAL

I encourage you to consider options for removing encroaching conifers in the Elk Flat aspen communities. How much conifer removal would be sufficient? I doubt this issue has been examined specifically for the Blue Mountains, but when aspen-to-conifer succession was studied in central Utah, it was found that “conifers can make up at least half of the stocking in mixed stands without apparent harm to the aspen clonal root system” (Shepperd et al. 2001).

I believe the 50% conifer threshold described by Shepperd et al. (2001) should function as an upper bound because aspen in central Utah is more abundant, and has better overall integrity, than Blue Mountains aspen. Since Blue Mountains aspen is relegated to small stands at the edge of aspen’s North American range, it has less resilience than aspen in Utah or Colorado, and I believe it is less tolerant of conifer encroachment here than there.

And why is conifer removal even necessary? This question has at least two answers. The ecology section described how aspen is a very intolerant tree species, and it will eventually be out-competed by other species with more tolerance. For Elk Flat, every other tree species has more tolerance than aspen, so they all represent a significant risk to aspen’s long-term viability.

The physiological reason for removing conifers is demonstrated by a research study, which found that small conifers exhibit greater water stress (midday xylem water potential) when growing under a conifer overstory than an aspen overstory. In this study, the small conifers functioned as water-stress indicators and they clearly showed that large conifers use more soil moisture than large aspens (Schimpf et al. 1980).

This study also suggests that allowing conifers to continue to encroach at Elk Flat will result in less available soil moisture than if the area supported other plants, including aspen trees. This is one reason for why the undergrowth of aspen stands is generally lusher than for conifer communities. The lush, floristically diverse undergrowth results in aspen stands having high value for livestock forage, wildlife browse, and wildflower enjoyment.

Conifer removal should occur as soon as possible to prevent further deterioration of aspen root system vigor. If root system vigor is lost, aspen itself will be lost (fig. 10), and experience elsewhere suggests we would then need to plant aspen to reestablish it at Elk Flat. Perhaps the most recent event contributing to impaired clonal vigor was an intense outbreak of satin moth, imparting an unhealthy appearance to the aspen communities (fig. 8 and enclosures 4-5).

Some people believe that a viable aspen root system will continue to exist underground where an aspen grove once stood. This is a fallacy, and it ignores the physiological reality that aspen roots are living tissue: they have respiration demands requiring carbohydrate replenishment from photosynthesizing foliage to remain alive. Once aspen is gone from a site, it is gone – there is no slumbering root system underground, just waiting for the next wildfire to awaken it!



Figure 10: Deteriorated aspen clone on the Heppner Ranger District. This clone was burned in the Wheeler Point wildfire in 1996, and most of the overstory trees died as a result of their fire-caused injuries (occasional trees survived, as shown at far right). When this image was acquired a year or two after the fire, there were no aspen suckers under the dead overstory trees, indicating that (1) clonal vigor had declined to the point where the root system could no longer produce any suckers, or (2) any limited amount of suckering was immediately removed by ungulate herbivory. In most instances, aspen responds to fire by producing a profusion of suckers, but this image shows that fire can kill clones when their pre-fire vigor was at very low levels. If an objective is to reestablish a viable aspen clone on sites such as this one, it would be necessary to fence the area and then outplant aspen seedlings or rootstock.

I recommend that conifers be removed for a distance of 1 to 1½ tree heights beyond the current extent of aspen root system to allow sunlight to reach the soil surface, helping promote aspen suckering and subsequent sucker development. Conifer removal was also recommended by Charlie Johnson, Craig Schmitt, Don Scott, and Lia Spiegel: see enclosures 1 and 3-5.

As noted in a Forest Supervisor letter of September 5, 2003 (Blackwood 2003), it might be necessary to amend the Forest Plan to remove conifers over 21" dbh because retaining them is emphasized by the Eastside Screens. If an amendment is needed to remove conifers, perhaps it could be coordinated with changing the Elk Flat management designation (see page 19).

It was clear during the field trip that some of the reluctance to consider timber harvest for conifer removal is related to perceived risk to soil and water associated with harvest equipment. I wonder if the District could address these perceptions by considering a fuelwood option where felled conifers are cut into short bolts, and then removed from the area by hand?

COMMENTS ABOUT PLANTING ASPEN

If living aspen are completely gone from an area, then planting would need to occur to reestablish it. Aspen planting has occurred on the Walla Walla RD since at least the early 1990s when Larry Frank tried it along Oregon Highway 204 after a January 1990 windstorm.

More recently, Betsy Kaiser has been planting a variety of broadleaved tree and shrub species while experimenting with alternative stock types, mulch mats for vegetation control, and fencing options to mitigate ungulate herbivory (fig. 11).

I commend this experimentation because we should not only continue to monitor our traditional approaches (such as buck-and-pole fencing), but when presented with opportunities to evaluate new options that might be more cost effective or persist longer than contemporary practices, I believe we should enthusiastically embrace them.

COMMENTS ABOUT ASPEN FENCING

Buck-and-pole, A-frame-style fencing has been widely used on the Umatilla National Forest for at least 15 years now as a way to mitigate some of the impacts associated with ungulate herbivory of aspen suckers (Shirley and Erickson 2001). Fencing has also been recommended by Area Ecologists for the Blue Mountains (enclosure 2).

Fencing is often included with other activities in an integrated aspen restoration plan. When conifers need to be removed from aspen stands such as the ones at Elk Flat, selling them for wood products could generate enough revenue to pay for the ungulate-exclusion fencing. If some of the conifers that need to be removed are suitable as buck-and-pole fencing material (such as pole-sized lodgepole pines), they could obviously be retained onsite for this purpose.

Another possible mitigation measure discussed during the field trip is to cut conifers and concentrate their stems in such a way as to form barriers, thus discouraging ungulate access to aspen suckers. This measure has worked well in some areas of the western United States to create temporary aspen refugia, allowing enough suckers to escape herbivory and successfully perpetuate the clone (Ripple and Larsen 2001, de Chantal and Granström 2007).

During the September 20th field trip, Bill Collar commented that the use of wood concentrations (jackstraws) has been tried on the Walla Walla Ranger District as a way to protect aspen suckers, but with limited success.

Slash piles, natural accumulations of woody debris, or conifer trees felled with the “hinge” technique have been effective at protecting aspen suckers on the North Fork John Day Ranger District. These treatments or techniques were most effective when they were kept small, encouraging native ungulates to go around them rather than through them (Shirley and Erickson 2001).



Figure 11: Example of a fencing alternative being evaluated on the Walla Walla Ranger District for establishment of broadleaved tree and shrub species (individuals included in the photograph are Kathy Campbell, Betsy Kaiser, and Vicky Erickson, from left to right). Although buck-and-pole fencing has traditionally been used on the Umatilla National Forest, the Walla Walla Ranger District is currently evaluating alternative materials such as steel wire and plastic mesh. Landscape fabric, mulch mats from recycled plastic, and other options for mitigating the effects of competing vegetation are also being evaluated in these establishment trials.

Regardless of which mitigation measure is ultimately selected, *it is important to address the ungulate herbivory issue in some fashion*. In the southwestern United States, another region of the country where aspen clones tend to be small and isolated, aspen has been found to be very vulnerable to herbivory, particularly when animals from a wide area have an opportunity to concentrate in small, stressed clones (Guyon 2006).

COMMENTS ABOUT POTENTIAL FUEL LOADING

During the field trip, a discussion ensued about cutting or girdling conifers and leaving them onsite as an option for avoiding potential timber harvest risks to soil and water resources. Although this strategy is compatible with the objective of killing conifers to help sustain aspen at Elk Flat, it could result in fuel loadings that are problematic in terms of future wildfire risk.

To evaluate the fuel loading issue, we took two stand examinations completed in the immediate vicinity of Elk Flat and used the Fire and Fuels Extension of the Forest Vegetation Simulator to calculate their standing wood biomass in tons per acre. I then compared the calculated bi-

omass for four levels of conifer felling with an optimum range of coarse woody debris (CWD) reflecting acceptable risks of fire hazard and fire severity. Biomass amounts occurring within the optimum range represents acceptable wildfire risk; amounts outside the range might be problematic from a fuel loading perspective.

For the fuels analysis, two stands were used because they reflect a range of stand density, and stand density is an important consideration because it dictates how much CWD would ultimately be created by either of the non-harvest treatments discussed during the field trip:

- Conifer felling in place, assuming no removal by either commercial timber harvest or fuelwood cutting, resulting in immediate creation of down wood.
- Conifer girdling, resulting in rapid creation of standing dead trees and delayed production of down wood after girdled trees topple over.

Table 1 presents results of the fuel loading analysis. The four percentages of standing biomass were selected to reflect a range of conifer felling or girdling. To be consistent with the published values for an optimum range of CWD (Brown et al. 2003), only the biomass values associated with live and dead wood greater than 3 inches in diameter were used for the analysis.

Table 1 shows that for the Elk Flat stand with relatively low conifer density (a basal area of 132 square feet per acre), up to half of the conifers could be felled or girdled and the resulting CWD (woody fuel) would remain within an optimum range of CWD for “cool moist” forests (Powell et al. 2007).

Table 1 shows that for the Elk Flat stand with relatively high conifer density (a basal area of 283 square feet per acre), only 25% of the conifers could be felled or girdled and have the resulting CWD (woody fuel) remain in an optimum range of CWD for “cool moist” forests (Powell et al. 2007).

Table 1 indicates that for Elk Flat, conifer felling or girdling at levels greater than 50 percent of the existing basal area would result in fuel loadings that present unacceptable risks of fire hazard and fire severity (Brown et al. 2003).

The results presented in table 1 suggest that if conifer removal by harvest or fuelwood is not considered a viable tactic, then fuels treatment (such as hand piling and burning) could be needed to mitigate the additional fuel created by conifer felling or girdling.

FOREST PLAN CONTEXT FOR ASPEN MANAGEMENT

The aspen communities at Elk Flat were an important reason for the area’s allocation as a proposed Research Natural Area (RNA) in the Forest Plan (USDA Forest Service 1990), but it was suggested by Charlie Johnson, a previous Area Ecologist, that a “special interest area” designation might provide more options to sustain aspen on this site (enclosure 1).

Table 1: Estimated amounts of standing dead and live woody biomass (greater than 3 inches in diameter) for two forest stands located in the vicinity of aspen communities at Elk Flat.

Conifer Amount Felled or Girdled (percentage)	Biomass of Felled or Girdled Trees (tons/acre)	Optimum Range of CWD (tons/acre)	Comparison Result (Biomass Felled vs. Optimum Range)
Stand 6880281 (basal area = 132 ft² per acre; total fuel biomass = 115 tons/acre)			
25%	15.5	10-30	Within the range
50%	31.0	10-30	Just above the range
75%	46.6	10-30	Above the range
100%	62.2	10-30	Well above the range
Stand 6950788 (basal area = 283 ft² per acre; total fuel biomass = 105 tons/acre)			
25%	23.4	10-30	Within the range
50%	46.8	10-30	Above the range
75%	70.3	10-30	Well above the range
100%	93.7	10-30	Well above the range

Sources/Notes: based on two Walla Walla stand examinations extracted from the FSVEg database. The biomass amounts (second column) pertain to standing dead or live wood greater than 3 inches in diameter, as reported in the “All Fuels Report” from the Fire and Fuels Extension to the Forest Vegetation Simulator (Reinhardt and Crookston 2003). The optimum range of coarse woody debris (CWD) is derived from Brown et al. (2003; see figure 2b for cool forest types on page 7 in that source). The “total fuel biomass” figure reported for each analysis stand reflects all fuel biomass, including both the standing wood and surface fuel components.

Charlie Johnson provided at least three reasons for why an RNA designation might be inappropriate for Elk Flat (enclosure 1). Charlie’s reasons involve biological or ecological concerns only; none of his reasons relate directly to whether or not the RNA standards and guidelines from the Forest Plan (management area D2, specifically) are compatible with aspen restoration.

The timber standards for RNAs state that “timber management use and practices are excluded. Cutting and removal of vegetation is prohibited, except as part of an approved scientific investigation. Firewood cutting is not permitted” (USDA Forest Service 1990, page 4-176).

In the absence of an approved research project with a study plan allowing or requiring vegetation manipulation, I believe the RNA timber standards will significantly constrain the active management alternatives you could consider for restoring and then sustaining the Elk Flat aspen communities. My opinion is that the RNA fuels standards constrain aspen restoration options to a similar extent as the timber standards.

I recommend you amend the Forest Plan so it allocates the Elk Flat aspen communities to something other than an RNA (D2) designation. If this happens, I hope you select a replacement allocation permitting a wider range of aspen restoration alternatives than is currently available.

COMMENTS ABOUT ELK FLAT HISTORY

Not only is Elk Flat considered to have special significance as perhaps the largest aspen stand in the Blue Mountains, but a review of historical references indicates that it might always have been that way (also see enclosure 6 for historical mapping sources pertaining to Elk Flat).

The Elk Flat area was administered by the Wenaha National Forest, headquartered in Walla Walla, until November of 1920 when the Wenaha and Umatilla National Forests were combined into the present Umatilla National Forest.

When George A. Bright completed an extensive reconnaissance of the Wenaha National Forest in 1913, he included a photograph of the Elk Flat meadow and its associated aspen communities (Bright 1914). The plate and caption from Bright's report is reproduced on the next page (Bright and Powell 1994).

It is interesting that close scrutiny of Unser's 1913 photograph could suggest that clonal vigor was higher in 1913 than it is now: note that the middleground clone on the right side is relatively dense, has very little obvious conifer invasion, and has many aspen stems with what appear to be relatively dense crowns having normal shapes and long crown ratios of 50 percent or more.

Also in the 1913 image, note the presence of pointed conifer crowns in the far background portion, indicating that aspen was occurring as a meadow fringe type in this particular locality (as is the case today), that the fringe-type aspen seemed to have high vigor (as based on its crown characteristics), and that there appeared to be a relatively high amount of size-class diversity because intermediate-size aspen trees are obvious in this portion of the photograph.

I took a photograph in September 2001 from approximately the same location as Unser's image in 1913 (fig. 12). Differences between the 1913 and 2001 photographs are apparent:

1. The small grove of mature aspen in the foreground of Unser's image are now gone.
2. Most of the middleground aspen now seem to be mature and had been defoliated by satin moth as of 2001 (although the small area of aspen regeneration in this portion of the image was not defoliated).
3. Conifers seem to be closer to the meadow edge in 2001 than they were in 1913.



“Plate 21: Elk Flat. A typical meadow in Sec. 5, T. 5 N., R. 41 E., W. M. Note the large size and abundance of quaking aspen” (photograph taken by M.N. Unser in 1913; quoted portion is taken verbatim from Bright’s report).



Figure 12: Contemporary photograph that apparently provides a similar perspective as Unser’s 1913 photograph (taken by Powell, September 2001). Note how the mature aspen stems in the foreground of Unser’s image are now gone; that most of the middleground aspen are now mature (as would be expected after 80 years for a short-lived tree species such as quaking aspen – refer to fig. 13); that much of the middleground aspen was defoliated and possibly killed during a recent satin moth outbreak; and that conifers growing behind the aspen appear to be closer to the meadow fringe now than they were in 1913.



Figure 13: Forest health issues associated with quaking aspen. The stems (ramets) of quaking aspen are short-lived, averaging about 80-90 years in the central and southern Rocky Mountains (Perala 1990). Since the longevity of a generation of ramets is typically controlled by the onset of diseases such as stem decay, quaking aspen has often been managed using the concept of a pathological rotation. Several insects affect aspen, ranging from relatively inconsequential ones such as poplar vagabond aphid (*Mordwilkoja vagabunda*; upper left, resulting in this unusual, apple-sized gall on a branch) to poplar borers that often kill mature trees. Defoliating insects such as forest tent caterpillar, large aspen tortrix, and satin moth can be important health issues in aspen forests (fig. 8 shows defoliation caused by satin moth). Aspen is affected by a plethora of diseases, ranging from a variety of stem cankers (sooty-bark canker, ceratocystis canker, hypoxylon canker, and cytospora canker are four important ones) to stem and butt decays. The most common stem decay organism affecting aspen is white trunk rot (*Phellinus tremulae*), which is easily recognized by the distinctive, hoof-shaped conks (upper right). Stem decay present in the lower bole (butt) of aspen trees is often caused by white mottled rot or artist conk (*Ganoderma applanatum*). Animals often damage quaking aspen forests; aspen is a favorite food source for beavers (right), and elk like to feed on the bark during winter (see fig. 9).



The set of paired photographs on page 21 can help us decide whether the aspen clones at Elk Flat are in a deteriorated condition. Five criteria have been used to assess aspen deterioration (Bartos and Campbell 1998, Schier and Campbell 1980), and they can be readily evaluated for the Elk Flat aspen communities:

ASPEN DETERIORATION CRITERIA	RESULT FOR ELK FLAT ASPEN COMMUNITIES
1. Is conifer canopy cover > 25%?	For most of the 50 acres that historically supported aspen at Elk Flat, current conifer canopy cover exceeds 25%.
2. Is aspen canopy cover < 40%?	For most of the 50 acres that historically supported aspen at Elk Flat, current aspen canopy cover is less than 40%.
3. Are dominant aspen trees > 100 years old?	As shown in fig. 7, some of the dominant aspen trees at Elk Flat likely exceed 100 years, although others seem to be less than 100 years; stand age easily exceeds 100 years if my assumption about fire history is correct (see fig. 6).
4. Is density of aspen regeneration (5-15' tall) < 500 trees per acre?	Although some areas of aspen regeneration exist, much of it is hedged to less than 5' tall, and density of aspen regeneration is often less than 500 trees per acre when it occurs.
5. Is aspen mortality occurring at high levels?	Much recent aspen mortality exists in the Elk Flat area, some of which presumably resulted from an intense outbreak of satin moth. Without objective criteria for what qualifies as a "high level," I am uncertain if this level of recent mortality qualifies as high (but suspect it does).

I believe the aspen deterioration criteria described above can provide a basis for establishing a desired future condition for aspen stands in the Elk Flat portion of the Walla Walla Ranger District.

Desired conditions contributing to a sustainable composition and structure for aspen stands include these five characteristics:

1. Conifer canopy cover is less than 25 percent.
2. Aspen canopy cover is greater than 40 percent.
3. Dominant aspen trees are less than 100 years old (less than 80 years is preferable).
4. Density of aspen regeneration (5-15' tall) is greater than 500 trees per acre.
5. Aspen mortality is occurring at no more than moderate levels.

I hope these comments can make a positive contribution to ongoing discussions about options for rejuvenating the Elk Flat aspen communities and sustaining them into the future.

ENCLOSURE 1: CHARLES JOHNSON EMAIL MESSAGE

Charles G Johnson

06/03/00 05:44 PM

To: Edwin V Pugh/R6/USDAFS@FSNOTES, Delanne B Ferguson/R6/USDAFS@FSNOTES, Mary Gibson/R6/USDAFS@FSNOTES, David C Powell/R6/USDAFS@FSNOTES, Randy Dohrmann/R6/USDAFS@FSNOTES, Nancy P Berlier/R6/USDAFS @ FSNOTES, Susan E Beall/R6/USDAFS@FSNOTES, Craig R Busskohl/R6/USDAFS@FSNOTES

cc: Angelica G Johnson/R6/USDAFS@FSNOTES, Jeff D Blackwood/R6/USDAFS@FSNOTES, Sarah Greene/PNW/USDAFS@ FSNOTES

Subject:

Hi everybody – I reflected on questions posed to me about the successional status of the aspen at Elk Flats as I drove home. I frankly give better answers on reflection instead of instantaneously after a question is posed. So hopefully you will accept this response as a better one than that which I gave in the field.

The aspen at Elk Flats meadow is ecotonal (transitional) between forest and wetland (meadow) ecosystems. All ecotones are “tension zones” where plants are in ecological transition between the neighboring plant communities. So we can speculate that the aspen here once was more extensive (connected) and was not being overtaken by the forest as it now is. The aspen is not seral to forest here – nor is it a part of the sedge-grass meadow community. It is unto itself as an ecotonal community. When a disturbance or a set of climatic conditions give it a nudge – it may respond with increased vigor – or conversely – be further deteriorated toward loss from the site.

I was happy with the group’s decision. I was not very pleased with what I saw on the ground. I was arriving with a 15-year old memory of how it once appeared. Some of the memory was weak and I’d glamorized the setting over time! I believe what we want for an RNA is an area that is about 300-500 acres (minimum) and encompasses aspen that is not ecotonal, not successional to a forest plant association, and which provides a balanced age/structure in the clones within the “area”. I will seek, with other helpers, potential RNAs which contain aspen as part of the southern Blue-Ochoco sage-grass ecosystem, as part of the northern Blue-Wallowas shrub-grassland ecosystem, and hopefully a place where aspen is part of a forested ecosystem and can be maintained by disturbances which have allowed it to persist.

I think Mary may have suggested the key to the Elk Flats aspen. It makes sense to me to manage this small area to retain and re-invigorate the clones. This could then carry a “special interest area” designation. I support that concept rather than to “force” the RNA designation.

I’d like to acknowledge that the group was well prepared for the discussions we had. I was singularly impressed with the “new” Ranger. Mary not only had been provided with good staff work but had a total grasp of the situation and delivered. I’ve seen a lot of Rangers defer to staff help to be the deliverers. I think its the job of the Ranger to make the suggestions and then be timely with presentation of viewpoints and finally with the decision. You did that Mary – and you did it well. I look forward to our next interaction. I’m off to Mill Creek.... Charlie

Charles G. Johnson Jr.
Plant Ecologist
Malheur, Umatilla and Wallowa-Whitman N.F.
charlesjohnson@fs.fed.us
541-523-1362

ENCLOSURE 2: ELIZABETH CROWE STAND REVIEW

Cottonwood and Aspen Stand Review Walla Walla Ranger District

Elizabeth A. Crowe
October 26, 1998

On September 14 and 15, 1998 Pattie Bosch and I visited numerous black cottonwood (*Populus trichocarpa*) and quaking aspen (*Populus tremuloides*) stands on the Walla Walla Ranger District to examine and discuss concerns about the stands including: the possibility for regeneration of black cottonwood stands, the low rate of survival of black cottonwood rooted cuttings that had been planted on known or suspected black cottonwood sites, and possible stand treatments to encourage regeneration and vigor of aspen stands that have not yet been treated. Attached is a chapter from Biology of Populus (Stettler and others, 1996) on the life history, ecology and conservation of cottonwoods that contains good information on how cottonwood stands are initiated and populations perpetuated.

The cottonwood stands generally occurred in three different environmental settings and conclusions about them were based on these settings and current stand development.

1. On Phillips Creek there was some concern about cottonwood regeneration along a stream reach within a historic clearcut. We looked at the stream channel itself which has a moderate gradient and a gravel-cobble bed substrate and the tendency to form some overflow channels. This is a stream system on which I would expect to see some regeneration of cottonwood so long as there is adequate sunlight for germination and growth of seedlings. The regeneration we saw looked very vigorous and quite abundant given the extent of establishment sites along the creek.
2. In the headwaters of Sheep Creek we looked at a site within a buck-and-pole enclosure that had been planted with cottonwood cuttings. There was very little survival of these cuttings, probably because of the prolonged soil saturation on the site through the growing season. Although cottonwood roots are adapted to standing in water during the normal spring flooding period, the root systems are not adapted for poorly aerated and wet soil conditions throughout the growing season. On sites where cottonwood usually establishes, the substrate is generally coarse textured (a mix of coarse sand, gravel and/or cobble), and allows for aeration of the roots as spring floodwaters recede. The soil on this site appears to be fairly fine-textured and would hold a lot of water even after snowmelt and spring rains are finished. Although there are a couple of older cottonwood trees growing in a couple of sites up the drainage from this enclosure, they appear to have become established during a geomorphic event that either scoured or deposited material on microsites allowing for the establishment of some cottonwood seedlings. Without another event of this nature, it is unlikely that there will be a self-perpetuating population of cottonwood in this headwater area.
3. In the upper reaches of a tributary to Proctor Creek are extended stringers of black cottonwood stands that have little regeneration. Most of the younger aboveground stems appear to be suckers from the root systems of older trees and are heavily browsed. Stream channels associated with these sites are interrupted and intermittent or non-existent. I believe that these stringer stands were established after a large fluvial geomorphic event occurred in these drainages that deposited a lot of sediment through overland flow and that cottonwood seeds subsequently colo-

ENCLOSURE 2: ELIZABETH CROWE STAND REVIEW

nized the site. There doesn't appear to be any regular flooding or disturbance in this small stream system that would perpetuate the establishment of new stands. New stand establishment is necessary for the population to be sustained without human intervention. I don't think that suckers from the roots of older trees will sustain the population indefinitely, especially as conifers become more abundant on the site and shade the cottonwoods.

The two aspen sites that we looked at were:

1. The "above the road site" in which the stand appears to be expanding down the slope away from its point of origin and has a great deal of shrub cover, primarily common chokecherry (*Prunus virginiana*) and Sitka alder (*Alnus sitchensis*). The aspen trees may be stressed not only by competition from the shrubs but also by being "forced" to the lower part of the slope which is drier than the upper part. The recommendation here is to remove some of the shrub competition through fire and/or cutting to try to increase aspen regeneration in this stand. POTR-018
2. The other site we visited was Elk Flats which has the largest extended collection of aspen stands I've seen on National Forest land in the Blue Mountains. The survival of this population does not appear to be in jeopardy, but if the District decides to increase successful regeneration from the clones, fencing would seem to be a good option. There is a lot of suckering from the stands that we examined, but the suckers are being heavily browsed by ungulates. POTR-001

References

Stettler, R.F., Bradshaw, H.D., Jr., Heilman, P.E., and Hinckley, T.M. 1996. Biology of *Populus* and its Implications for Management and Conservation. NRC Research Press, Ottawa, Canada. 539 p.

ENCLOSURE 3: 1992 ASPEN VIABILITY REVIEW



United States
Department of
Agriculture

Forest
Service

Forestry and Range
Sciences Laboratory

1401 Gekeler Lane
La Grande, OR 97850
(503) 963-7122

Reply To: 3420

Date: July 13, 1992

Subject: Aspen Viability, Umatilla NF

To: District Ranger, Walla Walla RD

On June 25, I met with Leona Brown and Christina Bauman to assess health of a number of aspen (*Populus tremuloides*) clones around the District, as well as a single stand containing Northwest paper birch (*Betula papyrifera* var: *subcordata*). This memo will report on the aspen condition. Most stands visited were in the northeast portion of the District.

Aspen communities in the northern Blue Mountains are relatively common but are usually quite small; possibly prior to the changes which have occurred this last 100 years, aspen was more common and consisted of larger stands. Aspen is almost always found associated with seeps, riparian, and other wet sites where subsurface moisture is available throughout most of the growing season. There is a wide-range of viability of these specific communities. Many seem to be relatively healthy, while others are dying with little or no regeneration becoming established. The sites that we visited on the Walla Walla RD were in comparatively good condition, although regeneration was marginal in one area.

Silviculture of aspen in the Blue Mountains has not received much attention. For the most part this is because aspen is rarely, if ever, managed as commercial timber in this area. Most knowledge of aspen silvics and stand silviculture comes from the Lake States and the central and southern Rocky Mountains.

Judging from the very limited microsites that currently support aspen in the Blue Mountains, it is probable that any significant disturbance which alters the site will have a potentially detrimental impact on the trees. In areas where aspen occupies a wider range of sites we would expect much more resiliency. The suppression of natural fire in the Blue Mountains in the last century probably has probably adversely affected aspen viability. Grazing by sheep and cattle and browsing by elk certainly also caused a substantial impact during this last century. The following specific factors need to be considered in aspen management:

1. While aspen is intolerant of fire, burning does simulate sucker production; thus while a burn may kill residual trees in a clone, sucker production will give rise to a new stand of stems. Light burning is known to reduce competition, especially from conifer ingrowth. Fire is especially valuable in rejuvenating deteriorating stands.
2. Aspen occurrence is closely related to the moisture regime of the site. Management activities which alter the water table or availability of water will affect clone health. Increased stocking of conifers in and adjacent to aspen clones probably contributes to decreased availability of moisture. This is a direct result of fire suppression.

ENCLOSURE 3: 1992 ASPEN VIABILITY REVIEW

3. Aspen is a relatively short-lived tree, although individual clones which are maintained as biomass below-ground may survive for thousands of years. As stands of stems die, regeneration, in the form of suckers, must become established for the clone to survive. Grazing, suppression by conifer ingrowth, lack of disturbance, etc. may hinder sucker development and survival.
4. In the Blue Mountains, aspen is considered site permanent, while in other parts of its range it plays an early successional role and is transient with the absence of disturbance.
5. Cutting is known to promote the production of suckers, especially when used with fire. To be effective, cutting needs to be heavy.
6. Introduction of cattle and sheep into the system, as well as the building of large elk herds, has had considerable impact on clone viability, especially with regard to sucker survival. Protection of certain sites by excluding animals may be needed. It may even be possible to protect established/reestablished aspen on wet sites by fencing.

Pests and Pest-Caused Damage

Aspen is prone to a variety of insect-caused damage, and canker and decay diseases. Considerable differences in susceptibility is observed between clones with some of these pests. Although we didn't see evidence of aspen trunk rot, caused by *Phellinus tremulae*, on this trip, I have seen this stem decay in other locations in the Blue Mountains. I'm sure it occurs on the Walla Walla District.

Ink spot, caused by *Ciborinia whetzellii*, is a leaf disease of aspen that was found at one of the visited sites. A low level of infection was seen; this disease being annual and dependent upon spring temperature and moisture for level of severity. During years of severe infection, trees will lose affected leaves prematurely.

Shepherd's crook, caused by *Pollaccia radiosa*, was also seen at at least one site. This disease causes a leaf and shoot blight that usually kills or deforms the terminal growth.

Aspen leaf rust, *Melampsora medusae*, was seen at at least one stop. This rust alternates between aspen and various conifer hosts. Damage to aspen is infrequent and only occurs when unusually severe infection occurs. Leaves may prematurely drop.

Some unidentified cankers were found that were predisposing trees to windbreak and decay in one area.

Insect pests are quite common on aspen. Some leaf-roll damage was seen. While not found on this trip, we have confirmed Mourningcloak butterfly (*Nymphalis antiopa*) infestation in some Blue Mountain aspen this year. Infestations result in rapid defoliation which can kill trees.

Recommendations

While pests of aspen are affecting some trees, not all impacts are detrimental. Cavity-nesting birds use aspen with stem decay. In relative terms, the majority of the aspen stands I'm familiar with in the Blue Mountains are healthy from an insect and disease perspective. Of more signifi-

ENCLOSURE 3: 1992 ASPEN VIABILITY REVIEW

cant concern is the lack of regeneration in some stands, sometimes coupled with advanced degradation of the mature aspen on the site. We have largely ignored aspen communities in the past; use of silvicultural treatments including cutting and/or fire and protection from grazing, should be initiated and monitored so we will know what treatments work best in this region for maintaining and rejuvenating these valuable stands.

Several options should be investigated for managing stands/sites in need of treatment. Conifer ingrowth should be removed in most situations. On most sites conifers are young, indicating they are invaders, probably due to lack of recent fire activity. These conifers should be completely thinned out. Where aspen regeneration is lacking, light fire should be used to simulate sucker sprouting and fencing done to exclude grazing/browsing animals. Excess fuels need to be removed from around trees to be saved. Declining trees could purposely be killed by fuel placement. In stands in need of complete rejuvenation, a combination of clearcutting and light fire should provide maximum sprouting. Cutting of aspen over a large area should be avoided since in some communities it's been shown to allow the water table to excessively rise, retarding regeneration.

While I've taken a shot at some silviculture options; Dave Powell, Forest Silviculturist, should be consulted prior to any planning/action. He has extensive experience in aspen ecology and silviculture from his tenure in Region 2.

Craig Schmitt
Zone Pathologist

cc: Leona Brown, Walla Walla RD
Dave Powell, UMA
Charlie Johnson, WAW
Don Scott
Bruce Kaufman, WAW

ENCLOSURE 4: 1999 INSECT AND DISEASE EVALUATION



United States
Department of
Agriculture

Forest
Service

Blue Mountains Pest
Management Service Center
Wallowa-Whitman NF

1401 Gekeler Lane
La Grande, OR 97850-3456
(541) 963-7122

Reply To: 3420

Date: October 4, 1999

Subject: Technical Assistance: Elk Flat Aspen, Walla Walla RD, Umatilla NF

To: District Ranger, Walla Walla RD

On September 30, 1999, we visited the District to review insects, diseases, and general conditions in the large aspen community adjacent to Elk Flats, which is about 4 miles northeast of Lookout Mountain, west of the 62 Road. There were preliminary reports of defoliation and excessive mortality of aspen in this area. Aspen are common over several hundred acres in and adjacent to the meadows and seasonal stream courses near Elk Flats. We walked through a representative portion of this community to determine the condition of the vegetation as well as the various biotic disturbance agents and their incidence.

Aspen older than 80 years usually hosts ever-increased levels of insect and disease incidence and associated mortality. While there are differences between the longevity of clones, a variety of factors contribute to the life span of stems. Biotic mortality-causing agents most often are canker diseases, wood borers, stem decays, and root diseases. Aspen communities in the Blue Mountains host seemingly high levels of these assorted insects, diseases, and their related activities.

Community conditions and disturbance activity

Judging from the different habits, phenology, etc., there are an abundance of different clones, most of which are fairly small, which comprise this entire aspen community. While most of the stems are mature, there are some smaller 1 to 4" diameter stems, usually in even-age groups. While we did not bore any individuals to determine age, several trees scarred with carved dates indicate that larger/older individuals date to the 1800's. Scattered mortality to individual stems has been occurring for a long time. There are standing as well as dead/down aspen stems throughout this area. There is no evidence of any cultural work done in any of the portions of this community that we visited. The last fire was likely in the 1800's, as there is no evidence of fire scars on residual trees.

Epidemic defoliation by satin moth (*Leucoma salicis*) was observed throughout this area. Various clones, and to a lesser degree, individuals within clones had dramatically different degrees of defoliation; ranging in loss of foliage from none to complete, and everything in between. At the time of our visit, first instar larvae were seen on foliage and bark where they were preparing to overwinter. While there was some feeding by this current generation, nearly all of the 1999 foliage damage had been done earlier this season by the previous generation of larvae. We also observed rather abundant braconid wasp cocoons (probably *Apanteles solitarius*, which is a particularly effective biological control for satin moth), which indicate an active population of parasites. These insects will likely control the population of the satin moth within the next several years. We do not know how long this outbreak has been occurring, but the number of braconids indicate that they have had an ample supply of hosts (satin moth larvae) for awhile.

ENCLOSURE 4: 1999 INSECT AND DISEASE EVALUATION

The satin moth is a foreign insect that was introduced into the United States and Canada in the early 1900's from Europe. It has one generation per year. The adult moth flies in July and deposits its eggs in flattened oval masses, covered with a white satiny secretion, on the boles of host trees and various other objects. The larval stage feeds on both poplars and willows. In the Blue Mountains, certain locations or clones of our quaking aspen resource are periodically partially, or completely, defoliated by the larval feeding. The young larvae that hatch from egg masses feed for a short time on aspen leaves, then spin silken hibernacula in bark crevices where they pass the winter. With spring leafing-out of aspen, the larvae become active and continue to feed, and cause essentially the bulk of defoliation during this spring and early summer feeding period, eventually reaching maturity and pupating in June. They pupate in loosely woven cocoons attached to leaves, twigs, or other objects.

Satin moth populations are largely brought in check by a combination of introduced and native parasitoids that build up in the population over the course of a few years. Although some trees in the Elk Flats clone were completely defoliated this season, they will most likely survive and re-foliate next year. While tree mortality can occur when high populations severely damage trees in new, outlying areas for several years in a row, we have not seen examples of this level of damage in the Blue Mountains. Natural enemies typically bring about the collapse of outbreaks, and maintain populations in check for a period of years. Satin moth infestations develop periodically in most of our aspen stands, but are usually soon brought into check and regulated by these parasitoids.

A rather high proportion of stems in most clones had white trunk rot, as indicated by *Phellinus tremulae* conks on boles of infected trees. Affected trees will have a soft white stem decay throughout most of the length of the bole. Such trees are often excavated by cavity nesters and serve as wildlife trees. Additionally, excavation by birds weakens the stem and such trees often break mid-bole. Since decayed, broken and dead and down trees contribute to stand diversity and provide for wildlife habitat, such disease activity is desirable at endemic levels and should be encouraged.

Blue Mountain aspen frequently has a rather high incidence of various stem cankers caused by several different pathogens. These often eventually result in girdling of the stem, killing the top and causing stem breakage. While some cankering was observed at Elk Flat, the incidence was considered relatively low.

Root diseases increase in severity as stems become older. Shoestring root rot, caused by *Armillaria mellea*, was suspected as causing some of the mortality in this area. Dead and down trees with signs of *Armillaria* infection, especially emerging honey mushrooms in the fall of the year, are good indicators of infection. Older aspen generally have a rather high incidence of root disease, and the level observed here at Elk Flats was not excessive.

Most of the aspen mortality in the Elk Flat area was believed due to the bronze poplar borer (*Agrilus granulatus liragus*). These insects prefer overmature individuals, stems weakened by site or other biotic factors (including stem decay). Borers will mine the cambium, causing girdling and death of large branches, or the entire crown; thus the tree. Most of the dead stems had cambium killed by galleries of the bronze poplar borer that had been etched into the sapwood. Mor-

ENCLOSURE 4: 1999 INSECT AND DISEASE EVALUATION

tality levels are probably slowly increasing as the age of stems in this community continues to increase. There does not appear to be any dramatic recent increase in tree mortality.

Discussion on community health and future management

We are unsure of the history of the satin moth epidemic in this community. We have seen very little similar activity this year in other aspen communities in the Blue Mountains, although satin moth hot-spots were noted in several other areas in 1997 and 1998. Although this is a non-native insect, natural parasites have become established and are present in this stand. Hopefully this outbreak will end in the next year or two. Damage is mostly temporary, although continually weakened trees will host other opportunistic agents such as wood borers, which readily cause mortality. We do not believe that much of this type of damage has yet happened in this community.

Healthy aspen communities have full diversity in age classes of stems. Disturbance associated with fire and removal/or death of old overstory is often needed to allow abundant suckering. This community is probably somewhat deficient in recruitment of younger age classes of stems. Sprouting was abundant in many areas, but browsing damage has been rather heavy. Fencing or other methods of protecting sprout development might be considered and well suited for this site.

If there are any questions regarding this evaluation, please contact either of us.

Craig L. Schmitt
Service Center Pathologist

Donald W. Scott
Service Center Entomologist

cc: Bill Collar, Walla Walla RD
Dave Powell, Umatilla NF
Suzanne Rainville, Wallowa-Whitman NF
Vicki Erickson, Umatilla NF
Jane Hayes, PNW La Grande
Don Scott
Craig Schmitt

ENCLOSURE 5: 2003 INSECT AND DISEASE EVALUATION



United States
Department of
Agriculture

Forest
Service

Blue Mountains Pest
Management Service Center
Wallowa-Whitman NF

1401 Gekeler Lane
La Grande, OR 97850-3456
(541) 963-7122

File Code: 3420

Date: December 29, 2003

Route To: Silviculture

Subject: Elk Flat Aspen Technical Assistance

To: District Ranger, Walla Walla RD, Umatilla NF

September 30 I visited Elk Flat with Bill Collar to evaluate the health of the aspen clones there. Over the past 13 years both Craig Schmitt and Don Scott with the Pest Management Service Center have reviewed the Elk Flat aspen but this was my first visit. The most recent visit by Craig and Don was in September 1999 and is documented in a technical assistance letter dated October 4, 1999. During this visit epidemic defoliation by the satin moth (*Leucoma salicis*) was observed throughout this area. My visit was prompted by concern from several district folks that the aspen were declining much more quickly now than in years past. This area of aspen is one of the largest in the Blue Mountains and contains the largest clone in the Blue Mountains. There is widespread concern for these aspen due to their contributions to vegetative diversity and their importance to wildlife.

We walked through various pure aspen clones, noting damage and mortality, and we also walked through stands that included mixed conifers with scattered aspen and aspen clumps present. There were pure aspen clones of various sizes. There were some areas with thick aspen regeneration about 3-4 feet tall. One stand comprised trees no taller than 15 feet, another was uniformly 10" diameter trees, and there were stands with mature trees of various sizes, including a few over 25" diameter. The mixed species stands were comprised of mainly lodgepole pine, Engelmann spruce, grand fir, aspen, and a few cottonwoods. The species in these mixed stands were very similar in size and both stumps and large trees were lacking. Although we have no information on tree age, it appeared that much of the stand had originated at about the same time. Much of the area with aspen was obviously very wet periodically, with mudflats and very deep hoof tracks dried in the mud.

Throughout the Elk Flat area there was evidence of damage from several insect and disease agents. We found evidence of some leaf feeding earlier in the summer, presumably by satin moth. There were also Cytospora cankers, sooty bark cankers (*Encoelia pruinosa*), and white trunk rot (*Phellinus tremulae*) on several dead, dying, and apparently healthy trees. Aspen are frequently host to many insects and diseases but if stands are kept vigorous by repeated recruitment of young trees into the overstory, aspen stands can be maintained. While no agent appeared of primary importance, dead and dying mature aspen were evident throughout. These various agents along with the past several years of drought and continuing conifer encroachment into these stands are all combining to stress the aspen trees in this stand. Because no single biological agent is responsible for this widespread decline, I recommend removing the conifer competition throughout this area to increase the vigor of the aspen.

ENCLOSURE 5: 2003 INSECT AND DISEASE EVALUATION

I found very little evidence of current satin moth damage in any of the trees. The time of the visit should have coincided with the presence of first instar larvae. Yet we found no larvae on foliage or bark. The first instars skeletonize leaves. This damage is visible as gaps in the green, upper layers of the leaves. These gaps appear as holes in the leaves but on close examination the lower leaf layer remains as a thin, transparent layer along with the leaf veins. Some of the leaves had begun to fall and we found very little evidence of feeding on the leaves on the ground. Some of the leaves had some earlier feeding damage, but it was restricted to ¼ or 1/3 of any given leaf. Trees that still retained most of their leaves showed no evidence of defoliation earlier in the season. Leaves appeared full-sized and crowns were not thin.

Satin moth is known to cause top-kill and mortality after repeated severe infestations. Many of the overstory trees had clumpy or lollipop-like foliage, almost like a brooming effect where the leaves in the canopy appeared to originate from one area. One of these trees so affected had recently fallen down. An examination of the broomed area yielded few clues. There was a slight swelling on the branch, no insect feeding damage either on the foliage or the branches and bole. While not precisely the type of damage recorded from previous satin moth infestation, we tentatively have attributed this branch brooming to chronic satin moth defoliation in years past.

Satin moth is an exotic insect introduced into the United States and Canada in the early 1900's from Europe. The larval stage feeds on native and planted poplars and willows during the early summer and fall. Many areas are periodically partially or completely defoliated. Several parasitic insects have been introduced to control the satin moth and frequently contribute to population collapses. Although top-kill and mortality can result from repeated infestations, this has not been known to happen in the Blue Mountains. This insect continues to expand its range into eastern British Columbia and now regularly defoliates native aspen communities when earlier it was only known on park, shade, and windbreak trees.

Many living trees with no symptoms, and dead trees, had cankers, probably *Cytospora*, on their main stems. Frequently, obvious canker margins running vertically up the bole for several feet could be seen discoloring the bark a reddish brown. Some cankers covered nearly 50% of the circumference of the bole. *Cytospora* is an opportunistic pathogen, attacking plants predisposed to infection by stressors such as flooding, drought, or other pathogens. This fungus overwinters in cankered bark and spreads via spores dispersed by wind, rain, insects, or birds. Infection occurs only through bark wounds, dead tips, or branch stubs. Because it is opportunistic, it has probably increased in this stand following the past several drought years.

Sooty bark canker and *Phellinus* decay are scattered throughout this stand, although not at alarming levels. These are common diseases of aspen, becoming more prevalent in older trees (>60 yrs). Sooty bark canker is probably responsible for some of the mortality here, while *Phellinus* is responsible for much of the aspen breakage. Infection occurs through wounds and it is generally believed that older trees are more susceptible.

Trees smaller than 5 inches in diameter had no evidence of insects or diseases yet. However, the larger trees showed quite a lot of damage from antler rubbing. These wounds provide infection sites for cankers and decay and if the wounding continues it can cause girdling. Action to protect some of these younger trees should be taken before they are lost to wildlife damage. Much of the 3-5 foot tall regeneration showed very little browsing damage. Current losses in the younger as-

ENCLOSURE 5: 2003 INSECT AND DISEASE EVALUATION

pen age classes are very small and these replacement trees look good.

However, there was quite a bit of mortality in trees around 10" dbh. Some of these trees had visible cankers, a few trees had some insect borer activity. This mortality did not occur as a patch of contiguous trees, but rather as individual trees in this mature size class, scattered throughout several stands. In many of these stands, the dying trees were nearly the largest trees in the stands. The lack of larger trees or stumps here suggests larger trees have not occupied this site in any numbers for some time.

As no single factor could be implicated in the deaths of these overstory trees, a combination of factors is probably responsible. The Blue Mountains have experienced below normal precipitation for the past 5-6 years. In addition, the past few winters have been warmer than average. These weather changes in combination with the conifer competition in these stands are considerable stressors on these aspens. The aspen cankers and decays present here are causing elevated mortality due to the drought and conifer competition. In addition, some of these trees may be dying outright from drought. Removing the conifer competition will allow more moisture for the aspens and should alleviate some of the drought stress. In addition, protecting some of the replacement immatures from antler rubbing and browsing will ensure future stands of aspen in this area.

If you have any questions regarding this evaluation, please contact me.

Lia H. Spiegel
Service Center Entomologist

cc: Su Meredith, Walla Walla RD
Betsy Kaiser, Walla Walla RD
Bill Collar, Walla Walla RD
Bob Rock, WAW
Dave Powell, UMA
Don Scott
Craig Schmitt

ENCLOSURE 6: HISTORICAL MAPPING SOURCES

Early in the 1910s, the District (Regional) Forester issued instructions and an outline for how an extensive reconnaissance was to be completed for national forests in the Pacific Northwest. The extensive reconnaissance process was designed to produce a report, and a map atlas, for every national forest in the District (Region).

The extensive reconnaissance report described both the physical characteristics (topography, climate, minerals, etc.) and the natural resources of a national forest, such as forage, timber, and water resources, and their possibilities for development. An extensive reconnaissance report can be thought of as an historical analogue of our current Forest Plan, although it was not prepared by an interdisciplinary team and it did not include any explicit public participation.

Most of the extensive reconnaissance reports included photographs to illustrate key features of a Forest, depicting scenes of general interest and also showing springs, telephone lines, trails, ranger stations, and other improvements.

One requirement of the reconnaissance process was to prepare a map, which could then help support future development of a national forest. Since the mapping requirement was mandatory, each reconnaissance map was prepared using a consistent legend and color scheme.

Although early examples of range-oriented mapping are common, the most accessible map for the northern half of the Umatilla National Forest has a timber emphasis. This limits our potential use of this early mapping because its classification system is based on timber volume instead of forest type or some other vegetation categorization allowing a more direct comparison of current and historical conditions.

The present-day Umatilla National Forest boundaries were previously contained within three national forests: the Umatilla, Wenaha, and Whitman. The extensive reconnaissance maps were located for all three national forests at the National Archives in College Park, Maryland, and copies were then made and subsequently digitized so that thematic data from the maps would be available in GIS.

Note that the base map data (elevation of known points, names and approximate locations of old ranger stations, locations of homesteads (including homesteader names), names of water-courses, range (livestock) driveways, and other annotations were not digitized.


To provide total coverage for the present-day Umatilla National Forest, a total of 27 hand-colored Atlas Folio sheets, each measuring 18 inches by 21 inches, were copied and digitized (not counting the legends, which were always provided on separate sheets).

The Elk Flat area is clearly depicted as a forested meadow on a 1914 map sheet for the Wenaha National Forest (Kendall 1914). The legend from Kendall's 1914 map, a vicinity portion showing the Elk Flat area, and the entire map sheet containing the Elk Flat vicinity excerpt are provided on the next two pages.


Vicinity maps for the Elk Flat area were also clipped from Wallowa County forest type maps published in 1936 (Buell et al. 1936) and 1957 (Spada et al. 1957), and they are provided after the 1914 map sheet.

General Land Office survey notes were recently analyzed for the Umatilla National Forest. A map is provided after the 1936/1957 vicinity maps showing areas where aspen abundance and size were great enough for surveyors to select it as a bearing tree at section corners or quarter-corners.

ENCLOSURE 6: HISTORICAL MAPPING SOURCES




Legend for an extensive reconnaissance map for the Wenaha National Forest by W.H. Kendall (Kendall 1914). Kendall's map includes 11 folio sheets, each measuring 18 inches by 21 inches. One of the map sheets was the legend shown here; the other ten sheets depict a timber volume classification for the Wenaha National Forest (note that the current Umatilla National Forest ranger districts of Pomeroy and Walla Walla were contained in the Wenaha National Forest prior to November 1920).




Portion of map sheet #5 showing Elk Flat and vicinity. Note that the Elk Flat meadow system is clearly shown on Kendall's 1914 map, and he added tree symbols to the yellow meadow shading to denote that Elk Flat also contained quaking aspen communities (Kendall does not definitively state the species composition of the tree crown squiggles shown on his map, but we know it to be quaking aspen from Bright's reconnaissance report and Unser's photography (Bright 1914)).

ENCLOSURE 6: HISTORICAL MAPPING SOURCES



Map sheet #5 from W.H. Kendall's extensive reconnaissance mapping for the Wenaha National Forest (Kendall 1914). These folio sheets were punched along their edges for use with an atlas system containing sheets for roads and trails, grazing, timber, land ownership, and other features or resources.

ENCLOSURE 6: HISTORICAL MAPPING SOURCES



Quaking aspen distribution as estimated from General Land Office (GLO) surveys completed on the Umatilla National Forest between 1879 and 1887. This map shows that quaking aspen was selected as a bearing tree by GLO land surveyors for several areas on the Heppner and North Fork John Day Ranger Districts, but apparently it was not selected for this purpose on the northern half of the Umatilla National Forest.

Note: GLO survey maps are available for birch, black cottonwood, bitter cherry, and a total of 18 tree species; they will be added to the Forest's Historic Documents website in the near future.

ASPEN REFERENCES AND LITERATURE CITED

- Alban, D.H. 1982.** Effects of nutrient accumulation by aspen, spruce, and pine on soil properties. *Soil Science Society of America Journal*. 46: 853-861.
- Alban, D.H. 1985.** Volume comparison of pine, spruce, and aspen growing side by side. Res. Note NC-327. St. Paul, MN: USDA Forest Service, North Central Forest Experiment Station. 6 p.
- Alban, D.H.; Perala, D.A.; Schlaegel, B.E. 1978.** Biomass and nutrient distribution in aspen, pine, and spruce stands on the same soil type in Minnesota. *Canadian Journal of Forest Research*. 8(3): 290-299.
- Anderson, G.W.; Anderson, R.L. 1968.** Relationship between density of quaking aspen and incidence of hypoxylon canker. *Forest Science*. 14(1): 107-112.
- Baker, F.S. 1918.** Aspen reproduction in relation to management. *Journal of Forestry*. 16(4): 389-398.
- Baker, F.S. 1921.** Two races of aspen. *Journal of Forestry*. 19(4): 412-413.
- Baker, F.S. 1925.** Aspen in the central Rocky Mountain region. Bulletin No. 1291. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Agriculture. 46 p.
- Baker, W.L.; Munroe, J.A.; Hessel, A.E. 1997.** The effects of elk on aspen in the winter range in Rocky Mountain National Park. *Ecography*. 20(2): 155-165.
- Barnes, B.V. 1966.** The clonal growth habit of American aspens. *Ecology*. 47(3): 439-447.
- Barnes, B.V. 1975.** Phenotypic variation of trembling aspen in western North America. *Forest Science*. 21(3): 319-328.
- Barnett, D.T.; Stohlgren, T.J. 2001.** Aspen persistence near the national elk refuge and Gros Ventre Valley elk feedgrounds of Wyoming, USA. *Landscape Ecology*. 16: 569-580.
- Bartos, D.L.; Amacher, M.C. 1998.** Soil properties associated with aspen to conifer succession. *Rangelands*. 20(1): 25-28.
- Bartos, D.L.; Brown, J.K.; Booth, G.D. 1994.** Twelve years biomass response in aspen communities following fire. *Journal of Range Management*. 47(1): 79-83.
- Bartos, D.L.; Campbell, R.B., Jr. 1998.** Decline of quaking aspen in the interior West – examples from Utah. *Rangelands*. 20(1): 17-24.
- Bartos, D.L.; Campbell, R.B., Jr. 1998.** Water depletion and other ecosystem values forfeited when conifer forests displace aspen communities. In: Potts, D.F., ed. *Proceedings of the AWRA Specialty Conference, Rangeland Management and Water Resources*. TPS-98-1. Herndon, VA: American Water Resources Association: 427-434.
- Bartos, D.L.; DeByle, N.V. 1981.** Quantity, decomposition, and nutrient dynamics of aspen litterfall in Utah. *Forest Science*. 27(2): 381-390.
- Bartos, D.L.; Lester, J.E. 1984.** Effects of 2,4-D on a *Populus tremuloides* community in the western United States—22 years after treatment. *Great Basin Naturalist*. 44(3): 459-467.
- Bartos, D.L.; Mueggler, W.F. 1981.** Early succession in aspen communities following fire in western Wyoming. *Journal of Range Management*. 34(4): 315-318.
- Bartos, D.L.; Mueggler, W.F. 1982.** Early succession following clearcutting of aspen communities in northern Utah. *Journal of Range Management*. 35(6): 764-768.
- Bartos, D.L.; Mueggler, W.F.; Campbell, R.B., Jr. 1991.** Regeneration of aspen by suckering on

- burned sites in western Wyoming. Res. Pap. INT-448. Ogden, UT: USDA Forest Service, Intermountain Research Station. 10 p.
- Bartos, D.L.; Ward, F.R.; Innis, G.S. 1983.** Aspen succession in the intermountain west: a deterministic model. Gen. Tech. Rep. INT-153. Ogden, UT: USDA Forest Service, Intermountain Forest and Range Experiment Station. 60 p.
- Basile, J.V. 1979.** Elk-aspen relationships on a prescribed burn. Res. Note INT-271. Ogden, UT: USDA Forest Service, Intermountain Forest and Range Experiment Station. 7 p.
- Bates, P.C.; Blinn, C.R.; Alm, A.A. 1993.** Harvesting impacts on quaking aspen regeneration in northern Minnesota. Canadian Journal of Forest Research. 23(11): 2403-2412.
- Beck, J.L.; Flinders, J.T.; Nelson, D.R.; Clyde, C.L.; Smith, H.D.; Hardin, P.J. 1996.** Elk and domestic sheep interactions in a north-central Utah aspen ecosystem. Res. Pap. INT-RP-491. Ogden, UT: USDA Forest Service, Intermountain Research Station. 114 p.
- Benson, M.K.; Schwabach, D.E. 1970.** Techniques for rooting aspen root sprouts. Tree Planters' Notes. 21(3): 12-14.
- Bergen, K.M.; Dronova, I. 2007.** Observing succession on aspen-dominated landscapes using a remote sensing-ecosystem approach. Landscape Ecology. 22(9): 1395-1410.
- Bettters, D.R.; Woods, R.F. 1981.** Uneven-aged stand structure and growth of Rocky Mountain aspen. Journal of Forestry. 79(10): 673-676.
- Blackwood, J.D. 2003 (September 5).** Guidance for implementing Eastside Screens; file designation 2430/2600 memorandum to S.O. Staff and District Rangers. Pendleton, OR: USDA Forest Service, Umatilla National Forest, Supervisor's Office. 7 p.
http://fsweb.f14.r6.fs.fed.us/nr/silv/pdf/SO_Screens_Memo_090503.pdf
- Bourdeau, P.F. 1958.** Photosynthetic and respiratory rates in leaves of male and female quaking aspens. Forest Science. 4(4): 331-334.
- Bradley, K.L.; Hancock, J.E.; Giardina, C.P.; Pregitzer, K.S. 2007.** Soil microbial community responses to altered lignin biosynthesis in *Populus tremuloides* vary among three distinct soils. Plant and Soil. 294(1-2): 185-201.
- Brandt, J.P.; Cerezke, H.F.; Mallett, K.I.; Volney, W.J.A.; Weber, J.D. 2003.** Factors affecting trembling aspen (*Populus tremuloides* Michx.) health in the boreal forest of Alberta, Saskatchewan, and Manitoba, Canada. Forest Ecology and Management. 178(3): 287-300.
- Bright, G.A. 1914.** The extensive reconnaissance report of the Wenaha National Forest. Unpublished Typescript Report. [Place of Publication Unknown]: USDA Forest Service. 84 p (plus map).
- Bright, G.A.; Powell, D.C. 1994.** An extensive reconnaissance of the Wenaha National Forest in 1913. F14-SO-08-94. Pendleton, OR: USDA Forest Service, Pacific Northwest Region, Umatilla National Forest. 56 p. <http://www.fs.fed.us/r6/uma/publications/history/wenaharpt.pdf>
- Brinkman, K.A.; Roe, E.I. 1975.** Quaking aspen: silvics and management in the Lake States. Agriculture Handbook No. 486. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office. 52 p.
- Brown, H.E.; Thompson, J.R. 1965.** Summer water use by aspen, spruce, and grassland. Journal of Forestry. 63(10): 756-760.
- Brown, J.K. 1985.** Role and use of fire in aspen. In: Forester's future: leaders or followers? Bethesda, MD: Society of American Foresters: 101-105.
- Brown, J.K.; DeByle, N.V. 1982.** Developing prescribed burning prescriptions for aspen in the intermountain West. In: Lotan, J.E., ed. Fire: its field effects: proceedings of a symposium. Intermountain

Fire Council and Rocky Mountain Fire Council Proceedings: 29-49.

- Brown, J.K.; DeByle, N.V. 1987.** Fire damage, mortality, and suckering in aspen. *Canadian Journal of Forest Research*. 17: 1100-1109.
- Brown, J.K.; BeByle, N.V. 1989.** Effects of prescribed fire on biomass and plant succession in western aspen. Res. Pap. INT-412. Ogden, UT: USDA Forest Service, Intermountain Research Station. 16 p.
- Brown, J.K.; Reinhardt, E.D.; Kramer, K.A. 2003.** Coarse woody debris: managing benefits and fire hazard in the recovering forest. Gen. Tech. Rep. RMRS-GTR-105. Ogden, UT: USDA Forest Service, Rocky Mountain Research Station. 16 p.
- Brown, J.K.; Simmerman, D.G. 1986.** Appraising fuels and flammability in western aspen: a prescribed fire guide. Gen. Tech. Rep. INT-205. Ogden, UT: USDA Forest Service, Intermountain Research Station. 48 p.
- Brown, K.; Hansen, A.J.; Keane, R.E.; Graumlich, L.J. 2006.** Complex interactions shaping aspen dynamics in the Greater Yellowstone Ecosystem. *Landscape Ecology*. 21: 933-951.
- Brown, M. 1995.** Aspen decline in the inland northwest: a review of some relevant literature. Corvallis, OR: USDA Forest Service, Pacific Northwest Region. 28 p.
- Buckman, R.E.; Blankenship, L.H. 1965.** Repeated spring prescribed burning reduces abundance and vigor of aspen root suckering. *Journal of Forestry*. 63(1): 23-25.
- Buell, E.D.; Kemp, P.D.; Jackson, G.H. 1936.** Forest type map; north part of Wallowa County, Oregon. Portland, OR: USDA Forest Service, Pacific Northwest Forest Experiment Station, Forest Survey – East of the Cascade Range. 1:63,360; projection unknown; 36" × 82"; thematic map.
- Buell, M.F.; Buell, H.F. 1959.** Aspen invasion of prairie. *Bulletin of the Torrey Botanical Club*. 86(4): 264-265.
- Canon, S.K.; Urness, P.J.; DeByle, N.V. 1987.** Habitat selection, foraging behavior, and dietary nutrition of elk in burned aspen forest. *Journal of Range Management*. 40(5): 433-438.
- Cantor, L.F.; Whitham, T.G. 1989.** Importance of belowground herbivory: pocket gophers may limit aspen to rock outcrop refugia. *Ecology*. 70(4): 962-970.
- Capp, J.; Gadt, L., editors. 1984.** Proceedings of the aspen symposium. Lakewood, CO: USDA Forest Service, Rocky Mountain Region. 126 p.
- Chen, H.Y.H.; Légaré, S.; Bergeron, Y. 2004.** Variation of the understory composition and diversity along a gradient of productivity in *Populus tremuloides* stands of northern British Columbia, Canada. *Canadian Journal of Botany*. 82: 1314-1323.
- Churchill, G.B.; John, H.H.; Duncan, D.P.; Hodson, A.C. 1964.** Long-term effects of defoliation of aspen by the forest tent caterpillar. *Ecology*. 45(3): 630-633.
- Comeau, P.G.; Harper, G.J.; Blache, M.E.; Boateng, J.O.; Thomas, K.D., editors. 1996.** Ecology and management of B.C. hardwoods. FRDA Report No. 255. Victoria, BC: British Columbia Ministry of Forests, Research Branch. 246 p.
- Comeau, P.; Heineman, J.; Newsome, T. 2006.** Evaluation of relationships between understory light and aspen basal area in the British Columbia central interior. *Forest Ecology and Management*. 226(1-3): 80-87.
- Copony, J.A.; Barnes, B.V. 1974.** Clonal variation in the incidence of Hypoxylon canker on trembling aspen. *Canadian Journal of Botany*. 52: 1475-1481.
- Cottam, W.P. 1954.** Prevernal leafing of aspen in Utah mountains. *Journal of the Arnold Arboretum*. 35:

239-250.

- Crawford, J.L.; McNulty, S.P.; Sowell, J.B. 1998.** Changes in aspen communities over 30 years in Gunnison County, Colorado. *American Midland Naturalist*. 140(2): 197-205.
- Crouch, G.L. 1981.** Regeneration on aspen clearcuts in northwestern Colorado. Res. Note RM-407. Fort Collins, CO: USDA Forest Service, Rocky Mountain Forest and Range Experiment Station. 5 p.
- Crouch, G.L. 1983.** Aspen regeneration after commercial clearcutting in southwestern Colorado. *Journal of Forestry*. 81(5): 316-319.
- Crouch, G.L. 1983.** Effects of commercial clearcutting of aspen on understory vegetation and wildlife habitat values in southwestern Colorado. Res. Pap. RM-246. Fort Collins, CO: USDA Forest Service, Rocky Mountain Forest and Range Experiment Station. 8 p.
- Crouch, G.L. 1986.** Aspen regeneration in 6- to 10-year old clearcuts in southwestern Colorado. Res. Note RM-467. Fort Collins, CO: USDA Forest Service, Rocky Mountain Forest and Range Experiment Station. 4 p.
- Crowe, E.A.; Clausnitzer, R.R. 1997.** Mid-montane wetland plant associations of the Malheur, Umatilla, and Wallowa-Whitman national forests. R6-NR-ECOL-TP-22-97. [Place of publication unknown]: USDA Forest Service, Pacific Northwest Region, Wallowa-Whitman National Forest. 299 p.
<http://www.reo.gov/ecoshare/Publications/documents/MidMountWetlandPAWallowaWhitnf.pdf>
- Cryer, D.H.; Murray, J.E. 1992.** Aspen regeneration and soils. *Rangelands*. 14(4): 223-226.
- Daniel, T.W.; Helms, J.A.; Baker, F.S. 1979.** Principles of silviculture. Second edition. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co. 500 p.
- Day, M.W. 1944.** The root system of aspen. *American Midland Naturalist*. 32: 502-509.
- De Byle, N.V. 1964.** Detection of functional intraclonal aspen root connections by tracers and excavation. *Forest Science*. 10(4): 386-396.
- DeByle, N.V. 1981.** Songbird populations and clearcut harvesting of aspen in northern Utah. Res. Note INT-302. Ogden, UT: USDA Forest Service, Intermountain Forest and Range Experiment Station. 7 p.
- DeByle, N.V.; Bevins, C.D.; Fischer, W.C. 1987.** Wildfire occurrence in aspen in the interior western United States. *Western Journal of Applied Forestry*. 2(3): 73-76.
- DeByle, N.V.; Winokur, R.P. 1985.** Aspen: ecology and management in the western United States. Gen. Tech. Rep. RM-119. Fort Collins, CO: USDA Forest Service, Rocky Mountain Forest and Range Experiment Station. 283 p.
- de Chantal, M.; Granstrom, A. 2007.** Aggregations of dead wood after wildfire act as browsing refugia for seedlings of *Populus tremula* and *Salix caprea*: disturbances at multiple scales as the basis of forest ecosystem restoration and management. *Forest Ecology and Management*. 250(1-2): 3-8.
- DesRochers, A.; Landhäusser, S.M.; Lieffers, V.J. 2002.** Coarse and fine root respiration in aspen (*Populus tremuloides*). *Tree Physiology*. 22: 725-732.
- DesRochers, A.; Lieffers, V.J. 2001.** The coarse-root system of mature *Populus tremuloides* in declining stands in Alberta, Canada. *Journal of Vegetation Science*. 12: 355-360.
- Doucet, R. 1989.** Regeneration silviculture of aspen. *Forestry Chronicle*. 65: 23-27.
- Edminster, C.B.; Mowrer, H.T.; Shepperd, W.D. 1985.** Site index curves for aspen in the central Rocky Mountains. Res. Note RM-453. Fort Collins, CO: USDA Forest Service, Rocky Mountain Forest and Range Experiment Station. 4 p.

- Einspahr, D.W.; van Buijtenen, J.P. 1961.** The influence of gibberellic acid on growth and fiber length of quaking aspen. *Forest Science*. 7(1): 43-51.
- Einspahr, D.W.; Winton, L.L. 1977.** Genetics of quaking aspen. Res. Pap. WO-25. Washington, DC: USDA Forest Service. 23 p.
- Elliott, G.P.; Baker, W.L. 2004.** Quaking aspen (*Populus tremuloides* Michx.) at treeline: a century of change in the San Juan Mountains, Colorado, USA. *Journal of Biogeography*. 31(5): 733-745.
- Ellison, L. 1943.** A natural seedling of western aspen. *Journal of Forestry*. 41(10): 767-768.
- Farmer, R.E., Jr. 1962.** Aspen root sucker formation and apical dominance. *Forest Science*. 8(4): 403-410.
- Farmer, R.E., Jr. 1963.** Effect of light intensity on growth of *Populus tremuloides* cuttings under two temperature regimes. *Ecology*. 44(2): 409-411.
- Fechner, G.H.; Burr, K.E.; Myers, J.F. 1981.** Effects of storage, temperature, and moisture stress on seed germination and early seedling development of trembling aspen. *Canadian Journal of Forest Research*. 11(3): 718-722.
- Fetherolf, J.M. 1917.** Aspen as a permanent forest type. *Journal of Forestry*. 15(6): 757-760.
- Fitzgerald, R.D.; Bailey, A.W. 1984.** Control of aspen regrowth by grazing with cattle. *Journal of Range Management*. 37(2): 156-158.
- Fitzgerald, R.D.; Hudson, R.J.; Bailey, A.W. 1986.** Grazing preferences of cattle in regenerating aspen forest. *Journal of Range Management*. 39(1): 13-18.
- Foote, K.C.; Schaedle, M. 1976.** Physiological characteristics of photosynthesis and respiration in stems of *Populus tremuloides* Michx. *Plant Physiology*. 58(1): 91-94.
- Forester, J.D.; Anderson, D.P.; Turner, M.G. 2007.** Do high-density patches of coarse wood and regenerating saplings create browsing refugia for aspen (*Populus tremuloides* Michx.) in Yellowstone National Park (USA)? *Forest Ecology and Management*. 253(1-3): 211-219.
- Fraser, E.C.; Lieffers, V.J.; Landhäusser, S.M.; Frey, B.R. 2002.** Soil nutrition and temperature as drivers of root suckering in trembling aspen. *Canadian Journal of Forest Research*. 32: 1685-1691.
- Frey, B.R.; Lieffers, V.J.; Hogg, E.H.T.; Landhausser, S.M. 2004.** Predicting landscape patterns of aspen dieback: mechanisms and knowledge gaps. *Canadian Journal of Forest Research*. 34(7): 1379-1390.
- Frey, B.R.; Lieffers, V.J.; Landhausser, S.M.; Comeau, P.G.; Greenway, K.J. 2003.** An analysis of sucker regeneration of trembling aspen. *Canadian Journal of Forest Research*. 33(7): 1169-1179.
- Gannett, H. 1902.** The forests of Oregon. Professional Paper No. 4, Series H, Forestry, 1. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of the Interior, Geological Survey. 36 p.
- Garrett, P.W.; Zahner, R. 1964.** Clonal variation of suckering of aspen obscures effects of various clear-cutting treatments. *Journal of Forestry*. 62(10): 749-750.
- Gifford, G.F. 1966.** Aspen root studies on three sites in northern Utah. *American Midland Naturalist*. 75(1): 132-141.
- Gifford, G.F. 1967.** The influence of growth media, temperatures, and light intensities on aspen root and top growth. Res. Note INT-67. Ogden, UT: USDA Forest Service, Intermountain Forest and Range Experiment Station. 4 p.
- Gifford, G.F.; Humphries, W.; Jaynes, R.A. 1984.** A preliminary quantification of the impacts of aspen to conifer succession on water yield – II. Modeling results. *Water Resources Bulletin*. 20(2): 181-186.

- Griffis-Kyle, K.L.; Beier, P. 2003.** Small isolated aspen stands enrich bird communities in southwestern ponderosa pine forests. *Biological Conservation*. 110: 375-385.
- Gruell, G.E.; Loope, L.L. 1974.** Relationships among aspen, fire, and ungulate browsing in Jackson Hole, Wyoming. Unpublished Report. [Place of publication unknown]: USDA Forest Service, Intermountain Region; U.S. Department of Interior, National Park Service, Rocky Mountain Region. 33 p.
- Guyon, J.C. II. 2006.** Are the changes in aspen forests in western North America a forest decline? In: Guyon, J.C., compiler. Proceedings of the 53rd western international forest disease work conference. Jackson, WY. Ogden, UT: USDA Forest Service, Intermountain Region: 95-101.
- Hadfield, J.; Magelssen, R. 2006.** Assessment of aspen condition on the Colville National Forest. Wenatchee, WA: USDA Forest Service, Okanogan and Wenatchee National Forests. 22 p.
- Hadfield, J.S. 2003.** Little Pend Oreille National Wildlife Refuge aspen condition assessment survey. Unnumbered Report. Wenatchee, WA: USDA Forest Service, Forestry Sciences Lab. 11 p.
- Harniss, R.O.; Harper, K.T. 1982.** Tree dynamics in seral and stable aspen stands of central Utah. Res. Pap. INT-297. Ogden, UT: USDA Forest Service, Intermountain Forest and Range Experiment Station. 7 p.
- Harniss, R.O.; Nelson, D.L. 1984.** A severe epidemic of *Marssonina* leaf blight on quaking aspen in northern Utah. Res. Note INT-339. Ogden, UT: USDA Forest Service, Intermountain Forest and Range Experiment Station. 6 p.
- Heidt, J. 1983.** Clonal variation in height growth of trembling aspen in central Alberta. *Agriculture and Forestry Bulletin*. 6(3): 20-23.
- Hessl, A. 2002.** Aspen, elk, and fire: the effects of human institutions on ecosystem processes. *BioScience*. 52(11): 1011-1022.
- Hessl, A.E.; Graumlich, L.J. 2002.** Interactive effects of human activities, herbivory and fire on quaking aspen (*Populus tremuloides*) age structures in western Wyoming. *Journal of Biogeography*. 29(7): 889-902.
- Hinds, T.E.; Shepperd, W.D. 1987.** Aspen sucker damage and defect in Colorado clearcut areas. Res. Pap. RM-278. Fort Collins, CO: USDA Forest Service, Rocky Mountain Forest and Range Experiment Station. 12 p.
- Hinds, T.E.; Wengert, E.M. 1977.** Growth and decay losses in Colorado aspen. Res. Pap. RM-193. Fort Collins, CO: USDA Forest Service, Rocky Mountain Forest and Range Experiment Station. 10 p.
- Hoff, C.C. 1957.** A comparison of soil, climate, and biota of conifer and aspen communities in the central Rocky Mountains. *American Midland Naturalist*. 58(1): 115-140.
- Hogg, E.H.; Hurdle, P.A. 1995.** The aspen parkland in western Canada: a dry-climate analogue for the future boreal forest? *Water, Air, and Soil Pollution*. 82: 391-400.
- Hogg, E.H.; Schwarz, A.G. 1999.** Tree-ring analysis of declining aspen stands in west-central Saskatchewan. Information Report NOR-X-359. Edmonton, Alberta, Canada: Natural Resources Canada, Canadian Forest Service, Northern Forestry Centre. 25 p.
- Hollenbeck, J.P.; Ripple, W.J. 2007.** Aspen patch and migratory bird relationships in the northern Yellowstone ecosystem. *Landscape Ecology*. 22(9): 1411-1425.
- Howard, J.L. 1996.** *Populus tremuloides*. In: Fire Effects Information System [Database]. Missoula, MT: USDA Forest Service, Rocky Mountain Research Station, Fire Sciences Laboratory (Producer). Available: <http://www.fs.fed.us/database/feis/> [2007, October 3]
- Hungerford, R.D. 1988.** Soil temperatures and suckering in burned and unburned aspen stands in Idaho.

- Res. Note INT-378. Ogden, UT: USDA Forest Service, Intermountain Research Station. 6 p.
- James, T.D.W.; Smith, D.W. 1977.** Short-term effects of surface fire on the biomass and nutrient standing crop of *Populus tremuloides* in southern Ontario. Canadian Journal of Forest Research. 7: 666-679.
- Jelinski, D.E. 1993.** Associations between environmental heterogeneity, heterozygosity, and growth rates of *Populus tremuloides* in a Cordilleran landscape. Arctic and Alpine Research. 25(3): 183-188.
- Jelinski, D.E.; Cheliak, W.M. 1992.** Genetic diversity and spatial subdivision of *Populus tremuloides* (Salicaceae) in a heterogeneous landscape. American Journal of Botany. 79(7): 728-736.
- Johns, B.W. 1993.** The influence of grove size on bird species richness in aspen parklands. Wilson Bulletin. 105(2): 256-264.
- Johnson, D.W.; Beatty, J.S.; Hinds, T.E. 1995.** Cankers on western quaking aspen. Forest Insect and Disease Leaflet 152. [Place of publication unknown]: USDA Forest Service. 8 p.
http://www.na.fs.fed.us/spfo/pubs/fidls/q_aspen/q_aspen.htm
- Johnston, B.C. 1996.** Regeneration of aspen clearcuts on the Uncompahgre Plateau, Colorado. Gunnison, CO: USDA Forest Service. 41 p.
- Johnston, B.C.; Hendzel, L. 1985.** Examples of aspen treatment, succession and management in western Colorado. Lakewood, CO: USDA Forest Service, Rocky Mountain Region, Range, Wildlife, Fisheries and Ecology. 164 p.
- Johnston, R.S. 1969.** Aspen sprout production and water use. Res. Note INT-89. Ogden, UT: USDA Forest Service, Intermountain Forest and Range Experiment Station. 6 p.
- Johnston, R.S. 1970.** Evapotranspiration from bare, herbaceous, and aspen plots: a check on a former study. Water Resources Research. 6(1): 324-327.
- Johnston, R.S. 1971.** Rainfall interception in a dense Utah aspen clone. Res. Note INT-143. Ogden, UT: USDA Forest Service, Intermountain Forest and Range Experiment Station. 4 p.
- Johnstone, J.F. 2005.** Effects of aspen (*Populus tremuloides*) sucker removal on postfire conifer regeneration in central Alaska. Canadian Journal of Forest Research. 35: 483-486.
- Jones, B.E.; Rickman, T.H.; Vazquez, A.; Sado, Y.; Tate, K.W. 2005.** Removal of encroaching conifers to regenerate degraded aspen stands in the Sierra Nevada. Restoration Ecology. 13(2): 373-379.
- Jones, J.R. 1985.** Distribution. In: DeByle, N.V.; Winokur, R.P. Aspen: ecology and management in the western United States. Gen. Tech. Rep. RM-119. Fort Collins, CO: USDA Forest Service, Rocky Mountain Forest and Range Experiment Station: 9-10.
- Jones, J.R.; Markstrom, D.C. 1973.** Aspen...an American wood. FS-217. Washington, DC: USDA Forest Service. 8 p.
- Juzwik, J.; Nishijima, W.T.; Hinds, T.E. 1978.** Survey of aspen cankers in Colorado. Plant Disease Reporter. 62(10): 906-910.
- Kashian, D.M.; Romme, W.H.; Regan, C.M. 2007.** Reconciling divergent interpretations of quaking aspen decline on the northern Colorado Front Range. Ecological Applications. 17(5): 1296-1311.
- Kay, C.E. 1993.** Aspen seedlings in recently burned areas of Grand Teton and Yellowstone national parks. Northwest Science. 67(2): 94-104.
- Kay, C.E. 1997.** Is aspen doomed? Journal of Forestry. 95(5): 4-11.
- Kay, C.E. 2003.** Aspen management guidelines for BLM lands in north-central Nevada. Unnumbered Report. Providence, UT: Wildlife Management Services. 63 p.

- Kay, C.E.; Bartos, D.L. 2000.** Ungulate herbivory on Utah aspen: assessment of long-term exclosures. *Journal of Range Management*. 53(2): 145-153.
- Kaye, M.W.; Binkley, D.; Stohlgren, T.J. 2005.** Effects of conifers and elk browsing on quaking aspen forests in the central Rocky Mountains, USA. *Ecological Applications*. 15(4): 1284-1295.
- Keigley, R.B.; Frisina, M.R. 1998.** Browse evaluation by analysis of growth form; volume 1, methods for evaluating condition and trend. [Place of publication unknown]: Montana Fish Wildlife & Parks. 153 p.
- Kemperman, J.A.; Barnes, B.V. 1976.** Clone size in American aspens. *Canadian Journal of Botany*. 54(22): 2603-2607.
- Kendall, W.H. 1914.** Wenaha classification, extensive. [Place of publication unknown]: [USDA Forest Service, Wenaha National Forest]. 1:63,360; projection unknown; 18" × 21"; 10 colored thematic map sheets. http://www.fs.fed.us/r6/uma/publications/history/1914_timber_classification.pdf
- Kent, W.H.B. 1904.** The proposed Wenaha Forest Reserve, Washington and Oregon. Unpublished Type-script Report. [Place of publication unknown]: USDA Bureau of Forestry. 22 p. <http://www.fs.fed.us/r6/uma/publications/history/Wenaha5.pdf>
- Knutson, D.M. 1973.** The bacteria in sapwood, wetwood, and heartwood of trembling aspen. *Canadian Journal of Botany*. 51: 498-500.
- Kozlowski, T.T.; Pallardy, S.G. 1997.** Physiology of woody plants. San Diego, CA: Academic Press. 411 p.
- Krebill, R.G. 1972.** Mortality of aspen on the Gros Ventre elk winter range. Res. Pap. INT-129. Ogden, UT: USDA Forest Service, Intermountain Forest and Range Experiment Station. 16 p.
- Kulakowski, D.; Veblen, T.T.; Drinkwater, S. 2004.** The persistence of quaking aspen (*Populus tremuloides*) in the Grand Mesa area, Colorado. *Ecological Applications*. 14(5): 1603-1614.
- Kulakowski, D.; Veblen, T.T.; Kurzel, B.P. 2006.** Influences of infrequent fire, elevation and pre-fire vegetation on the persistence of quaking aspen (*Populus tremuloides* Michx.) in the Flat Tops area, Colorado, USA. *Journal of Biogeography*. 33(8): 1397-1413.
- Kurzel, B.P.; Veblen, T.T.; Kulakowski, D. 2007.** A typology of stand structure and dynamics of quaking aspen in northwestern Colorado. *Forest Ecology and Management*. 252(1-3): 176-190.
- Landhausser, S.M.; Lieffers, V.J. 1998.** Growth of *Populus tremuloides* in association with *Calamagrostis canadensis*. *Canadian Journal of Forest Research*. 28: 396-401.
- Landhausser, S.M.; Mulak, T.L.; Lieffers, V.J. 2007.** The effect of roots and litter of *Calamagrostis canadensis* on root sucker regeneration of *Populus tremuloides*. *Forestry*. 80(4): 481-488.
- Larsen, E.J.; Ripple, W.J. 2003.** Aspen age structure in the northern Yellowstone ecosystem: USA. *Forest Ecology and Management*. 179(1-3): 469-482.
- Larson, G.C. 1944.** More on seedlings of western aspen. *Journal of Forestry*. 42(6): 452.
- Little, E.L., Jr. 1971.** Atlas of United States trees: volume 1, conifers and important hardwoods. Miscellaneous Publication No. 1146. Washington, DC: USDA Forest Service. 230 p. <http://www.fs.fed.us/r6/uma/nr/silv/range-maps.shtml>
- Lu, E.-Y.; Sucoff, E.I. 2001.** Responses of quaking aspen (*Populus tremuloides*) seedlings to solution calcium. *Canadian Journal of Forest Research*. 31: 123-131.
- Manier, D.J.; Laven, R.D. 2002.** Changes in landscape patterns associated with the persistence of aspen (*Populus tremuloides* Michx.) on the western slope of the Rocky Mountains, Colorado. *Forest Ecology and Management*. 152(1-2): 11-21.

- gy and Management. 167(1-3): 263-284.
- Marston, R.B. 1952.** Ground cover requirements for summer storm runoff control on aspen sites in northern Utah. *Journal of Forestry*. 50(4): 303-307.
- McCain, E.B.; Zlotoff, J.I.; Ebersole, J.J. 2003.** Effects of elk browsing on aspen stand characteristics, Rampart Range, Colorado. *Western North American Naturalist*. 63(1): 129-132.
- McDonough, W.T. 1985.** Sexual reproduction, seeds, and seedlings. In: DeByle, N.V.; Winokur, R.P. *Aspen: ecology and management in the western United States*. Gen. Tech. Rep. RM-119. Fort Collins, CO: USDA Forest Service, Rocky Mountain Forest and Range Experiment Station: 25-28.
- Meinecke, E.P. 1929.** Quaking aspen: a study in applied forest pathology. Technical Bulletin No. 155. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Agriculture. 33 p.
- Miller, B. 1996.** Aspen management literature review. NEST Technical Report TR-028. Ontario, ON: Ontario Ministry of Natural Resources. 92 p.
- Mitton, J.B.; Grant, M.C. 1980.** Observations on the ecology and evolution of quaking aspen, *Populus tremuloides*, in the Colorado Front Range. *American Journal of Botany*. 67(2): 202-209.
- Mitton, J.B.; Grant, M.C. 1996.** Genetic variation and the natural history of quaking aspen. *BioScience*. 46(1): 25-31.
- Moench, R.D. [Date unknown].** Aspen seed collection. Nursery Information Series. Fort Collins, CO: Colorado State University, Colorado State Forest Service. 7 p.
- Morgan, M.D. 1969.** Ecology of aspen in Gunnison County, Colorado. *American Midland Naturalist*. 82(1): 204-228.
- Morgenstern, E.K. 1996.** Geographic variation in forest trees: genetic basis and application of knowledge in silviculture. Vancouver, BC: UBC Press. 209 p.
- Moss, E.H. 1938.** Longevity of seed and establishment of seedlings in species of *Populus*. *Botanical Gazette*. 99: 529-542.
- Mowrer, H.T. 1986.** Site productivity estimates for aspen in the central Rocky Mountains. *Western Journal of Applied Forestry*. 1(3): 89-91.
- Mowrer, H.T.; Shepperd, W.D. 1987.** Field measurement of age in quaking aspen in the central Rocky Mountains. Res. Note RM-476. Fort Collins, CO: USDA Forest Service, Rocky Mountain Forest and Range Experiment Station. 4 p.
- Mueggler, W.F. 1988.** Aspen community types of the Intermountain Region. Gen. Tech. Rep. INT-250. Ogden, UT: USDA Forest Service, Intermountain Research Station. 135 p.
- Mueggler, W.F. 1989.** Age distribution and reproduction of intermountain aspen stands. *Western Journal of Applied Forestry*. 4(2): 41-45.
- Mueggler, W.F. 1994.** Sixty years of change in tree numbers and basal area in central Utah aspen stands. Res. Pap. INT-RP-478. Ogden, UT: USDA Forest Service, Intermountain Research Station. 11 p.
- Mueggler, W.F.; Campbell, R.B., Jr. 1982.** Aspen community types on the Caribou and Targhee National Forests in southeastern Idaho. Res. Pap. INT-294. Ogden, UT: USDA Forest Service, Intermountain Research Station. 32 p.
- Mueggler, W.F.; Campbell, R.B., Jr. 1986.** Aspen community types of Utah. Res. Pap. INT-362. Ogden, UT: USDA Forest Service, Intermountain Research Station. 69 p.
- Newsome, T.A.; Heineman, J.L.; Daintith, N.M. 2005.** Suitability of native broadleaf species for reforestation in the Cariboo area of the southern interior forest region. Extension Note 73. Victoria, BC:

British Columbia Ministry of Forests, Research Branch. 8 p.

- Noble, I.R.; Slatyer, R.O. 1980.** The use of vital attributes to predict successional changes in plant communities subject to recurrent disturbances. *Vegetatio*. 43: 5-21.
- Ohms, S.R. 2003.** Restoration of aspen in different stages of mortality in southern Utah. Logan, UT: Utah State University. M.S. thesis. 88 p.
- Ostry, M.E.; Anderson, N.A.; Rugg, D.J.; Ward, K.T. 2004.** Long-term response of precommercially thinned aspen clones to Hypoxylon canker. Res. Pap. NC-341. St. Paul, MN: USDA Forest Service, North Central Research Station. 12 p.
- Ostry, Michael E.; Anderson, Neil A. 1998.** Interactions of insects, woodpeckers, and hypoxylon canker on aspen. Res. Pap. NC-331. St. Paul, MN: USDA Forest Service, North Central Forest Experiment Station. 15 p.
- Ottmar, R.D.; Vihnanek, R.E.; Wright, C.S. 2000.** Stereo photo series for quantifying natural fuels; volume III: lodgepole pine, quaking aspen, and Gambel oak types in the Rocky Mountains. PMS 832. Boise, ID: National Wildfire Coordinating Group, National Interagency Fire Center. 85 p.
- Packard, F.M. 1942.** Wildlife and aspen in Rocky Mountain National Park, Colorado. *Ecology*. 23(4): 478-482.
- Parker, A.J.; Parker, K.C. 1983.** Comparative successional roles of trembling aspen and lodgepole pine in the southern Rocky Mountains. *Great Basin Naturalist*. 43(3): 447-455.
- Patton, D.R.; Avant, H.D. 1970.** Fire stimulated aspen sprouting in a spruce-fir forest in New Mexico. Res. Note RM-159. Fort Collins, CO: USDA Forest Service, Rocky Mountain Forest and Range Experiment Station. 3 p.
- Pearson, G.A. 1914.** The role of aspen in the reforestation of mountain burns in Arizona and New Mexico. *The Plant World*. 17(9): 249-260.
- Pearson, L.C.; Lawrence, D.B. 1958.** Photosynthesis in aspen bark. *American Journal of Botany*. 45(5): 383-387.
- Perala, D.A. 1977.** Manager's handbook for aspen in the north-central states. Gen. Tech. Rep. NC-36. St. Paul, MN: USDA Forest Service, North Central Forest Experiment Station. 30 p.
- Perala, D.A. 1990.** *Populus tremuloides* Michx.; quaking aspen. In: Burns, R.M.; Honkala, B.H., technical coordinators. *Silvics of North America; volume 2, hardwoods*. Agriculture Handbook 654. Washington, DC: USDA Forest Service: 555-569.
- Perala, D.A. 1995.** Quaking aspen productivity recovers after repeated prescribed fire. Res. Pap. NC-324. St. Paul, MN: USDA Forest Service, North Central Forest Experiment Station. 11 p.
- Perala, D.A.; Leary, R.A.; Cieszewski, C.J. 1999.** Self-thinning and stockability of the circumboreal aspens (*Populus tremuloides* Michx., and *P. tremula* L.). Res. Pap. NC-335. St. Paul, MN: USDA Forest Service, North Central Research Station. 16 p.
- Peterson, C.J.; Squiers, E.R. 1995.** Competition and succession in an aspen-white-pine forest. *Journal of Ecology*. 83: 449-457.
- Philpot, C.W. 1969.** The effect of reduced extractive content on the burning rate of aspen leaves. Res. Note INT-92. Ogden, UT: USDA Forest Service, Intermountain Forest and Range Experiment Station. 6 p.
- Pothier, D.; Raulier, F.; Riopel, M. 2004.** Ageing and decline of trembling aspen stands in Quebec. *Canadian Journal of Forest Research*. 34: 1251-1258.

- Powell, D.C. 1988.** Aspen community types of the Pike and San Isabel National Forests in south-central Colorado. R2-ECOL-88-01. Lakewood, CO: USDA Forest Service, Rocky Mountain Region. 254 p.
- Powell, D.C. 2009.** Historical vegetation mapping. Unpub. Rep. Pendleton, OR: USDA Forest Service, Pacific Northwest Region, Umatilla National Forest. 53 p.
http://www.fs.fed.us/r6/uma/publications/history/Historical_Vegetation_Mapping.pdf
- Powell, D.C.; Johnson, C.G., Jr.; Crowe, E.A.; Wells, A.; Swanson, D.K. 2007.** Potential vegetation hierarchy for the Blue Mountains section of northeastern Oregon, southeastern Washington, and west-central Idaho. Gen. Tech. Rep. PNW-GTR-709. Portland, OR: USDA Forest Service, Pacific Northwest Research Station. 87 p. <http://www.treearch.fs.fed.us/pubs/27598>
- Prévost, M.; Pothier, D. 2002.** Partial cuts in a trembling aspen-conifer stand: effects on microenvironmental conditions and regeneration dynamics. Canadian Journal of Forest Research. 33: 1-15.
- Reed, R.M. 1971.** Aspen forests of the Wind River Mountains, Wyoming. American Midland Naturalist. 86(2): 327-343.
- Reinhardt, E.D.; Crookston, N.L., technical editors. 2003.** The fire and fuels extension to the Forest Vegetation Simulator. Gen. Tech. Rep. RMRS-GTR-116. Ogden, UT: USDA Forest Service, Rocky Mountain Research Station. 209 p.
- Reynolds, H.G. 1969.** Aspen grove use by deer, elk, and cattle in southwestern coniferous forests. Res. Note RM-138. Fort Collins, CO: USDA Forest Service, Rocky Mountain Forest and Range Experiment Station. 4 p.
- Ripple, W.J.; Beschta, R.L. 2005.** Willow thickets protect young aspen from elk browsing after wolf reintroduction. Western North American Naturalist. 65(1): 118-122.
- Ripple, W.J.; Larsen, E.J. 2001.** The role of postfire coarse woody debris in aspen regeneration. Western Journal of Applied Forestry. 16(2): 61-64.
- Rogers, P. 2002.** Using forest health monitoring to assess aspen forest cover change in the southern Rockies ecoregion. Forest Ecology and Management. 155(1-3): 223-236.
- Rogers, P.C.; Shepperd, W.D.; Bartos, D.L. 2007.** Aspen in the Sierra Nevada: regional conservation of a continental species. Natural Areas Journal. 27(2): 183-193.
- Romme, W.H.; Turner, M.G.; Gardner, R.H.; Hargrove, W.W.; Tuskan, G.A.; Despain, D.G.; Renkin, R.A. 1997.** A rare episode of sexual reproduction in aspen (*Populus tremuloides* Michx.) following the 1988 Yellowstone fires. Natural Areas Journal. 17(1): 17-25.
- Romme, W.H.; Turner, M.G.; Tuskan, G.A.; Reed, R.A. 2005.** Establishment, persistence, and growth of aspen (*Populus tremuloides*) seedlings in Yellowstone National Park. Ecology. 86(2): 404-418.
- Rose, A.H. 1958.** The effect of defoliation on foliage production and radial growth of quaking aspen. Forest Science. 4(4): 335-342.
- Ruark, G.A.; Bockheim, J.G. 1988.** Biomass, net primary production, and nutrient distribution for an age sequence of *Populus tremuloides* ecosystems. Canadian Journal of Forest Research. 18(4): 435-443.
- Sampson, A.W. 1919.** Effect of grazing upon aspen reproduction. Bulletin No. 741. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Agriculture. 29 p. <http://www.fs.fed.us/r6/uma/publications/history/Sampson.pdf>
- Schaedle, M.; Foote, K.C. 1971.** Seasonal changes in the photosynthetic capacity of *Populus tremuloides* bark. Forest Science. 17(3): 308-313.
- Schier, G.A.; Johnston, R.S. 1971.** Clonal variation in total nonstructural carbohydrates of trembling aspen roots in three Utah areas. Canadian Journal of Forest Research. 1: 252-255.

- Schier, G.A. 1973.** Origin and development of aspen root suckers. *Canadian Journal of Forest Research*. 3(1): 45-53.
- Schier, G.A. 1973.** Seasonal variation in sucker production from excised roots of *Populus tremuloides* and the role of endogenous auxin. *Canadian Journal of Forest Research*. 3(3): 459-461.
- Schier, G.A. 1975a.** Deterioration of aspen clones in the middle Rocky Mountains. Res. Pap. INT-170. Ogden, UT: USDA Forest Service, Intermountain Forest and Range Experiment Station. 14 p.
- Schier, G.A. 1975b.** Promotion of sucker development on *Populus tremuloides* root cuttings by an antiauxin. *Canadian Journal of Forest Research*. 5: 338-340.
- Schier, G.A. 1976.** Physiological and environmental factors controlling vegetative regeneration of aspen. Gen. Tech. Rep. RM-29. Fort Collins, CO: USDA Forest Service, Rocky Mountain Forest and Range Experiment Station. 4 p.
- Schier, G.A. 1978.** Variation in suckering capacity among and within lateral roots of an aspen clone. Res. Note INT-241. Ogden, UT: USDA Forest Service, Intermountain Forest and Range Experiment Station. 7 p.
- Schier, G.A. 1978.** Vegetative propagation of Rocky Mountain aspen. Gen. Tech. Rep. INT-44. Ogden, UT: USDA Forest Service, Intermountain Forest and Range Experiment Station. 13 p.
- Schier, G.A. 1979.** Shoot development in young aspen. Res. Note INT-275. Ogden, UT: USDA Forest Service, Intermountain Forest and Range Experiment Station. 4 p.
- Schier, G.A. 1980.** Rooting stem cuttings from aspen seedlings. Res. Note INT-282. Ogden, UT: USDA Forest Service, Intermountain Forest and Range Experiment Station. 4 p.
- Schier, G.A.; Campbell, R.B. 1978.** Aspen sucker regeneration following burning and clearcutting on two sites in the Rocky Mountains. *Forest Science*. 24(2): 303-308.
- Schier, G.A.; Campbell, R.B. 1978.** Effect of cold storage on development of suckers on aspen root cuttings. Res. Note INT-248. Ogden, UT: USDA Forest Service, Intermountain Forest and Range Experiment Station. 8 p.
- Schier, G.A.; Campbell, R.B. 1980.** Variation among healthy and deteriorating aspen clones. Res. Pap. INT-264. Ogden, UT: USDA Forest Service, Intermountain Forest and Range Experiment Station. 12 p.
- Schier, G.A.; Jones, J.R.; Winokur, R.P. 1985.** Vegetative regeneration. In: DeByle, N.V.; Winokur, R.P. *Aspen: ecology and management in the western United States*. Gen. Tech. Rep. RM-119. Fort Collins, CO: USDA Forest Service, Rocky Mountain Forest and Range Experiment Station: 29-33.
- Schier, G.A.; Smith, A.D. 1979.** Sucker regeneration in a Utah aspen clone after clearcutting, partial cutting, scarification and girdling. Res. Note INT-253. Ogden, UT: USDA Forest Service, Intermountain Forest and Range Experiment Station. 6 p.
- Schier, G.A.; Zasada, J.C. 1973.** Role of carbohydrate reserves in the development of root suckers in *Populus tremuloides*. *Canadian Journal of Forest Research*. 3: 243-250.
- Schimpf, D.J.; Henderson, J.A.; MacMahon, J.A. 1980.** Some aspects of succession in the spruce-fir forest zone of northern Utah. *Great Basin Naturalist*. 40(1): 1-26.
- Shiue, C-J.; Hossfeld, R.L.; Rees, L.W. 1958.** Absorption and translocation of 2,4,5-trichlorophenoxyacetic acid derivatives in quaking aspen. *Forest Science*. 4(4): 319-324.
- Schmitt, C.L. 1995.** Aspen clone health in enclosures on the North Fork John Day RD, Umatilla NF. BMZ-96-03. Baker City, OR: USDA Forest Service, Pacific Northwest Region, Blue Mountain Pest Management Zone, Wallowa-Whitman National Forest. 7 p.

- Severson, K.E.; Kranz, J.J. 1976.** Understory production not predictable from aspen basal area or density. Res. Note RM-314. Fort Collins, CO : USDA Forest Service, Rocky Mountain Forest and Range Experiment Station. 4 p.
- Severson, K.E.; Thilenius, J.F. 1976.** Classification of quaking aspen stands in the Black Hills and Bear Lodge Mountains. Res. Pap. RM-166. Fort Collins, CO: USDA Forest Service, Rocky Mountain Forest and Range Experiment Station. 24 p.
- Shepperd, W.D.; Smith, F.W. 1993.** The role of near-surface lateral roots in the life cycle of aspen in the central Rocky Mountains. *Forest Ecology and Management*. 61(1-2): 157-170.
- Shepperd, W.D. 1981.** Stand characteristics of Rocky Mountain aspen. In: DeByle, N.V., ed. *Situation management of two intermountain species: aspen and coyotes*. Volume I. Aspen. Logan, UT: Utah State University, College of Natural Resources: 22-30.
- Shepperd, W.D. 1990.** A classification of quaking aspen in the central Rocky Mountains based on growth and stand characteristics. *Western Journal of Applied Forestry*. 5(3): 69-75.
- Shepperd, W.D. 1993.** The effect of harvesting activities on soil compaction, root damage, and suckering in Colorado aspen. *Western Journal of Applied Forestry*. 8(2): 62-66.
- Shepperd, W.D. 1993.** Initial growth, development, and clonal dynamics of regenerated aspen in the Rocky Mountains. Res. Pap. RM-312. Fort Collins, CO: USDA Forest Service, Rocky Mountain Forest and Range Experiment Station. 8 p.
- Shepperd, W.D. 1996.** Response of aspen root suckers to regeneration methods and post-harvest protection. Res. Pap. RM-RP-324. Fort Collins, CO: USDA Forest Service, Rocky Mountain Forest and Range Experiment Station. 8 p.
- Shepperd, W.D.; Bartos, D.L.; Mata, S.A. 2001.** Above- and below-ground effects of aspen clonal regeneration and succession to conifers. *Canadian Journal of Forest Research*. 31(5): 739-745.
- Shepperd, W.D.; Binkley, D.; Bartos, D.L.; Stohlgren, T.J.; Eskew, L.G., compilers. 2001.** Sustaining aspen in western landscapes: symposium proceedings. Proceedings RMRS-P-18. Fort Collins, CO: USDA Forest Service, Rocky Mountain Research Station. 460 p.
- Shepperd, W.D.; Rogers, P.C.; Burton, D.; Bartos, D.L. 2006.** Ecology, biodiversity, management, and restoration of aspen in the Sierra Nevada. Gen. Tech. Rep. RMRS-GTR-178. Fort Collins, CO: USDA Forest Service, Rocky Mountain Research Station. 122 p.
- Shields, W.J., Jr.; Bockheim, J.G. 1981.** Deterioration of trembling aspen clones in the Great Lakes region. *Canadian Journal of Forest Research*. 11: 530-537.
- Shirley, D.M.; Erickson, V. 2001.** Aspen restoration in the Blue Mountains of northeast Oregon. In: Shepperd, W.D.; Binkley, D.; Bartos, D.L.; Stohlgren, T.J.; Eskew, L.G., compilers. *Sustaining aspen in western landscapes: symposium proceedings*. Proceedings RMRS-P-18. Fort Collins, CO: USDA Forest Service, Rocky Mountain Research Station: 101-115.
- Smith, A.E.; Smith, F.W. 2005.** Twenty-year change in aspen dominance in pure aspen and mixed aspen/conifer stands on the Uncompahgre Plateau, Colorado, USA. *Forest Ecology and Management*. 213(1-3): 338-348.
- Spada, B.; Bones, J.T.; Hightree, P.E.; Hazard, J.; Kennedy, J.; Geiger, P.H.; Orr, W.; Harden, C. 1957.** Forest type map of Wallowa County, Oregon. Portland, OR: USDA Forest Service, Pacific Northwest Forest and Range Experiment Station. 1:63,360; polyconic projection; thematic map.
- Starr, G.H. 1971.** Propagation of aspen trees from lateral roots. *Journal of Forestry*. 69(12): 866-867.
- Steneker, G.A. 1973.** The size of trembling aspen (*Populus tremuloides* Michx.) clones in Manitoba. Ca-

- nadian Journal of Forest Research. 3: 472-478.
- Steneker, G.A. 1974.** Factors affecting the suckering of trembling aspen. *Forestry Chronicle*. 50: 32-34.
- Stoekeler, J.H. 1961.** Organic layers in Minnesota aspen stands and their role in soil improvement. *Forest Science*. 7(1): 66-71.
- Strain, B.R.; Johnson, P.L. 1963.** Corticular photosynthesis and growth in *Populus tremuloides*. *Ecology*. 44(3): 581-584.
- Strand, E.K.; Vierling, L.A.; Bunting, S.C.; Gessler, P.E. 2009.** Quantifying successional rates in western aspen woodlands: current conditions, future predictions. *Forest Ecology and Management*. 257(8): 1705-1715.
- Strong, W.L.; La Roi, G.H. 1983.** Root-system morphology of common boreal forest trees in Alberta, Canada. *Canadian Journal of Forest Research*. 13: 1164-1173.
- Suzuki, K.; Suzuki, H.; Binkley, D.; Stohlgren, T.J. 1999.** Aspen regeneration in the Colorado Front Range: differences at local and landscape scales. *Landscape Ecology*. 14(3): 231-237.
- Tew, R.K. 1967.** Soil moisture depletion by aspen in central Utah. Res. Note INT-73. Ogden, UT: USDA Forest Service, Intermountain Forest and Range Experiment Station. 8 p.
- Tew, R.K. 1968.** Properties of soil under aspen and herb-shrub cover. Res. Note INT-78. Ogden, UT: USDA Forest Service, Intermountain Forest and Range Experiment Station. 4 p.
- Tew, R.K. 1970.** Root carbohydrate reserves in vegetative reproduction of aspen. *Forest Science*. 16(3): 318-320.
- Tew, R.K.; DeByle, N.V.; Schultz, J.D. 1969.** Intraclonal root connections among quaking aspen trees. *Ecology*. 50(5): 920-921.
- Thompson, G.; Johnson, A.J. 1900.** Map of the state of Oregon showing the classification of lands and forests. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of the Interior, Geological Survey. 1:1,000,000; projection unknown; 29" × 23"; colored thematic map.
- Turner, M.G.; Gardner, R.H.; Hargrove, W.W.; Tuskan, G.A. 1997.** A rare episode of sexual reproduction in aspen (*Populus tremuloides* Michx.) following the 1988 Yellowstone fires. *Natural Areas Journal*. 17(1): 17-25.
- USDA Forest Service. 1985.** Guidelines for managing aspen. Unpublished Report. Lakewood, CO: USDA Forest Service, Rocky Mountain Region. 28 p.
- USDA Forest Service. 1990.** Land and resource management plan: Umatilla National Forest. Portland, OR: USDA Forest Service, Pacific Northwest Region. Irregular pagination.
<http://www.fs.fed.us/r6/uma/projects/90-forestplan-cover.pdf>
- USDA Forest Service. 2004.** Browsed plant method for young quaking aspen: an annual monitoring method for determining the incidence of use on sprouts and young plants during the growing season. [Place of publication unknown]: USDA Forest Service, Pacific Southwest Region. 14 p.
- Wall, T.G.; Miller, R.F.; Svejcar, T.J. 2001.** Juniper encroachment into aspen in the northwest Great Basin. *Journal of Range Management*. 54(6): 691-698.
- Wall, R.E. 1971.** Variation in decay in aspen stands as affected by their clonal growth pattern. *Canadian Journal of Forest Research*. 1(3): 141-146.
- Walters, J.W.; Hinds, T.E.; Johnson, D.W.; Beatty, J. 1982.** Effects of partial cutting on diseases, mortality, and regeneration of Rocky Mountain aspen stands. Res. Pap. RM-240. Fort Collins, CO: USDA Forest Service, Rocky Mountain Forest and Range Experiment Station. 12 p.

- Wang, G.G. 2003.** Early regeneration and growth dynamics of *Populus tremuloides* suckers in relation to fire severity. Canadian Journal of Forest Research. 33: 1998-2006.
- Weigle, W.G.; Frothingham, E.H. 1911.** The aspens: their growth and management. Bulletin No. 93. Washington, DC: USDA Forest Service. 35 p.
- White, C.A.; Olmsted, C.E.; Kay, C.E. 1998.** Aspen, elk, and fire in the Rocky Mountain national parks of North America. Wildlife Society Bulletin. 26(3): 449-462.
- Wilde, S.A.; Pronin, D.T. 1949.** Growth of trembling aspen in relation to ground water and soil organic matter. Soil Science Society of America Proceedings. 13: 345-347.
- Winternitz, B.L. 1980.** Birds in aspen. In: DeGraaf, R.M., ed. Management of western forests and grasslands for nongame birds. Gen. Tech. Rep. INT-86. Ogden, UT: USDA Forest Service, Intermountain Forest and Range Experiment Station: 247-257.
- Wirth, T.; Maus, P.; Powell, J.; Lachowski, H.; Suzuki, K.; McNamara, J.; Riordan, P.; Brohman, R. 1996.** Monitoring aspen decline using remote sensing and GIS: Gravelly Mountain landscape, southwestern Montana. In: Greer, J.D., ed. Remote sensing: people in partnership with technology; proceedings of the sixth Forest Service remote sensing applications conference. Bethesda, MD: American Society for Photogrammetry and Remote Sensing: 174-183.
- Wooley, S.C.; Walker, S.; Vernon, J.; Lindroth, R.L. 2008.** Aspen decline, aspen chemistry, and elk herbivory: Are they linked? Rangelands. 30(1): 17-21.
- Worrall, J.J.; Egeland, L.; Eager, T.; Mask, R.A.; Johnson, E.W.; Kemp, P.A.; Shepperd, W.D. 2008.** Rapid mortality of *Populus tremuloides* in southwestern Colorado, USA. Forest Ecology and Management. 255(3-4): 686-696.
- Youngblood, A.P.; Mueggler, W.F. 1981.** Aspen community types on the Bridger-Teton National Forest in western Wyoming. Res. Pap. INT-272. Ogden, UT: USDA Forest Service, Intermountain Research Station. 34 p.
- Younger, P.D.; Koch, R.G.; Kapustka, L.A. 1980.** Allelochemic interference by quaking aspen leaf litter on selected herbaceous species. Forest Science. 26(3): 429-434.
- Zahner, R.; DeByle, N.V. 1965.** Effect of pruning the parent root on growth of aspen suckers. Ecology. 46(3): 373-375.
- Zieroth, E.J. 1999.** The aspen advantage. Women in Natural Resources. 20(4): 30-32.
- Zon, R. 1907.** A new explanation of the tolerance and intolerance of trees. Proceedings of the Society of American Foresters. 2: 79-94.

APPENDIX: SILVICULTURE WHITE PAPERS

White papers are internal reports, and they are produced with a consistent formatting and numbering scheme – all papers dealing with Silviculture, for example, are placed in a silviculture series (Silv) and numbered sequentially. Generally, white papers receive only limited review and, in some instances pertaining to highly technical or narrowly focused topics, the papers may receive no technical peer review at all. For papers that receive no review, the viewpoints and perspectives expressed in the paper are those of the author only, and do not necessarily represent agency positions of the Umatilla National Forest or the USDA Forest Service.

Large or important papers, such as two papers discussing active management considerations for dry and moist forests (white papers Silv-4 and Silv-7, respectively), receive extensive review comparable to what would occur for a research station general technical report (but they don't receive blind peer review, a process often used for journal articles).

White papers are designed to address a variety of objectives:

- (1) They guide how a methodology, model, or procedure is used by practitioners on the Umatilla National Forest (to ensure consistency from one unit, or project, to another).
- (2) Papers are often prepared to address ongoing and recurring needs; some papers have existed for more than 20 years and still receive high use, indicating that the need (or issue) has long standing – an example is white paper #1 describing the Forest's big-tree program, which has operated continuously for 25 years.
- (3) Papers are sometimes prepared to address emerging or controversial issues, such as management of moist forests, elk thermal cover, or aspen forest in the Blue Mountains. These papers help establish a foundation of relevant literature, concepts, and principles that continuously evolve as an issue matures, and hence they may experience many iterations through time. [But also note that some papers have not changed since their initial development, in which case they reflect historical concepts or procedures.]
- (4) Papers synthesize science viewed as particularly relevant to geographical and management contexts for the Umatilla National Forest. This is considered to be the Forest's self-selected 'best available science' (BAS), realizing that non-agency commenters would generally have a different conception of what constitutes BAS – like beauty, BAS is in the eye of the beholder.
- (5) The objective of some papers is to locate and summarize the science germane to a particular topic or issue, including obscure sources such as master's theses or Ph.D. dissertations. In other instances, a paper may be designed to wade through an overwhelming amount of published science (dry-forest management), and then synthesize sources viewed as being most relevant to a local context.
- (6) White papers function as a citable literature source for methodologies, models, and procedures used during environmental analysis – by citing a white paper, specialist reports can include less verbiage describing analytical databases, techniques, and so forth, some of which change little (if at all) from one planning effort to another.
- (7) White papers are often used to describe how a map, database, or other product was developed. In this situation, the white paper functions as a 'user's guide' for the new product. Examples include papers dealing with historical products: (a) historical fire extents for the Tucannon watershed (WP Silv-21); (b) an 1880s map developed from General Land Office survey notes (WP Silv-41); and (c) a

description of historical mapping sources (24 separate items) available from the Forest's history website (WP Silv-23).

The following papers are available from the Forest's website: [Silviculture White Papers](#)

Paper #	Title
1	Big tree program
2	Description of composite vegetation database
3	Range of variation recommendations for dry, moist, and cold forests
4	Active management of dry forests in the Blue Mountains: silvicultural considerations
5	Site productivity estimates for upland forest plant associations of the Blue and Ochoco Mountains
6	Fire regimes of the Blue Mountains
7	Active management of moist forests in the Blue Mountains: silvicultural considerations
8	Keys for identifying forest series and plant associations of the Blue and Ochoco Mountains
9	Is elk thermal cover ecologically sustainable?
10	A stage is a stage is a stage...or is it? Successional stages, structural stages, seral stages
11	Blue Mountains vegetation chronology
12	Calculated values of basal area and board-foot timber volume for existing (known) values of canopy cover
13	Created opening, minimum stocking level, and reforestation standards from the Umatilla National Forest land and resource management plan
14	Description of EVG-PI database
15	Determining green-tree replacements for snags: a process paper
16	Douglas-fir tussock moth: a briefing paper
17	Fact sheet: Forest Service trust funds
18	Fire regime condition class queries
19	Forest health notes for an Interior Columbia Basin Ecosystem Management Project field trip on July 30, 1998 (handout)
20	Height-diameter equations for tree species of the Blue and Wallowa Mountains
21	Historical fires in the headwaters portion of the Tucannon River watershed
22	Range of variation recommendations for insect and disease susceptibility
23	Historical vegetation mapping
24	How to measure a big tree
25	Important insects and diseases of the Blue Mountains
26	Is this stand overstocked? An environmental education activity
27	Mechanized timber harvest: some ecosystem management considerations
28	Common plants of the south-central Blue Mountains (Malheur National Forest)
29	Potential natural vegetation of the Umatilla National Forest
30	Potential vegetation mapping chronology
31	Probability of tree mortality as related to fire-caused crown scorch
32	Review of the "Integrated scientific assessment for ecosystem management in the interior Columbia basin, and portions of the Klamath and Great basins" – forest vegetation
33	Silviculture facts

Paper #	Title
34	Silvicultural activities: description and terminology
35	Site potential tree height estimates for the Pomeroy and Walla Walla ranger districts
36	Tree density protocol for mid-scale assessments
37	Tree density thresholds as related to crown-fire susceptibility
38	Umatilla National Forest Land and Resource Management Plan: forestry direction
39	Updates of maximum stand density index and site index for the Blue Mountains variant of the Forest Vegetation Simulator
40	Competing vegetation analysis for the southern portion of the Tower Fire area
41	Using General Land Office survey notes to characterize historical vegetation conditions for the Umatilla National Forest
42	Life history traits for common conifer trees of the Blue Mountains
43	Timber volume reductions associated with green-tree snag replacements
44	Density management field exercise
45	Climate change and carbon sequestration: vegetation management considerations
46	The Knutson-Vandenberg (K-V) program
47	Active management of quaking aspen plant communities in the northern Blue Mountains: regeneration ecology and silvicultural considerations
48	The Tower Fire...then and now. Using camera points to monitor postfire recovery
49	How to prepare a silvicultural prescription for uneven-aged management
50	Stand density conditions for the Umatilla National Forest: a range of variation analysis
51	Restoration opportunities for upland forest environments of the Umatilla National Forest
52	New perspectives in riparian management: Why might we want to consider active management for certain portions of riparian habitat conservation areas?
53	Eastside Screens chronology
54	Using mathematics in forestry: an environmental education activity
55	Silviculture certification: tips, tools, and trip-ups
56	Vegetation polygon mapping and classification standards: Malheur, Umatilla, and Wallowa-Whitman national forests
57	The state of vegetation databases on the Malheur, Umatilla, and Wallowa-Whitman national forests

REVISION HISTORY

March 2014: This revision implemented the new white-paper template format, and minor formatting and editing changes were made throughout the document.