

Forests cover a vast area of the United States, 304 million ha, or approximately one-third of the Nation's land area (Smith and others 2009). These forests possess the capacity to provide a broad range of goods and services to current and future generations, to safeguard biological diversity, and to contribute to the resilience of ecosystems, societies, and economies (USDA Forest Service 2011). Their ecological roles include supplying large and consistent quantities of clean water, preventing soil erosion, and providing habitat for a broad diversity of plant and animal species. Their socioeconomic benefits include wood products, nontimber goods, recreational opportunities, and pleasing natural beauty. Both the ecological integrity and the continued capacity of these forests to provide ecological and economic goods and services are of concern, however, in the face of a long list of threats, including insect and disease infestation, fragmentation, catastrophic fire, invasive species, and the effects of climate change.

Natural and anthropogenic stresses vary among biophysical regions and local environments; they also change over time and interact with each other. These and other factors make it challenging to establish baselines of forest health and to detect important departures from normal forest ecosystem functioning (Riitters and Tkacz 2004). Monitoring the health of forests is a critically important task, however, reflected within the Criteria and Indicators for the Conservation and Sustainable Management of Temperate and Boreal Forests (Montréal Process Working Group 1995), which the Forest Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture,

uses as a forest sustainability assessment framework (USDA Forest Service 2004, 2011). The primary objective of such monitoring is to identify ecological resources whose condition is deteriorating in subtle ways over large regions in response to cumulative stresses, which requires consistent, large-scale, and long-term monitoring of key indicators of forest health status, change, and trends (Riitters and Tkacz 2004). This is best accomplished through the participation of multiple Federal, State, academic, and private partners.

While the concept of a healthy forest has universal appeal, forest ecologists and managers have struggled with how exactly to define forest health (Teale and Castello 2011), and there is no universally accepted definition. Such a definition can help guide efforts to monitor and assess forest health, with which managers and policymakers have also struggled. Most definitions of forest health can be categorized as representing an ecological or a utilitarian perspective (Kolb and others 1994). From an ecological perspective, the current understanding of ecosystem dynamics suggests that healthy ecosystems are those that are able to maintain their organization and autonomy over time while remaining resilient to stress (Costanza 1992), and that evaluations of forest health should emphasize factors that affect the inherent processes and resilience of forests (Edmonds and others 2011, Kolb and others 1994, Raffa and others 2009). On the other hand, the utilitarian perspective holds that a forest is healthy if management objectives are met, and that a forest is unhealthy if not (Kolb and others 1994). While this definition may be appropriate

CHAPTER 1.

Introduction

KEVIN M. POTTER

when a single, unambiguous management objective exists, such as the production of wood fiber or the maintenance of wilderness attributes, it is too narrow when multiple management objectives are required (Edmonds and others 2011, Teale and Castello 2011). Teale and Castello (2011) incorporate both ecological and utilitarian perspectives into their two-component definition of forest health: First, a healthy forest must be sustainable with respect to its size structure, including a correspondence between baseline and observed mortality; and second, a healthy forest must meet the landowner's objectives, provided that these objectives do not conflict with sustainability.

This national report, the 14th in an annual series sponsored by the Forest Health Monitoring (FHM) Program of the Forest Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture, attempts to quantify the status of, changes to, and trends in a wide variety of broadly defined indicators of forest health. The indicators described in this report encompass forest insect and disease activity, wildland fire occurrence, drought, tree mortality, and fragmentation, among others. The previous reports in this series are Ambrose and Conkling (2007, 2009), Conkling (2011), Conkling and others (2005), Coulston and others (2005a, 2005b, 2005c), and Potter and Conkling (2012a, 2012b, 2013a, 2013b, 2014, 2015).

This report has three specific objectives. The first is to present information about forest health from a national perspective, or from a multi-State regional perspective when appropriate, using data collected by the Forest Health Protection

(FHP) and Forest Inventory and Analysis (FIA) programs of the Forest Service, as well as from other sources available at a wide extent. The chapters that present analyses at a national scale, or multi-State regional scale, are divided between section 1 and section 2 of the report. Section 1 presents results from the analyses of forest health data that are available on an annual basis. Such repeated analyses of regularly collected indicator measurements allow for the detection of trends over time and help establish a baseline for future comparisons (Riitters and Tkacz 2004). Section 2 presents longer term forest health trends, in addition to describing new techniques for analyzing forest health data at national or regional scales (the second objective of the report). While in-depth interpretation and analysis of specific geographic or ecological regions are beyond the scope of these parts of the report, the chapters in sections 1 and 2 present information that can be used to identify areas that may require investigation at a finer scale.

The second objective of the report is to present new techniques for analyzing forest health data as well as new applications of established techniques, presented in selected chapters of section 2. Examples in this report are chapter 6, which presents the 2012 National Insect and Disease Risk Map, and chapter 7, which assesses the decline of intact forest by forest type and ownership using FIA and national land cover data.

The third objective of the report is to present results of recently completed Evaluation Monitoring (EM) projects funded through

the FHM national program. These project summaries, presented in section 3, determine the extent, severity, and/or cause of forest health problems (FHM 2014), generally at a finer scale than that addressed by the analyses in sections 1 and 2. Each of the 10 chapters in section 3 contains an overview of an EM project, key results, and contacts for more information.

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

THE FOREST HEALTH MONITORING PROGRAM

The national FHM Program is designed to determine the status, changes, and trends in indicators of forest condition on an annual

basis, and covers all forested lands through a partnership encompassing the Forest Service, State foresters, and other State and Federal agencies and academic groups (FHM 2014). The FHM Program utilizes data from a wide variety of data sources, both inside and outside the Forest Service, and develops analytical approaches for addressing forest health issues that affect the sustainability of forest ecosystems. The FHM Program has five major components (fig. 1.2):

- **Detection Monitoring**—nationally standardized aerial and ground surveys to evaluate status and change in condition of forest ecosystems (sections 1 and 2 of this report).
- **Evaluation Monitoring**—projects to determine extent, severity, and causes of undesirable changes in forest health identified through Detection Monitoring (section 3 of this report).
- **Intensive Site Monitoring**—projects to enhance understanding of cause-effect relationships by linking Detection Monitoring to ecosystem process studies and to assess specific issues, such as calcium depletion and carbon sequestration, at multiple spatial scales (section 3 of this report).
- **Research on Monitoring Techniques**—work to develop or improve indicators, monitoring systems, and analytical techniques, such as urban and riparian forest health monitoring, early detection of invasive species, multivariate analyses of forest health indicators, and spatial scan statistics (section 2 of this report).

Alaska Ecoregion Provinces

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

Conterminous States Ecoregion Provinces

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

- Analysis and Reporting—synthesis of information from various data sources within and external to the Forest Service to produce issue-driven reports on status and change in forest health at national, regional, and State levels (sections 1, 2, and 3 of this report).

The FHM Program, in addition to national reporting, generates regional and State reports, often in cooperation with FHM partners both within the Forest Service and in State forestry and agricultural departments. For example, the FHM regions cooperate with their respective State partners to produce the annual Forest Health Highlights report series, available on the FHM Web site at www.fs.fed.us/foresthealth/fhm. Other examples include Harris and others (2011) and Steinman (2004).

The FHM Program and its partners also produce reports and journal articles on monitoring techniques and analytical methods, including forest health data (Smith and Conkling 2004); soils as an indicator of forest health (O'Neill and others 2005); urban forest health monitoring (Bigsby and others 2014; Cumming and others 2006, 2007; Lake and others 2006); health conditions in National forests (Morin and others 2006); crown conditions (Randolph 2010a, 2010b, 2013; Randolph and Moser 2009; Schomaker and others 2007); vegetation diversity and structure (Schulz and Gray 2012, Schulz and others 2009); forest lichen communities (Jovan and others 2012, Root and others 2014); downed woody materials in forests (Woodall and others 2012, 2013); ozone monitoring (Rose




Figure 1.2—The design of the Forest Health Monitoring (FHM) Program of the Forest Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture (FHM 2003). A fifth component, Analysis and Reporting of Results, draws from the four FHM components shown here and provides information to help support land management policies and decisions.

and Coulston 2009); predicting establishment of alien-invasive forest insect species (Koch and others 2011, 2014; Yemshanov and others 2014); spatial patterns of land cover (Riitters 2011, Riitters and Wickham 2012, Riitters and others 2012); broad-scale assessments of forest biodiversity (Potter and Koch 2014; Potter and Woodall 2012, 2014); predictions of climate

change effects on forest tree species (Potter and Hargrove 2013); and the overall forest health indicator program (Woodall and others 2011).

For more information about the FHM Program, visit the FHM Web site at www.fs.fed.us/foresthealth/fhm. Among other things, this Web site includes links to all past national forest health reports (www.fs.fed.us/foresthealth/fhm/pubs), information about funded Evaluation Monitoring projects (www.fs.fed.us/foresthealth/fhm/em), and annual State Forest Health Highlights reports (www.fs.fed.us/foresthealth/fhm/fhh/fhmusamap.shtml).

DATA SOURCES

Forest Service data sources included in this edition of the FHM national report are: FIA annualized phase 2 and phase 3 survey data (Bechtold and Patterson 2005, Woodall and others 2010, Woudenberg and others 2010), FHP national Insect and Disease Survey forest mortality and defoliation data for 2013 (FHP 2014), Moderate Resolution Imaging Spectroradiometer (MODIS) Active Fire Detections for the United States database for 2013 (USDA Forest Service 2014), forest cover data developed from MODIS satellite imagery by the U.S. Forest Service Remote Sensing Applications Center, and 186 individual insect and disease hazard models developed by the Forest Health Technology Enterprise Team (FHTET). Other sources of data are the Parameter-elevation Regression on Independent Slopes Model (PRISM) climate mapping system data (Daly and Taylor 2000, PRISM Climate Group 2014) and

2001 and 2006 National Land Cover Database land cover maps (U.S. Geological Survey 2011a, 2011b).

As a major source of data for several FHM analyses, the FIA Program merits detailed description. The FIA Program collects forest inventory information across all forest land ownerships in the United States and maintains a network of more than 125,000 permanent forested ground plots across the conterminous United States and southeastern Alaska, with a sampling intensity of approximately 1 plot per 2428 ha. FIA phase 2 encompasses the annualized inventory measured on plots at regular intervals, with each plot surveyed every 5 to 7 years in most Eastern States, but with plots in the Rocky Mountain and Pacific Northwest regions surveyed once every 10 years (Reams and others 2005). The standard 0.067-ha plot (fig. 1.3) consists of four 7.315-m radius subplots (approximately 168.6 m² or 1/24th acre), on which field crews measure trees at least 12.7 cm in diameter. Within each of these subplots is nested a 2.073-m radius microplot (approximately 13.48 m² or 1/300th acre), on which crews measure trees smaller than 12.7 cm in diameter. A core-optional variant of the standard design includes four “macroplots,” each with radius of 17.953 m (or approximately 0.1012 ha) that originates at the center of each subplot (Woudenberg and others 2010).

FIA phase 3 plots represent a subset of these phase 2 plots, with 1 phase 3 plot for every 16 standard FIA phase 2 plots. In addition to traditional forest inventory measurements, data

for a variety of important ecological indicators are collected from phase 3 plots, including tree crown condition, lichen communities, down woody material, soil condition, and vegetation structure and diversity, while data on ozone bioindicator plants are collected on a separate grid of plots (Woodall and others 2010, 2011). Most of these additional forest health indicators were measured as part of the FHM Detection Monitoring ground plot system prior to 2000¹ (Palmer and others 1991).

FHM REPORT PRODUCTION

This FHM national report, the 14th in a series of such annual documents, is produced by forest health monitoring researchers at the Eastern Forest Environmental Threat Assessment Center (EFETAC) in collaboration with North Carolina State University cooperators. EFETAC, a unit of the Southern Research Station of the Forest Service, was established under the Healthy Forests Restoration Act of 2003 to generate the knowledge and tools needed to anticipate and respond to environmental threats. For more information about the research team and about threats to U.S. forests, please visit www.forestthreats.org/about.

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




Figure 1.3—The Forest Inventory and Analysis Program mapped plot design. Subplot 1 is the center of the cluster with subplots 2, 3, and 4 located 120 feet away at azimuths of 360°, 120°, and 240°, respectively (Woudenberg and others 2010).

LITERATURE CITED

- Ambrose, M.J.; Conkling, B.L., eds. 2007. Forest Health Monitoring 2005 national technical report. Gen. Tech. Rep. SRS-104. Asheville, NC: U.S. Department of Agriculture Forest Service, Southern Research Station. 76 p.
- Ambrose, M.J.; Conkling, B.L., eds. 2009. Forest Health Monitoring 2006 national technical report. Gen. Tech. Rep. SRS-117. Asheville, NC: U.S. Department of Agriculture Forest Service, Southern Research Station. 118 p.
- Bailey, R.G. 1995. Descriptions of the ecoregions of the United States. 2^d ed. Misc. Publ. 1391. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Agriculture Forest Service. 108 p. [Map scale 1:7,500,000].
- Bechtold, W.A.; Patterson, P.L., eds. 2005. The enhanced Forest Inventory and Analysis Program—national sampling design and estimation procedures. Gen. Tech. Rep. SRS-80. Asheville, NC: U.S. Department of Agriculture Forest Service, Southern Research Station. 85 p.
- Biggsby, K.M.; Ambrose, M.J.; Tobin, P.C.; Sills, E.O. 2014. The cost of gypsy moth sex in the city. *Urban Forestry & Urban Greening*. 13(3): 459-468.
- Cleland, D.T.; Avers, P.E.; McNab, W.H. [and others]. 1997. National hierarchical framework of ecological units. In: Boyce, M.S.; Haney, A., eds. *Ecosystem management applications for sustainable forest and wildlife resources*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press: 181-200.
- Cleland, D.T.; Freeouf, J.A.; Keys, J.E., Jr. [and others]. 2007. Ecological subregions: sections and subsections for the conterminous United States. In: Sloan, A.M., tech ed. Gen. Tech. Rep. WO-76. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Agriculture Forest Service. [Map, presentation scale 1:3,500,000; Albers equal area projection; colored]. [Also available as a Geographic Information System coverage in ArcINFO[®] format on CD-ROM or online at <http://data.fs.usda.gov/geodata/edw/datasets.php>. [Date accessed: July 20, 2015].
- Conkling, B.L.; Coulston, J.W.; Ambrose, M.J., eds. 2005. Forest Health Monitoring 2001 national technical report. Gen. Tech. Rep. SRS-81. Asheville, NC: U.S. Department of Agriculture Forest Service, Southern Research Station. 204 p.
- Conkling, B.L., ed. 2011. Forest Health Monitoring 2007 national technical report. Gen. Tech. Rep. SRS-147. Asheville, NC: U.S. Department of Agriculture Forest Service, Southern Research Station. 159 p.
- Costanza, R. 1992. Toward an operational definition of ecosystem health. In: Costanza, R.; Norton, B.G.; Haskell, B.D., eds. *Ecosystem health: new goals for environmental management*. Washington, DC: Island Press: 239-256.
- Coulston, J.W.; M.J.; Riitters, K.H.; Conkling, B.L. 2005a. Forest Health Monitoring 2002 national technical report. Gen. Tech. Rep. SRS-84. Asheville, NC: U.S. Department of Agriculture Forest Service, Southern Research Station. 97 p.
- Coulston, J.W.; Ambrose, M.J.; Riitters, K.H. [and others]. 2005b. Forest Health Monitoring 2003 national technical report. Gen. Tech. Rep. SRS-85. Asheville, NC: U.S. Department of Agriculture Forest Service, Southern Research Station. 97 p.
- Coulston, J.W.; Ambrose, M.J.; Riitters, K.H.; Conkling, B.L. 2005c. Forest Health Monitoring 2004 national technical report. Gen. Tech. Rep. SRS-90. Asheville, NC: U.S. Department of Agriculture Forest Service, Southern Research Station. 81 p.
- Cumming, A.B.; Nowak, D.J.; Twardus, D.B. [and others]. 2007. Urban forests of Wisconsin: pilot monitoring project 2002. NA-FR-05-07. Newtown Square, PA: U.S. Department of Agriculture Forest Service, Northeastern Area State and Private Forestry. 33 p. Available online: low resolution: http://www.na.fs.fed.us/pubs/fhm/pilot/pilot_study_wisconsin_02_lr.pdf high resolution: http://www.na.fs.fed.us/pubs/fhm/pilot/pilot_study_wisconsin2_02_hr.pdf [Date accessed: October 19, 2007]
- Cumming, A.B.; Twardus, D.B.; Smith, W.D. 2006. National Forest Health Monitoring Program, Maryland and Massachusetts street tree monitoring pilot projects. NA-FR-01-06. Newtown Square, PA: U.S. Department of Agriculture Forest Service, Northeastern Area State and Private Forestry. 23 p.
- Daly, C.; Taylor, G. 2000. United States average monthly or annual precipitation, temperature, and relative humidity 1961-90. ArcINFO[®] and ArcView[®] coverages. Corvallis, OR: Spatial Climate Analysis Service at Oregon State University (SCAS/OSU).

- Edmonds, R.L.; Agee, J.K.; Gara, R.I. 2011. Forest health and protection. Long Grove, IL: Waveland Press, Inc. 667 p.
- Forest Health Monitoring (FHM). 2003. Forest Health Monitoring: a national strategic plan. http://fhm.fs.fed.us/annc/strategic_plan03.pdf. [Date accessed: June 28, 2013].
- Forest Health Protection (FHP). 2014. Insect and Disease Detection Survey Database (IDS). Digital Data. Fort Collins, CO: U.S. Department of Agriculture Forest Service, Forest Health Technology Enterprise Team. Available: <http://foresthealth.fs.usda.gov/ids>. [Date accessed: July 20, 2015].
- Forest Health Monitoring (FHM). 2014. Program description. Forest Health Monitoring fact sheet series. <http://www.fhm.fs.fed.us/fact/>. [Date accessed: July 29, 2014].
- Harris, J.L., comp.; Region 2 Forest Health Protection staff. 2011. Forest health conditions, 2009–2010: Rocky Mountain region (R2). R2–11–RO–31. Golden, CO: U.S. Department of Agriculture Forest Service, Renewable Resources, Forest Health Protection, Rocky Mountain Region. 108 p.
- Jovan, S.; Riddell, J.; Padgett, P.E.; Nash, T.H., III. 2012. Eutrophic lichens respond to multiple forms of N: implications for critical levels and critical loads research. *Ecological Applications*. 22(7): 1910–1922.
- Koch, F.H.; Yemshanov, D.; Colunga-Garcia, M. [and others]. 2011. Potential establishment of alien-invasive forest insect species in the United States: where and how many? *Biological Invasions*. 13: 969–985.
- Koch, F.H.; Yemshanov, D.; Haack, R.A.; Magarey, R.D. 2014. Using a network model to assess risk of forest pest spread via recreational travel. *PLoS ONE* 9(7): e102105.
- Kolb, T.E.; Wagner, M.R.; Covington, W.W. 1994. Concepts of forest health: utilitarian and ecosystem perspectives. *Journal of Forestry*. 92: 10–15.
- Lake, M.; Marshall, P.; Mielke, M. [and others]. 2006. National Forest Health Monitoring Program monitoring urban forests in Indiana: pilot study 2002, part 1. Analysis of field methods and data collection. Gen. Tech. Rep. NA–FR–06–06. Newtown Square, PA: U.S. Department of Agriculture Forest Service, Northeastern Area State and Private Forestry. <http://www.fhm.fs.fed.us/pubs/ufhm/indianaforests02/indianaforests02.html>. [Date accessed: November 6, 2007].
- Montréal Process Working Group. 1995. Criteria and indicators for the conservation and sustainable management of temperate and boreal forests. <http://www.montrealprocess.org>. [Date accessed: March 4, 2015].
- Morin, R.S.; Liebhold, A.M.; Gottschalk, K.W. [and others]. 2006. Analysis of forest health monitoring surveys on the Allegheny National Forest (1998–2001). Gen. Tech. Rep. NE–339. Newtown Square, PA: U.S. Department of Agriculture Forest Service, Northeastern Research Station. 102 p. http://www.fs.fed.us/ne/newtown_square/publications/. [Date accessed: November 6, 2007].
- Nowacki, G.; Brock, T. 1995. Ecoregions and subregions of Alaska [EcoMap]. Version 2.0. Juneau, AK: U.S. Department of Agriculture Forest Service, Alaska Region. [Map, presentation scale 1:5,000,000; colored].
- O'Neill, K.P.; Amacher, M.C.; Perry, C.H. 2005. Soils as an indicator of forest health: a guide to the collection, analysis, and interpretation of soil indicator data in the Forest Inventory and Analysis Program. Gen. Tech. Rep. NC–258. St. Paul, MN: U.S. Department of Agriculture Forest Service, North Central Research Station. 53 p.
- Palmer, C.J.; Riitters, K.H.; Strickland, T. [and others]. 1991. Monitoring and research strategy for forests—Environmental Monitoring and Assessment Program (EMAP). EPA/600/4–91/012. Washington, DC: U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. 189 p.
- Potter, K.M.; Conkling, B.L., eds. 2012a. Forest Health Monitoring 2008 national technical report. Gen. Tech. Rep. SRS–158. Asheville, NC: U.S. Department of Agriculture Forest Service, Southern Research Station. 179 p.
- Potter, K.M.; Conkling, B.L., eds. 2012b. Forest Health Monitoring 2009 national technical report. Gen. Tech. Rep. SRS–167. Asheville, NC: U.S. Department of Agriculture Forest Service, Southern Research Station. 252 p.
- Potter, K.M.; Conkling, B.L., eds. 2013a. Forest Health Monitoring: national status, trends, and analysis 2010. Gen. Tech. Rep. SRS–176. Asheville, NC: U.S. Department of Agriculture Forest Service, Southern Research Station. 162 p.
- Potter, K.M.; Conkling, B.L., eds. 2013b. Forest Health Monitoring: national status, trends, and analysis 2011. Gen. Tech. Rep. SRS–185. Asheville, NC: U.S. Department of Agriculture Forest Service, Southern Research Station. 149 p.

- Potter, K.M.; Conkling, B.L., eds. 2014. Forest Health Monitoring: national status, trends, and analysis 2012. Gen. Tech. Rep. SRS-198. Asheville, NC: U.S. Department of Agriculture Forest Service, Southern Research Station. 192 p.
- Potter, K.M.; Conkling, B.L., eds. 2015. Forest Health Monitoring: national status, trends, and analysis 2013. Gen. Tech. Rep. SRS-207. Asheville, NC: U.S. Department of Agriculture Forest Service, Southern Research Station. 199 p.
- Potter, K.M.; Hargrove, W.W. 2013. Quantitative metrics for assessing predicted climate change pressure on North American tree species. *Mathematical and Computational Forestry and Natural Resources Sciences*. 5(2): 151-169.
- Potter, K.M.; Koch, F.H. 2014. Phylogenetic community structure of forests across the conterminous United States: regional ecological patterns and forest health implications. *Forest Science*. 60(5): 851-861.
- Potter, K.M.; Woodall, C.W. 2012. Trends over time in tree and seedling phylogenetic diversity indicate regional differences in forest biodiversity change. *Ecological Applications*. 22(2): 517-531.
- Potter, K.M.; Woodall, C.W. 2014. Does biodiversity make a difference? Relationships between species richness, evolutionary diversity, and aboveground live tree biomass across U.S. forests. *Forest Ecology and Management*. 321: 117-129.
- PRISM Climate Group. 2014. 2.5-arcmin (4 km) gridded monthly climate data. <http://www.prism.oregonstate.edu>. [Date accessed: June 9, 2014].
- Raffa, K.F.; Aukema, B.; Bentz, B.J. [and others]. 2009. A literal use of "forest health" safeguards against misuse and misapplication. *Journal of Forestry*. 107: 276-277.
- Randolph, K.C. 2010a. Equations relating compacted and uncompacted live crown ratio for common tree species in the South. *Southern Journal of Applied Forestry*. 34(3): 118-123.
- Randolph, K.C. 2010b. Comparison of the arithmetic and geometric means in estimating crown diameter and crown cross-sectional area. *Southern Journal of Applied Forestry*. 34(4): 186-189.
- Randolph, K.C. 2013. Development history and bibliography of the U.S. Forest Service crown-condition indicator for forest health monitoring. *Environmental Monitoring and Assessment*. 185(6): 4977-4993.
- Randolph, K.C.; Moser, W.K. 2009. Tree crown condition in Missouri, 2000–2003. Gen. Tech. Rep. SRS-113. Asheville, NC: U.S. Department of Agriculture Forest Service, Southern Research Station. 11 p.
- Reams, G.A.; Smith, W.D.; Hansen, M.H. [and others]. 2005. The Forest Inventory and Analysis sampling frame. In: Bechtold, W.A.; Patterson, P.L., eds. *The enhanced Forest Inventory and Analysis Program—national sampling design and estimation procedures*. Gen. Tech. Rep. SRS-80. Asheville, NC: U.S. Department of Agriculture Forest Service, Southern Research Station: 11-26.
- Riitters, K.H. 2011. Spatial patterns of land cover in the United States: a technical document supporting the Forest Service 2010 RPA assessment. Gen. Tech. Rep. SRS-136. Asheville, NC: U.S. Department of Agriculture Forest Service, Southern Research Station. 64 p.
- Riitters, K.H.; Wickham, J.D. 2012. Decline of forest interior conditions in the conterminous United States. *Scientific Reports*. 2: 653.
- Riitters, K.H.; Coulston, J.W.; Wickham, J.D. 2012. Fragmentation of forest communities in the Eastern United States. *Forest Ecology and Management*. 263: 85-93.
- Riitters, K.H.; Tkacz, B. 2004. The U.S. Forest Health Monitoring Program. In: Wiersma, G.B., ed. *Environmental monitoring*. Boca Raton, FL: CRC Press: 669-683.
- Root, H.T.; McCune, B.; Jovan, S. 2014. Lichen communities and species indicate climate thresholds in southeast and south-central Alaska, USA. *The Bryologist*. 117(3): 241-252.
- Rose, A.K.; Coulston, J.W. 2009. Ozone injury across the Southern United States, 2002–06. Gen. Tech. Rep. SRS-118. Asheville, NC: U.S. Department of Agriculture Forest Service, Southern Research Station. 25 p.
- Schomaker, M.E.; Zarnoch, S.J.; Bechtold, W.A. [and others]. 2007. *Crown-condition classification: a guide to data collection and analysis*. Gen. Tech. Rep. SRS-102. Asheville, NC: U.S. Department of Agriculture Forest Service, Southern Research Station. 78 p.
- Schulz, B.K.; Bechtold, W.A.; Zarnoch, S.J. 2009. Sampling and estimation procedures for the vegetation diversity and structure indicator. Gen. Tech. Rep. PNW-GTR-781. Portland, OR: U.S. Department of Agriculture Forest Service, Pacific Northwest Research Station. 53 p.

- Schulz, B.K.; Gray, A.N. 2013. The new flora of the northeastern USA: quantifying introduced plant species occupancy in forest ecosystems. *Environmental Monitoring and Assessment*. 185: 3931-3957.
- Smith, W.B.; Miles, P.D.; Perry, C.H.; Pugh, S.A. 2009. Forest resources of the United States, 2007. Gen. Tech. Rep. WO-78. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Agriculture Forest Service. 336 p.
- Smith, W.D.; Conkling, B.L. 2004. Analyzing forest health data. Gen. Tech. Rep. SRS-077. Asheville, NC: U.S. Department of Agriculture Forest Service, Southern Research Station. 33 p. http://www.srs.fs.usda.gov/pubs/gtr/gtr_srs077.pdf. [Date accessed: November 6, 2007].
- Steinman, J. 2004. Forest health monitoring in the Northeastern United States: disturbances and conditions during 1993–2002. NA-TP-01-04. Newtown Square, PA: U.S. Department of Agriculture Forest Service, Northeastern Area State and Private Forestry. 46 p. http://fhm.fs.fed.us/pubs/tp/dist_cond/dc.shtml. [Date accessed: December 8, 2009].
- Teale, S.A.; Castello, J.D. 2011. The past as key to the future: a new perspective on forest health. In: Castello, J.D.; Teale, S.A., eds. *Forest health: an integrated perspective*. New York: Cambridge University Press: 3-16.
- U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) Forest Service. 2004. National report on sustainable forests–2003. FS-766. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Agriculture Forest Service. 139 p.
- U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) Forest Service. 2011. National report on sustainable forests–2010. FS-979. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Agriculture Forest Service. 134 p.
- U.S. Geological Survey. 2011a. National land cover database 2001 land cover. Version 2.0, ed. 2.0. Sioux Falls, SD: U.S. Geological Survey. [Date accessed: August 12, 2011].
- U.S. Geological Survey. 2011b. National land cover database 2006 land cover. Ed. 1.0. Sioux Falls, SD: U.S. Geological Survey. [Date accessed: August 12, 2011].
- U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) Forest Service. 2014. MODIS active fire mapping program: fire detection GIS data. <http://activefiremaps.fs.fed.us/gisdata.php>. [Date accessed: March 31, 2014].
- Woodall, C.W.; Amacher, M.C.; Bechtold, W.A. [and others]. 2011. Status and future of the forest health indicators program of the USA. *Environmental Monitoring and Assessment*. 177: 419-436.
- Woodall, C.W.; Conkling, B.L.; Amacher, M.C. [and others]. 2010. The Forest Inventory and Analysis database version 4.0: database description and users manual for phase 3. Gen. Tech. Rep. NRS-61. Newtown Square, PA: U.S. Department of Agriculture Forest Service, Northern Research Station. 180 p.
- Woodall, C.W.; Walters, B.F.; Westfall, J.A. 2012. Tracking downed dead wood in forests over time: development of a piece matching algorithm for line intercept sampling. *Forest Ecology and Management*. 277: 196-204.
- Woodall, C.W.; Walters, B.F.; Oswalt, S.N. [and others]. 2013. Biomass and carbon attributes of downed woody materials in forests of the United States. *Forest Ecology and Management*. 305: 48-59.
- Woudenberg, S.W.; Conkling, B.L.; O'Connell, B.M. [and others]. 2010. The Forest Inventory and Analysis database: database description and users manual version 4.0 for phase 2. Gen. Tech. Rep. RMRS-GTR-245. Fort Collins, CO: U.S. Department of Agriculture Forest Service, Rocky Mountain Research Station. 336 p.
- Yemshanov, D.; Koch, F.H.; Lu, B. [and others]. 2014. There is no silver bullet: the value of diversification in planning invasive species surveillance. *Ecological Economics*. 104: 61-72.