Comparison of tree mortality patterns between even- and uneven-aged stands

2019 Forest Ecosystem Monitoring Cooperative conference December 13, 2019. Burlington, Vermont.

> Rebeca Cordero Montoya (M.Sc. Student) UQO-ISFORT

Collaborators: Philippe Nolet¹, Christian Messier¹, Pascal Rochon^{1,2} and Tony D'Amato³ University of Quebec in Outaouais¹ - Nova Sylva Inc.² ⁻ Rubenstein School of Environment and Natural Resources, UVM³













Presentation objectives

Terrestrial Mobile LiDAR approach

Mortality project using LiDAR



Forest inventory (LiDAR) Sites are delimited



Point cloud collection

Velodyne LiDAR

Augmented[™] LiDAR Simultaneous localisation & mapping







Forest inventory (LiDAR) Sites are delimited



Point cloud collection

Simultaneous localisation & mapping

Augmented[™] LiDAR

Velodyne LiDAR°



Automatic identification From a group of algorithms, the characteristics of the trees are extracted



Digital elevation model

Extraction of the stems (only)

DBH calculation



Roussel, J.R., Auty, D., De Boissieu, F., & Sánchez Meador, A. (2019).

Assisted validation (visual)

R & QGIS scripts-integrated were created to facilitate the DBH validation by QGIS





Woody debris





Vernal pool





Comparison of tree mortality patterns between even- and uneven-aged stands

PHOTO S.OUKPEDJO

Even-aged

- Stand structure is continuously changing
- Favors shade-intolerant tree species



- Stable stand structure
- Favors shade-tolerant species



Nolet, P., Kneeshaw, D., Messier, C., & Béland, M. (2018).

Spatial and temporal scales

Kuuluvainen, Tahvonen, & Aakala (2012)



Stand dynamics influences tree vulnerability to stressors



Long-term trial (2016-2017):

NATURE

- Strips 15 years
- Strips 30 years
- Old forests

9 sites from each type of forest management





A sampling with a great variability!

61k acres







Results & Potential use

>>> point cloud Database

Overview

Inventory for 22 sites

Management	alive	dead
EAS 30	3,984	70
UEAS 30	2,345	112
UEAS 15	2,792	164
Grand Total	9,121	346

Local topograpy

		alive	dead
EAS	Flat Area	98.78%	1.22%
	Lower Slope	97.13%	2.87%
	Middle Slope	98.35%	1.65%
	Ridge	98.10%	1.90%
	Upper Slope	98.55%	1.45%
	Valley	98.28%	1.72%
UEAS	Flat Area	95.95%	4.05%
	Lower Slope	95.26%	4.74%
	Middle Slope	94.43%	5.57%
	Ridge	95.10%	4.90%
	Upper Slope	93.48%	6.52%
	Valley	96.80%	3.20%







ĺ	
	Status
	dood
	ueau
	alive

Diameter class distribution for the Even-aged (EAS) and Uneven-aged (UEAS) stands





Mortality occurring by self-thinning versus other factors (e.g. stressedrelated)



X, Y position of every tree



Take-home message



- □ For similar DBH classes tree mortality is higher in UEAS than in EAS stands.
- Current competition does not explain this higher mortality, hence...
- It seems that trees growing in UEAS stands have a higher vulnerability to stressors than the ones in EAS stands.
- □ Terrestrial mobile LiDAR: a promising technique ≠ 'plug & play' tool
- A database provided by a point cloud gives endless opportunities for studying the forest from the office.

Acknowledgements

PHILIPPE NOLET CHRISTIAN MESSIER PASCAL ROCHON TONY D'AMATO JEAN FRANÇOIS SÉNÉCAL MARC-OLIVIER MARTIN GUAY MEDHI ELHRIZI SADATH OUKPEDJO LÉRY TANGUAY **RÉGIS POULIOT** MARIE-ÈVE ROY ÉMILIE LADENT FLORENCE TAUC ALINE MEUNIER LIANE NOWELL



Rebeca Cordero Montoya corr04@uqo.ca











