

¹ Local host tree density increases forest insect disturbance severity,
² but host size effect depends on climatic water deficit

³ Michael J. Koontz^{1,2,*}, Andrew M. Latimer^{1,2}, Leif A. Mortenson³, Christopher J. Fettig³, Malcolm P.
⁴ North^{1,2,4}

⁵ ¹Graduate Group in Ecology, University of California, Davis, CA, USA

⁶ ²Department of Plant Sciences, University of California, Davis, CA, USA

⁷ ³USDA Forest Service, Pacific Southwest Research Station, Placerville, CA, USA

⁸ ⁴USDA Forest Service, Pacific Southwest Research Station, Davis, CA, USA

⁹ *Correspondence: michael.koontz@colorado.edu

¹⁰ Date report generated: April 07, 2019

¹¹ **Abstract**

¹² Bark beetles are a primary mortality agent of trees in western U.S. forests, and the recent Californian hot
¹³ drought of 2012 to 2015 created favorable conditions for bark beetle-induced tree mortality throughout the
¹⁴ yellow pine/mixed-conifer forest system in the Sierra Nevada mountain range. The western pine beetle,
¹⁵ *Dendroctonus brevicomis*, is the forest insect that is largely responsible for the especially common deaths of its
¹⁶ main host in California, the ponderosa pine tree (*Pinus ponderosa*). While previous work has demonstrated a
¹⁷ link between climate conditions related to tree water stress and forest density on the severity of the western
¹⁸ pine beetle disturbance, it remains challenging to disentangle the relative effects of these variables. Further,
¹⁹ forest density can affect western pine beetle behavior in a number of ways, which creates a need for more
²⁰ information on complex forest structure (including local density, tree size, and the heterogeneity of these
²¹ variables across a forest stand) to uncover the most likely mechanism.

²² We conducted aerial surveys over an established network of 32 permanent vegetation monitoring plots along
²³ a 350km and 1000m elevation gradient in the Sierra Nevada mountain range of California using a small,
²⁴ unhumanned aerial system (sUAS aka drone) equipped with a narrow-band multispectral camera. Using
²⁵ Structure from Motion (SfM) processing on over 450,000 images, we reconstructed the complex vegetation
²⁶ structure of over 9 square kilometers of forest that experienced ponderosa pine mortality as a result of
²⁷ western pine beetle activity. Using this dataset, we built a model to predict the probability of ponderosa
²⁸ pine mortality as a function of forest structure variables (including ponderosa pine density and mean size, as
²⁹ well as all tree density and mean size), an environmental gradient of climatic water deficit, and a Gaussian

30 process to capture spatial covariance in the response.

31 Data from small, unhummaned aerial systems (sUAS) can provide important context surrounding ground
32 plots, which enables inference and generates new insights into ecological processes. sUAS are best-suited to
33 enhancing ground data, which implies that we need not abandon lessons learned from sound experimental
34 design (i.e., a network of plots along a gradient is still a powerful way to use sUAS data).

35 Host availability for aggressive bark beetles appears to have played the dominant role in increasing the
36 probability of ponderosa pine mortality in the most hard-hit forest stands during the cumulative mortality
37 event of 2012 to 2018. Host size played a role in its interaction with environmental condition– climatic
38 water deficit– such that numerous and smaller host trees increased the probability of ponderosa mortality at
39 cool/wet sites, while numerous and larger host trees increased the probability of ponderosa mortality at
40 hot/dry sites.

41 Our results corroborate the role of host tree density and regional climate conditions on the severity of forest
42 insect disturbance, but also highlight the importance of complex forest structure (i.e., both host density and
43 average host size) in its interaction with regional climate. Thus, the future forest structure may be affected
44 differently by a large-scale forest insect disturbance for the same host tree/forest insect pairing, and during
45 the same extreme drought, but across a gradient of regional climate conditions.

46 Introduction

47 Framing: environmental drivers of insect severity, forest structure drivers of insect severity,

48 Aggressive bark beetles dealt the final blow to many of the nearly 150 million trees killed in the California
49 drought of 2012 to 2015 and its aftermath (USDAFS 2019). A harbinger of climate change effects to come,
50 high temperatures exacerbating the extreme drought led to tree mortality events of unprecedented size in the
51 driest, densest forests across the state (Millar and Stephenson 2015, Young et al. 2017). A century of fire
52 suppression policy has enabled forests to grow into dense stands, which increases water stress on trees and
53 makes them more vulnerable to bark beetle attack (Fettig 2012, North et al. 2015).

54 Forests in California’s Sierra Nevada region are characterized by regular bark beetle disturbances that interact
55 with forest structure. Bark beetles shape forest structure as they sporadically kill weakened trees under
56 normal conditions, or wide swaths of even healthy trees under outbreak conditions (Raffa et al. 2015). Forest
57 structure also strongly influences bark beetle activity. Low-density forests are less prone to bark beetle
58 attacks (Fettig 2012), but resolving the mechanism underlying this observation requires a more nuanced view
59 of forest structure. For instance, a low-density forest may resist attack because longer dispersal distances are

60 required for successful colonization of new hosts, because widely-spaced trees experience less competition
61 for water resources and thus average tree vigor is greater (Hayes et al. 2009), or because its wider canopy
62 openings disrupt pheromone signaling between beetles (Fettig 2012).

63 Tree density is often a coarse gauge of the size and spatial distribution of trees— the forest structure— with
64 which bark beetles interact (Raffa et al. 2008). Climate change mitigation strategies emphasize reducing tree
65 densities (North et al. 2015, Young et al. 2017), but understanding the optimal scale and pattern of tree
66 distribution that can mitigate bark beetle outbreaks will be vital for predicting how California forests may
67 respond to these interventions. Recent research has shown a strong link between complex forest structure
68 and forest resilience, but measuring this complexity generally requires expensive equipment or labor-intensive
69 field surveys (Larson and Churchill 2012, Kane et al. 2014). These barriers restrict survey frequency and
70 extent, which limits insights into phenomena like bark beetle outbreaks that rapidly emerge over weeks to
71 months but have long-lasting effects on forest conditions. Further, the vast spatial extent and environmental
72 gradient of mortality (Young et al. 2017, USDAFS 2019) challenges our ability to simultaneously consider
73 how environmental conditions may interact with local forest structure to produce patterns of insect activity.
74 Small, unhumanned aerial systems (sUAS) enable fast and relatively cheap remote imaging over dozens of
75 hectares of forest, which can be used to determine both forest structure and tree condition at the individual
76 tree scale (Morris et al. 2017, Shiklomanov et al. 2019).

77 We used ultra-high resolution remote sensing data from a small, unhumanned aerial system over a network of
78 32 sites in the Sierra Nevada spanning 1000m of elevation and 350km of latitude and covering a total of 9
79 square kilometers of forest to ask how fine-scale forest structure affected the probability of tree mortality
80 during the cumulative mortality event of 2012 to 2018. We asked:

- 81 1. How does local host tree density and size affect the severity of western pine beetle disturbance?
- 82 2. How does total tree density and size affect the severity of western pine beetle disturbance?
- 83 3. How does environmentally-driven tree moisture stress affect the severity of western pine beetle distur-
84 bance?
- 85 4. Do the effects of forest structure and environmental condition on western pine beetle disturbance
86 interact?

87 Which trees die during drought? Gradient of stress to host selection. Stephenson et al. (2019) argue that
88 there are differences across species during an extreme drought on whether environment or forest structure
89 drives mortality. But even within the same species, there could be *interaction* between the background

90 environmental condition and the forest struture in driving mortality that gives rise to stress-dominated
91 mortality in some locations and host-selection dominated mortality in other locations *for the same species*.

92 Methods

93 Study system

94 The study sites comprise mostly ponderosa pine trees, *Pinus ponderosa*, whose primary bark beetle predator
95 in California is the western pine beetle (WPB), *Dendroctonus brevicomis*. The WPB is an aggressive bark
96 beetle, meaning it must attack and kill live trees in order to successfully reproduce (Raffa et al. 2008).
97 Pioneer WPBs disperse to a new host tree, determine the host's susceptibility to attack, and use pheromone
98 signals to attract other WPBs. The attracted WPBs mass attack the tree by boring into its inner bark,
99 laying eggs, and dying, leaving their offspring to develop inside the doomed tree before themselves dispersing
100 (Raffa et al. 2008). Small WPB populations prefer weakened trees but large populations can overwhelm
101 the defense mechanisms of even healthy trees. Successful attacks on large, healthy trees are boons to bark
102 beetle fecundity and trigger outbreaks in which populations explode and massive tree mortality occurs. In
103 California, the WPB can have 3 generations in a single year giving it a greater potential to spread rapidly
104 through forests than its more infamous congener, the mountain pine beetle, *Dendroctonus ponderosa* (MPB).

105 We built our study on 180 vegetation/forest insect monitoring plots at 36 sites established between 2016 and
106 2017 (Fettig et al. 2019). These established plots were located in beetle-attacked, mixed-conifer forests across
107 the Eldorado, Stanislaus, Sierra and Sequoia National Forests and were stratified by elevation (914-1219
108 meters [3000-4000 feet], 1219-1524 meters [4000-5000 feet], 1524-1828 meters [5000-6000 feet] above sea level).
109 In the Sequoia National Forest, the National Forest that is furthest south, plots were stratified with the lowest
110 elevation band between 1219 and 1524 (4000-5000 feet) and extended to an upper elevation band of 1828-2133
111 (6000-7000 feet) to capture a more similar forest community composition as at the more northern National
112 Forests. The sites have variable forest structure and disturbance history and plot locations were selected
113 specifically in areas with >40% ponderosa pine basal area and >10% ponderosa pine mortality. The 0.04ha
114 circular plots are clustered along transects in groups of 5, with between 80 and 200m between each plot. All
115 trees within the plot were assessed as dead or alive. The stem location of all trees was mapped relative to the
116 center of each plot using azimuth/distance measurements. Tree identity to species and diameter at breast
117 height (dbh) were recorded if dbh was greater than 6.35cm. During the spring and early summer of 2018, all
118 field plots were revisited to assess whether dead trees had fallen (Fettig et al. 2019).




Figure 1: The network of field plots spanned a 350 km latitudinal gradient from the Eldorado National Forest in the north to the Sequoia National Forest in the south. Plots were stratified by three elevation bands in each forest, with the plots in the Sequoia National Forest (the southern-most National Forest) occupying elevation bands 305m above the three bands in the other National Forests in order to capture a similar community composition.

119 **Instrumentation**

120 Imagery was captured using a DJI Zenmuse X3 RGB camera (DJI 2015a) and a Micasense RedEdge3 5-band
121 multispectral camera (Micasense 2015). We mounted both of these instruments simultaneously on a DJI
122 Matrice 100 aircraft (DJI 2015b) using the DJI 3-axis stabilized gimbal for the Zenmuse X3 camera and a
123 Micasense angled fixed mount for the RedEdge3 camera. The gimbal and the angled fixed mount ensured
124 both instruments were nadir-facing during image capture. Just prior or after image capture at each site, we
125 calibrated the RedEdge3 camera by taking an image of a calibration panel on the ground in full sun with
126 known reflectance values for each of the 5 narrow bands.

Table 1: Reflectance sensitivity of the Micasense Rededge3 camera. The calibration panel value represents the reflectance of the calibration panel for the given wavelength.

Band number	Band name	Center wavelength	Band width	Wavelength range	Panel reflectance
1	blue (b)	475	20	465-485	0.64
2	green (g)	560	20	550-570	0.64
3	red (r)	668	10	663-673	0.64
4	near infrared (nir)	840	40	820-860	0.6
5	red edge (re)	717	10	712-722	0.63

127 **Flight protocol**

128 Image capture was conducted as close to solar noon as possible to minimize shadow effects (always within 4
129 hours; usually within 2 hours). Prior to the aerial survey, two strips of bright orange drop cloth (~100cm x
130 15cm) were positioned as an “X” over the permanent monuments marking the center of the 5 field plots from
131 Fettig et al. (2019).

132 For each of the 36 sites (containing 5 plots each), we captured imagery over the surrounding ~40 hectares of
133 forested area using north-south aerial transects. For three sites, we surveyed less surrounding area in order to
134 maintain visual and radio communication with the aircraft during flight which can be obstructed by steep
135 terrain or non-centrally available takeoff locations. (Table 3; as a supplement, I think; Columns: Site, forest,
136 elevation, rep, CWD, surveyed area, survey date).

137 We preprogrammed transect paths using Map Pilot for DJI on iOS (hereafter Map Pilot) (Easy 2018). All

138 transects tracked the terrain and their altitude remained approximately constant at 120 meters above ground
139 level in order to maintain consistent ground sampling distance in the imagery. Ground level was based on a
140 1-arc-second digital elevation model (Farr et al. 2007) and we implemented terrain following using Map Pilot.
141 For this analysis, we dropped 4 sites whose imagery was of insufficient quality to process.

142 Structure from motion (SfM) processing requires highly overlapping images, especially in densely vegetated
143 areas. We planned transects with 90% forward overlap and 90% side overlap at 100 meters below the lens.
144 Thus, with flights being at 120 meters above ground level, we achieved slightly higher than 90/90 overlap for
145 objects 20 meters tall or shorter (91.6/91.6 overlap at the ground). Overlap values were based on focal length
146 (3.6mm), sensor width (6.2mm), and image dimension (4000x3000 pixels) parameters of the Zenmuse X3
147 camera. Images were captured at a constant rate of 1 image every 2 seconds for both cameras. A forward
148 overlap of 90% at 100 meters translates to a flight speed of approximately 6.45 m/s and a side overlap of 90%
149 at 100 meters translates to transects approximately 17.2 meters apart. The Rededge camera has a different
150 focal length (5.4mm), sensor width (4.8mm), and image dimension (1280x960 pixels), which translates to
151 image overlap of 80.7/80.7 at 100m below the lens and 83.9/83.9 at ground level. Approximately 1900 photos
152 were captured over each 40 hectare survey area for each camera.

153 **Structure from motion/Photogrammetric processing**

154 We used structure from motion (SfM), aka photogrammetry, to generate orthorectified reflectance maps,
155 digital surface models, and dense point clouds for each field site. We used Pix4Dmapper Cloud to process
156 imagery using parameters ideal for images of a densely vegetated area taken by a multispectral camera.
157 For three sites, we processed the RGB and the multispectral imagery in the same project to enhance the
158 resolution of the dense point cloud. All SfM projects resulted in a single processing “block,” indicating that
159 all images in the project were optimized and processed together.

160 **Creating canopy height models**

161 We classified each survey area’s dense point cloud into “ground” and “non-ground” points using a cloth
162 simulation filter algorithm (Zhang et al. 2016) implemented in the **lidR** (Roussel et al. 2019) package. We
163 rasterized the ground points using the **raster** package (Hijmans et al. 2019) to create a digital terrain model
164 representing the ground underneath the vegetation at 1 meter resolution. We created a canopy height model
165 by subtracting the digital terrain model from the digital surface model created in Pix4Dmapper.

166 **Tree detection**

167 We tested a total of 7 automatic tree detection algorithms and a total of 177 parameter sets on the canopy
168 height model or the dense point cloud to locate trees within each site (Table 2). We used 3 parameter sets of
169 a variable window filter implemented in **ForestTools** (Plowright 2018) including the default variable window
170 filter function in **ForestTools** as well as the “pines” and “combined” functions from Popescu and Wynne
171 (2004). We used 6 parameter sets of a local maximum filter implemented in **lidR**. We used 131 parameter
172 sets of the algorithm from Li et al. (2012), which operates on the original point cloud. These parameter
173 sets included those from Shin et al. (2018) and Jakubowski et al. (2013). We used 3 parameter sets of the
174 **watershed** algorithm implemented in **lidR**, which is a wrapper for a function in the **EBImage** package (Pau
175 et al. 2010). We used 3 parameter sets of **ptrees** (Vega et al. 2014) implemented in **lidR** (Roussel et al.
176 2019) and **lidRplugins** (Roussel 2019) and which operates on the raw point cloud, without first normalizing
177 it to height above ground level (i.e.. subtracting the ground elevation from the dense point cloud). We used
178 the default parameter set of the **multichm** (Eysn et al. 2015) algorithm implmented in **lidR** (Roussel et
179 al. 2019) and **lidRplugins** (Roussel 2019). We used 30 parameter sets of the experimental algorithm **lmfx**
180 (Roussel 2019).

Table 2: Algorithm name, number of parameter sets tested for each algorithm, and references.

Algorithm	Parameter sets tested	Reference(s)
li2012	131	Li et al. (2012); Jakubowski et al. (2013); Shin et al. (2018)
lmfx	30	Roussel (2019)
localMaxima	6	Roussel et al. (2019)
multichm	1	Eysn et al. (2015)
ptrees	3	Vega et al. (2014)
vwf	3	Plowright (2018)
watershed	3	Pau et al. (2010)

181 **Map ground data**

182 Each orthorectified reflectance map was inspected to locate the 5 orange “X”s marking the center of the
183 field plots. We were able to locate 110 out of 180 field plots and were then able to use these plots for

validation of automated tree detection algorithms. We used the `sf` package (Pebesma et al. 2019) to convert distance-from-center and azimuth measurements of each tree in the ground plots to an x-y position on the SfM-derived reflectance map using the x-y position of the orange X visible in the reflectance map as the center.

Correspondence of automatic tree detection with ground data

We calculated 7 forest structure metrics for each field plot using the ground data collected by Fettig et al. (2019): total number of trees, number of trees greater than 15 meters, mean height of trees, 25th percentile tree height, 75th percentile tree height, mean distance to nearest tree neighbor, mean distance to 2nd nearest neighbor.

For each tree detection algorithm and parameter set described above, we calculated the same set of 7 structure metrics within the footprint of the validation field plots. We calculated the Pearson's correlation and root mean square error (RMSE) between the ground data and the aerial data for each of the 7 structure metrics for each of the 177 automatic tree detection algorithms/parameter sets.

For each algorithm and parameter set, we calculated its performance relative to other algorithms as whether its Pearson's correlation was within 5% of the highest Pearson's correlation as well as whether its RMSE was within 5% of the lowest RMSE. For each algorithm/parameter set, we summed the number of forest structure metrics for which it reached these 5% thresholds. For automatically detecting trees across the whole study, we selected the algorithm/parameter set that performed well across the most number of forest metrics.

Segmentation of crowns

We delineated individual tree crowns with a marker controlled watershed segmentation algorithm (Meyer and Beucher 1990) using the detected treetops as markers implemented in the `ForestTools` package (Plowright 2018). If the automatic segmentation algorithm failed to generate a crown segment for a detected tree (e.g., often snags with a very small crown footprint), a circular crown was generated with a radius of 0.5 meters. If the segmentation generated multiple polygons for a single detected tree, only the polygon containing the detected tree was retained. Image overlap decreases near the edges of the overall flight path, which reduces the quality of the SfM processing in those areas. Thus, we excluded segmented crowns within 35 meters of the edge of the survey area. Given the narrower field of view of the RedEdge multispectral camera versus the X3 RGB camera whose optical parameters were used to define the ~40 hectare survey area around each site, as well as the 35 meter additional buffering, the survey area at each site was approximately 30 hectares (Table 3).

214 We used the `velox` package (Hunziker 2017) to extract all the pixel values from the orthorectified reflectance
215 map for each of the 5 narrow bands within each segmented crown polygon. Per pixel, we additionally
216 calculated the normalized difference vegetation index (NDVI; Rouse et al. (1973)), the normalized difference
217 red edge (NDRE; Gitelson and Merzlyak (1994)), the red-green index (RGI; Coops et al. (2006)), the red
218 edge chlorophyll index (CI[red edge]; Clevers and Gitelson (2013)), and the green chlorophyll index (CI[green];
219 Clevers and Gitelson (2013)). For each crown polygon, we calculated the mean value for each raw and derived
220 reflectance band (5 raw; 5 derived).

221 Classification of trees

222 We overlaid the segmented crowns on the reflectance maps from 20 sites spanning the latitudinal and
223 elevational gradient in the study. Using QGIS, we hand classified 564 trees as live/dead and as one of 5
224 dominant species in the study area (*Pinus ponderosa*, *Pinus lambertiana*, *Abies concolor*, *Calocedrus decurrens*,
225 or *Quercus kelloggii*) using the mapped ground data as a guide.

226 We used all 10 mean values of the reflectance bands for each tree crown polygon to predict whether the hand
227 classified trees were alive or dead using a boosted logistic regression model implemented in the `caret` package
228 (accuracy of live/dead classification on a withheld test dataset: 97.3%) (Kuhn 2008). For just the living trees,
229 we similarly used all 10 reflectance values to predict the tree species using regularized discriminant analysis
230 implemented in the `caret` package (accuracy of species classification on a withheld testing dataset: 66.7%;
231 accuracy of WPB host/non-WPB-host (i.e., ponderosa pine versus other tree species) on a withheld testing
232 dataset: 74.4%).

233 Finally, we used these models to classify all tree crowns in the data set as alive or dead as well as the species
234 of living trees.

235 Allometric scaling of height to basal area

236 We converted the height of each tree determined using the canopy height model to its basal area. Using
237 the tree height and diameter at breast height (DBH; breast height = 1.37m) ground data from Fettig et al.
238 (2019), we fit a simple linear regression to predict DBH from height for each of the 5 dominant species. Using
239 the model-classified tree species of each segmented tree, we used the corresponding linear relationship for
240 that species to estimate the DBH given the tree's height. We then calculated each tree's basal area, assuming
241 no tapering from breast height.

242 **Note on assumptions about dead trees**

243 For the purposes of this study, we assumed that all dead trees were ponderosa pine and were thus host trees
244 for the western pine beetle. This is a reasonably good assumption, given that Fettig et al. (2019) found that
245 73.4% of the dead trees in the coincident ground plots were ponderosa pine. The species contributing to
246 the next highest proportion of dead trees was incense cedar which represented 18.72% of the dead trees in
247 the ground plots. Incense cedar is not a potential host of the western pine beetle, and we expand on the
248 limitations of this study given the assumption of dead trees being ponderosa pine in the Discussion.

249 **Rasterizing individual tree data**

250 Because the tree detection algorithms were validated against ground data at the plot level, we rasterized the
251 classified trees at a spatial resolution similar to that of the ground plots (rasterized to 20m x 20m equalling
252 400 m²; circular ground plots with 11.35m radius equalling 404 m²). In each raster cell, we calculated the:
253 number of live trees, number of dead trees, number of ponderosa pine trees, total number of trees (of all
254 species, including ponderosa pine), quadratic mean diameter (QMD) of ponderosa pine trees, and QMD of all
255 trees of any species (overall QMD). We converted the count of ponderosa pine trees and the total tree count
256 to a density measurement of trees per hectare (tpha) by multiplying the counts in each 20m x 20m cell by 25
257 to create a “host density” and an “overall density” variable per cell.

258 **Environmental data**

259 We used climatic water deficit (CWD) (Stephenson 1998) from the 1980-2010 mean value of the basin
260 characterization model (Flint et al. 2013) as an integrated measure of temperature and moisture conditions
261 for each cell. Higher values of CWD correspond to hotter, drier conditions and lower values correspond
262 to cooler, wetter conditions CWD has been shown to correlate well with broad patterns of tree mortality
263 in the Sierra Nevada (Young et al. 2017). We resampled the climatic water deficit product using bilinear
264 interpolation implemented in the `raster` package to match the 20m x 20m spatial scale of the other variables.
265 We converted the CWD value for each cell into a z-score representing that cell’s deviation from the mean
266 CWD across the climatic range of Sierra Nevada ponderosa pine as determined from 179 herbarium records
267 described in Baldwin et al. (2017). Thus, a CWD z-score of one would indicate that the CWD at that
268 cell is one standard deviation hotter/drier than the mean CWD across all geolocated herbarium records for
269 ponderosa pine in the Sierra Nevada.

270 **Statistical model**

271 We used a generalized linear model with a zero-inflated binomial response and a logit link to predict the
 272 probability of ponderosa pine mortality within each raster cell as a function of the crossed effects of ponderosa
 273 pine quadratic mean diameter and density added to the crossed effect of overall quadratic mean diameter and
 274 density as well as the interaction of each summand with climatic water deficit at each site.

275 To measure and account for spatial autocorrelation of the bark beetle behavioral processes underlying
 276 ponderosa mortality, we first subsampled the data at each site to a random selection of 200, 20m x 20m
 277 cells representing approximately 27.5% of the surveyed area. With these subsampled data, we included a
 278 separate exact Gaussian process term per site of the interaction between the x- and y-position of each cell
 279 using the `gp()` function in the `brms` package (Bürkner 2017). The Gaussian process accounts for spatial
 280 autocorrelation in the model by jointly estimating the spatial covariance of the response variable with the
 281 effects of the other covariates.

$$y_{i,j} \sim \begin{cases} 0, & p \\ Binom(n_i, \pi_i), & 1 - p \end{cases}$$

$$\text{logit}(\pi_i) = \beta_0 +$$

$$\beta_1 X_{cwd,j} +$$

$$\beta_1 X_{cwd,j} (\beta_2 X_{\text{pipoQMD},i} + \beta_3 X_{\text{pipoDensity},i} + \beta_4 X_{\text{pipoQMD},i} X_{\text{pipoDensity},i}) +$$

$$\beta_1 X_{cwd,j} (\beta_5 X_{\text{overallQMD},i} + \beta_6 X_{\text{overallDensity},i} + \beta_7 X_{\text{overallQMD},i} X_{\text{overallDensity},i}) +$$

$$\mathcal{GP}_j(x_i, y_i)$$

282 Where y_i is the number of dead trees in cell i , n_i is the sum of the dead trees and live ponderosa pine trees
 283 in cell i , π_i is the probability of ponderosa pine tree mortality in cell i , p is the probability of there being
 284 zero dead trees in a cell arising as a result of an unmodeled process, $X_{cwd,j}$ is the z-score of climatic water
 285 deficit for site j , $X_{\text{pipoQMD},i}$ is the scaled quadratic mean diameter of ponderosa pine in cell i , $X_{\text{pipoDensity},i}$
 286 is the scaled density of ponderosa pine trees in cell i , $X_{\text{overallQMD},i}$ is the scaled quadratic mean diameter
 287 of all trees in cell i , $X_{\text{overallDensity},i}$ is the scaled density of all trees in cell i , x_i and y_i are the x- and y-
 288 coordinates of the centroid of the cell in an EPSG3310 coordinate reference system, and \mathcal{GP}_j represents the
 289 exact Gaussian process describing the spatial covariance between cells at site j .

290 We used 4 chains with 2000 iterations each (1000 warmup, 1000 samples), and confirmed chain convergence
 291 by ensuring all `Rhat` values were less than 1.1 (Brooks and Gelman 1998). We used posterior predictive

292 checks to visually confirm model performance by overlaying the density curves of the predicted number of
293 dead trees per cell over the observed number (Gabry et al. 2019). For the posterior predictive checks, we
294 used 50 random samples from the model fit to generate 50 density curves and ensured curves were centered
295 on the observed distribution, paying special attention to model performance at capturing counts of zero.

296 **Software and data availability**

297 All data are available via the Open Science Framework. Statistical analyses were performed using the `brms`
298 packages. With the exception of the SfM software (Pix4Dmapper Cloud) and the GIS software QGIS, all
299 data carpentry and analyses were performed using R (R Core Team 2018).

300 **Results**

Table 3: Site characteristics for each of the 32 sites. The site name consists of the forest name, elevation band, and rep separated by an underscore. The Eldorado National Forest is ‘eldo’, the Stanislaus National Forest is ‘stan’, the Sierra National Forest is ‘sier’, and the Sequoia National Forest is ‘sequ’. The elevation band represents the lower bounds of the 305 meter (1000 foot) elevation bands in feet. Thus ‘3k’ implies that site was located between 3,000 and 4,000 feet (914-1219 meters). Aerially detected mortality and density of the whole site is presented along with the mortality and density calculated from the ground data (aerial / ground). The density is measured in trees per hectare (tpha).

Site	CWD (mm)	CWD (z-score)	Survey area (ha)	Mortality (aerial/ground)	Density (tpha; aerial/ground)
eldo_3k_1	678	0.319	31.02	0.11/0.61	630.01/410.19
eldo_3k_2	706	0.501	30.61	0.12/0.36	444.26/647.42
eldo_3k_3	655	0.163	30.95	0.22/0.36	492.63/410.19
eldo_4k_1	570	-0.383	28.04	0.09/0.39	632.82/588.11
eldo_4k_2	642	0.0831	28.41	0.15/0.78	338.20/271.82
eldo_5k_1	663	0.219	28.44	0.11/0.44	661.80/543.63
eldo_5k_2	627	-0.0132	30.02	0.12/0.36	584.89/968.65

Site	CWD (mm)	CWD (z-score)	Survey area (ha)	Mortality (aerial/ground)	Density (tpha; aerial/ground)
eldo_5k_3	599	-0.2	29.73	0.07/0.32	488.66/622.71
stan_3k_1	638	0.059	31.04	0.10/0.52	739.45/1037.84
stan_3k_2	739	0.713	18.78	0.40/0.78	433.53/405.25
stan_3k_3	762	0.859	30.1	0.22/0.41	558.43/326.18
stan_4k_1	540	-0.58	29.62	0.29/0.63	507.61/711.66
stan_4k_2	528	-0.658	30.54	0.18/0.56	481.85/256.99
stan_5k_1	524	-0.688	30.94	0.19/0.54	388.89/336.06
stan_5k_2	524	-0.685	29.94	0.21/0.44	399.33/622.71
sier_3k_1	764	0.871	30.42	0.19/0.48	651.46/850.04
sier_3k_2	768	0.898	30.05	0.20/0.77	438.84/153.21
sier_3k_3	773	0.932	29.77	0.32/0.77	511.26/459.62
sier_4k_1	841	1.38	30.43	0.54/0.51	576.15/538.69
sier_4k_2	764	0.877	29.3	0.33/0.57	499.43/854.98
sier_4k_3	688	0.383	26.39	0.48/0.59	454.23/499.15
sier_5k_1	722	0.599	14.59	0.41/0.43	631.30/716.60
sier_5k_2	710	0.523	27.53	0.53/0.74	477.29/454.67
sier_5k_3	779	0.968	28.93	0.33/0.43	569.44/484.33
sequ_4k_1	767	0.891	29.59	0.50/0.56	365.81/607.88
sequ_4k_3	816	1.21	29.69	0.35/0.71	433.35/306.41
sequ_5k_1	718	0.577	27.12	0.35/0.52	364.01/444.79
sequ_5k_2	587	-0.274	29.1	0.45/0.43	478.31/499.15
sequ_5k_3	611	-0.117	31.34	0.42/0.48	348.68/494.21
sequ_6k_1	731	0.657	27.78	0.30/0.70	433.43/360.77
sequ_6k_2	690	0.39	11.83	0.26/0.43	699.04/934.06
sequ_6k_3	603	-0.174	26.51	0.36/0.32	535.54/691.89

301 **Tree detection**

302 We found that the experimental `lmfx` algorithm with parameter values of `dist2d = 1` and `ws = 2.5` (Roussel
 303 et al. 2019) performed the best across 7 measures of forest structure as measured by Pearson's correlation




Figure 2: A dense point cloud representing ~40 hectares of forest is generated using Structure from Motion (SfM) processing of ~1900 images. The dense point cloud z- position represents the ground elevation plus the vegetation height.




Figure 3: The digital surface model (DSM) is a 2-dimensional representation of the dense point cloud generated using structure from motion (SfM) processing. The DSM represents the ground elevation plus the vegetation height.




Figure 4: The digital terrain model (DTM) is generated by processing the dense point cloud using the cloth simulation filter algorithm (Zhang et al. 2016), which classifies points as “ground” or “not-ground” and then interpolates the “ground” elevation using Delaunay triangulation for the rest of the dense point cloud footprint. The DTM represents the ground elevation without any vegetation.




Figure 5: The canopy height model (CHM) is generated by subtracting the digital terrain model from the digital surface model. The CHM represents the height of all of the elevation above ground level.




Figure 6: Tree locations are detected using the `lmfx` (Roussel et al. 2019) treetop detection algorithm on the dense point cloud.




Figure 7: Individual crowns are delineated using a marker controlled watershed segmentation algorithm (Meyer and Beucher 1990, Plowright 2018) on the canopy height model (CHM) using the detected tree locations as a priority map. If the algorithm failed to delineate a crown for a tree that was identified in the tree detection step, a circular crown with a 0.5m buffer centered on point location of the detected tree was added as a crown.




Figure 8: The orthomosaic for each of the 32 sites is generated with the Structure from Motion (SfM) processing, showing a top-down view of the whole survey area such that distances between objects in the scene are preserved and can be measured. Depicted is an example orthomosaic for one of the 32 sites cropped to the extent of a single ground plot (5 ground plots per site) showing the orange X placed at exactly the plot center prior to flight. The original orthomosaic for the whole site represents an area approximately 1000 times as large as the area depicted here.




Figure 9: Each tree is classified as live or dead by extracting the pixel values from the 5 narrow bands of the Rededge3 camera (and 5 derived bands– see methods) in the orthomosaic within each segmented tree crown of the detected trees, taking their mean value, and using those means to predict live/dead status with a boosted logistic regression previously trained on a hand-classified set of segmented crowns from across the study area.




Figure 10: We rasterized the individual tree data by aggregating values to 20m x 20m cells. This example shows the proportion of dead trees per cell for the same example site as in the previous figures.




Figure 11: For each live tree, we classified its species using the same means of extracted pixel values across the 5 Rededge3 narrow bands (and 5 derived bands) as predictors in a regularized discriminant analysis previously trained on a hand-classified set of segmented crowns from across the study area. Host/non-host data were also rasterized as in the previous figure prior to analyses (not shown).




Figure 12: Posterior distributions of effect size from zero-inflated binomial model predicting the probability of ponderosa pine mortality in a 20m x 20m cell given forest structure characteristics of host trees and all trees within the cell, as well as a site-level climatic water deficit. The gray density distribution for each model covariate represents the density of the posterior distribution, the point underneath each density curve represents the median of the estimate, the bold interval surrounding the point estimate represents the 66% credible interval, and the thin interval surrounding the point estimate represents the 95% credible interval.




Figure 13: Line version of model results with 95% credible intervals showing primary influence of ponderosa pine structure on the probability of ponderosa pine mortality, and the interaction across climatic water deficit. The “larger trees” line represents the quadratic mean diameter of ponderosa pine 0.7 standard deviations above the mean, and the “smaller trees” line represents the quadratic mean diameter of ponderosa pine 0.7 standard deviations below the mean.

304 with ground data (Table 3).

Table 4: Correlation and differences between the best performing tree detection algorithm (lmfx with dist2d = 1 and ws = 2.5) and the ground data. An asterisk next to the correlation or RMSE indicates that this value was within 5% of the value of the best-performing algorithm/parameter set. Ground mean represents the mean value of the forest metric across the 110 ground plots that were visible from the sUAS-derived imagery. The median error is calculated as the median of the differences between the air and ground values for the 110 visible plots. Thus, a positive number indicates an overestimate by the sUAS workflow and a negative number indicates an underestimate.

Forest structure metric	Ground mean	Correlation with ground	RMSE	Median error
total tree count	19	0.67*	8.68*	2
count of trees > 15m	9.9	0.43	7.38	0
dist to 1st nearest neighbor (m)	2.8	0.55*	1.16*	0.26
dist to 2nd nearest neighbor (m)	4.3	0.61*	1.70*	0.12
height (m); 25th percentile	12	0.16	8.46	-1.2
height (m); mean	18	0.29	7.81*	-2.3
height (m); 75th percentile	25	0.35	10.33*	-4

305 **Effect of local structure and regional climate on western pine beetle severity**

306 We detected no main effect of climatic water deficit on the probability of ponderosa pine mortality within
307 each 20m x 20m cell.

308 We found a strong main effect of ponderosa pine local density, accounting for quadratic mean diameter of
309 ponderosa pine, with greater density increasing the probability of ponderosa pine mortality.

310 Conversely, we found a generally negative effect of quadratic mean diameter of ponderosa pine on the
311 probability of ponderosa mortality, suggesting that the western pine beetle attacked smaller trees, on average.

312 There was a strong positive interaction between the climatic water deficit and ponderosa pine quadratic mean
313 diameter, such that larger trees were more likely to increase the probability of ponderosa mortality in hotter,
314 drier sites.

315 We found negative main effects of overall tree density and overall quadratic mean diameter. There was a
316 positive interaction between these variables, such that denser stands with larger trees did lead to greater
317 ponderosa pine mortality.

318 **Spatial effects**

319 We were able to calculate the length scale of the spatial autocorrelation in the probability of ponderosa
320 pine mortality at each site, accounting for forest structure and environmental factors. By fitting a separate
321 approximate Gaussian process for each site on the interacting variables of the x- and y- position, we measured
322 the spatial covariance inherent in the data, accounting for other factors. ## Discussion

323 **Closer spacing between potential host trees facilitates dispersal**

324 If this drives mortality patterns, then we'd expect the local density of ponderosa pine trees, accounting for
325 other variables, to have a strong positive effect.

326 **Host preference for large trees**

327 If this drives mortality patterns, then we'd expect the quadratic mean diameter of ponderosa pine trees,
328 accounting for other variables, to have a strong positive effect.

329 **Denser forests augment pheromone communication**

330 If this drives mortality patterns, then we'd expect the local density of all trees, accounting for other variables,
331 to have a strong positive effect.

332 **Tree crowding leads to greater average water stress per tree**

333 If this drives mortality patterns, then we'd expect the quadratic mean dimater of all trees, accounting for
334 other factors, to have a strong positive effect.

335 **Interaction between host density and host size**

336 A positive coefficient would indicate a combined effect of WPB preference for large trees and nearby host
337 availability.

338 **Interaction between all tree density and all tree size**

339 A positive coefficient would indicate a combined effect of tree crowding and pheromone communication
340 enhancement.

341 **Implications of forest structure/regional climate interactions**

342 We found that the probability of ponderosa pine mortality generally increased with local host availability
343 (host density), but also interacted with both host size and regional climate such that the role of tree size
344 became increasingly important in more climatically extreme sites. A smaller average tree size led to a lower
345 probability of ponderosa mortality in cool/wet sites and a larger average tree size led to a greater probability
346 of ponderosa mortality in hot/dry sites. These mortality patterns highlight a possible distinction in behavior
347 between the recent western bark beetle activity across the gradient of climatic water deficit. Even in the most
348 highly impacted forest stands (because our study sites were selected conditional on there being high levels of
349 western pine beetle activity), there is still a detectable effect of tree size such that the smaller (presumably
350 weaker) trees are getting killed in cooler/wetter sites, and the larger (presumably more well-defended) trees
351 are getting killed more in the hotter/drier sites. So while mortality is high everywhere, there does appear to
352 be a difference in the beetle choosiness across the climatic water deficit gradient.

353 **Similarities and differences with Fettig et al. (2019)**

354 Fettig et al. (2019) found positive relationship between number of trees killed and: total number of trees,
355 total basal area, stand density index.

356 Fettig et al. (2019) found negative relationship between the proportion of trees killed and: total number of
357 trees, stand density index.

358 Hayes et al. (2009) and Fettig et al. (2019) found measures of host availability explained less variation in
359 mortality than measures of stand density.

360 Negrón et al. (2009) reported positive association of probability of ponderosa pine mortality and tree density
361 during a drought in Arizona.

362 Effect of competition may be masked because drought was so extreme Fettig et al. (2019); Floyd et al.
363 (2009), which is perhaps why we saw a counter-intuitive signal of increasing total basal area leading to lower
364 probability of ponderosa pine mortality.

365 **Broader context around field plots**

366 We surveyed 9 square kilometers of forest representing ~450,000 trees along a broad environmental gradient
367 of climatic water deficit. Site selection and small plot size can influence inference. For instance, Fettig et
368 al. (2019) reported statistically undetectable differences in overall mortality in their plot network across 4
369 national forests. By expanding the hectarage surveyed by a factor of 200, we detected dramatic differences in
370 overall mortality.

371 This is about more than sample size (though that helps). This is also about capturing the local disturbance
372 phenomenon.

373 **Implications for future forest structure**

374 We have demonstrated that forest structure (local host density and size) affected the cumulative severity
375 of the western pine beetle in the Sierra Nevada in the 2012 to 2015 drought and its aftermath. Clearly,
376 this forest insect disturbance has reciprically impacted the forest structure, with uncertain consequences for
377 long-term forest dynamics.

378 Small trees are getting killed in cooler/wetter sites, larger trees getting killed in hotter/drier sites. Perhaps
379 the cooler/wetter sites are resisting even this massive disturbance event?

380 **Spatial effect**

381 The western pine beetle is known to exhibit strong aggregation and anti-aggregation behavior arising from
382 its pheromone communication, and thus it is likely that the measured spatial covariance in this study is
383 attributable in part to the magnitude of this effect at each site.

384 Some studies have suggested that “outbreak” conditions are distinguishable by clustered tree mortality, but
385 this is perhaps challenging to tease apart (Raffa et al. 2008). Our modeling framework allows for a joint
386 estimation of the effects of forest structure, environmental condition, and the spatial effect. This framework
387 would be enhanced with confidence in individual tree level data, and a lot of it, along with a strong gradient
388 of environmental conditions and forest structure.

389 We won’t interpret this measure of contagion, because the uncertainties in this particular study are too great
390 (tree detection, species classification, dead trees all assumed to be WPB hosts, didn’t account for topographic
391 effects which could also manifest as part of this spatial covariance process). We do suggest that this could be
392 a meaningful and quantifiable means of assessing bark beetle “stage of outbreak”.

393 **Future spatial directions (will cut this; here for now so I can write it down elsewhere)**

394 Perhaps could also compare relative effect of individual tree spacing (Voronoi polygon area) with the length
395 scale parameter at a certain site to get at a similar question. A big voronoi polygon area effect and a short
396 covariance kernel tells us that it's a water stress effect— a crowded tree gets attacked regardless of whether
397 nearby trees were attacked. A small voronoi polygon area effect and a long covariance kernel tells us that the
398 mortality is patterned more based on there being spillover from nearby attacked neighbors instead of how
399 crowded any given tree is. I expect we might see different relative magnitudes of voronoi polygon area and
400 covariance kerel effects depending on CWD.

401 **Important considerations**

402 Cumulative effect of elevated insect activity, as mortality was spread out over 5 years and we surveyed at the
403 end. All the detected dead trees were considered ponderosa pine— we know this is wrong. Only about 3 out
404 of 4 dead trees in Fettig et al. (2019) were ponderosa.

405 **Room for improvement**

- 406 • Better geometry by using higher overlap, more spatially resolved images.
- 407 • Better image classification and scalability by using instrumentation having spectral overlap with more
408 widely deployed instrumentation (e.g., Landsat).
- 409 • Better tree detection using machine learning approaches
- 410 • Our live/dead classifier works pretty well.
- 411 • Our species classifier could improve. Perhaps also using machine learning approaches.

412 (Seidl et al. 2015) (Preisler et al. 2017)

413 **References**

- 414 Baldwin, B. G., A. H. Thornhill, W. A. Freyman, D. D. Ackerly, M. M. Kling, N. Morueta-Holme, and B. D.
415 Mishler. 2017. Species richness and endemism in the native flora of California. American Journal of Botany
416 104:487–501.
- 417 Brooks, S. P., and A. Gelman. 1998. General Methods for Monitoring Convergence of Iterative Simulations.
418 Journal of Computational and Graphical Statistics 7:434.
- 419 Bürkner, P.-C. 2017. **Brms** : An *R* Package for Bayesian Multilevel Models Using *Stan*. Journal of Statistical

- 420 Software 80.
- 421 Clevers, J., and A. Gitelson. 2013. Remote estimation of crop and grass chlorophyll and nitrogen content using
422 red-edge bands on Sentinel-2 and -3. International Journal of Applied Earth Observation and Geoinformation
423 23:344–351.
- 424 Coops, N. C., M. Johnson, M. A. Wulder, and J. C. White. 2006. Assessment of QuickBird high spatial
425 resolution imagery to detect red attack damage due to mountain pine beetle infestation. Remote Sensing of
426 Environment 103:67–80.
- 427 DJI. 2015a. Zenmuse X3 - Creativity Unleashed. <https://www.dji.com/zenmuse-x3/info>.
- 428 DJI. 2015b. DJI - The World Leader in Camera Drones/Quadcopters for Aerial Photography. <https://www.dji.com/matrice100/info>.
- 430 Easy, D. M. 2018. Map Pilot for DJI. <https://itunes.apple.com/us/app/map-pilot-for-dji/id1014765000?mt=8>.
- 431 Eysn, L., M. Hollaus, E. Lindberg, F. Berger, J.-M. Monnet, M. Dalponte, M. Kobal, M. Pellegrini, E.
432 Lingua, D. Mongus, and N. Pfeifer. 2015. A Benchmark of Lidar-Based Single Tree Detection Methods Using
433 Heterogeneous Forest Data from the Alpine Space. Forests 6:1721–1747.
- 434 Farr, T. G., P. A. Rosen, E. Caro, R. Crippen, R. Duren, S. Hensley, M. Kobrick, M. Paller, E. Rodriguez, L.
435 Roth, D. Seal, S. Shaffer, J. Shimada, J. Umland, M. Werner, M. Oskin, D. Burbank, and D. Alsdorf. 2007.
436 The Shuttle Radar Topography Mission. Reviews of Geophysics 45.
- 437 Fettig, C. J. 2012. Chapter 2: Forest health and bark beetles. *in* Managing Sierra Nevada Forests. PSW-
438 GTR-237. USDA Forest Service.
- 439 Fettig, C. J., L. A. Mortenson, B. M. Bulaon, and P. B. Foulk. 2019. Tree mortality following drought in the
440 central and southern Sierra Nevada, California, U.S. Forest Ecology and Management 432:164–178.
- 441 Flint, L. E., A. L. Flint, J. H. Thorne, and R. Boynton. 2013. Fine-scale hydrologic modeling for regional land-
442 scape applications: The California Basin Characterization Model development and performance. Ecological
443 Processes 2:25.
- 444 Floyd, M. L., M. Clifford, N. S. Cobb, D. Hanna, R. Delph, P. Ford, and D. Turner. 2009. Relationship of
445 stand characteristics to drought-induced mortality in three Southwestern piñonJuniper woodlands. Ecological
446 Applications 19:1223–1230.
- 447 Gabry, J., D. Simpson, A. Vehtari, M. Betancourt, and A. Gelman. 2019. Visualization in Bayesian workflow.

- ⁴⁴⁸ Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series A (Statistics in Society) 182:389–402.
- ⁴⁴⁹ Gitelson, A., and M. N. Merzlyak. 1994. Spectral Reflectance Changes Associated with Autumn Senescence
⁴⁵⁰ of *Aesculus hippocastanum* L. and *Acer platanoides* L. Leaves. Spectral Features and Relation to Chlorophyll
⁴⁵¹ Estimation. *Journal of Plant Physiology* 143:286–292.
- ⁴⁵² Hayes, C. J., C. J. Fettig, and L. D. Merrill. 2009. Evaluation of Multiple Funnel Traps and Stand
⁴⁵³ Characteristics for Estimating Western Pine Beetle-Caused Tree Mortality. *Journal of Economic Entomology*
⁴⁵⁴ 102:2170–2182.
- ⁴⁵⁵ Hijmans, R. J., J. van Etten, M. Sumner, J. Cheng, A. Bevan, R. Bivand, L. Busetto, M. Canty, D. Forrest,
⁴⁵⁶ A. Ghosh, D. Golicher, J. Gray, J. A. Greenberg, P. Hiemstra, I. for M. A. Geosciences, C. Karney, M.
⁴⁵⁷ Mattiuzzi, S. Mosher, J. Nowosad, E. Pebesma, O. P. Lamigueiro, E. B. Racine, B. Rowlingson, A. Shortridge,
⁴⁵⁸ B. Venables, and R. Wueest. 2019. *Raster: Geographic Data Analysis and Modeling*.
- ⁴⁵⁹ Hunziker, P. 2017. *Velox: Fast Raster Manipulation and Extraction*.
- ⁴⁶⁰ Jakubowski, M. K., W. Li, Q. Guo, and M. Kelly. 2013. Delineating Individual Trees from Lidar Data: A
⁴⁶¹ Comparison of Vector- and Raster-based Segmentation Approaches. *Remote Sensing* 5:4163–4186.
- ⁴⁶² Kane, V. R., M. P. North, J. A. Lutz, D. J. Churchill, S. L. Roberts, D. F. Smith, R. J. McGaughey, J. T.
⁴⁶³ Kane, and M. L. Brooks. 2014. Assessing fire effects on forest spatial structure using a fusion of Landsat and
⁴⁶⁴ airborne LiDAR data in Yosemite National Park. *Remote Sensing of Environment* 151:89–101.
- ⁴⁶⁵ Kuhn, M. 2008. Building Predictive Models in R Using the caret Package. *Journal of Statistical Software*
⁴⁶⁶ 28:1–26.
- ⁴⁶⁷ Larson, A. J., and D. Churchill. 2012. Tree spatial patterns in fire-frequent forests of western North America,
⁴⁶⁸ including mechanisms of pattern formation and implications for designing fuel reduction and restoration
⁴⁶⁹ treatments. *Forest Ecology and Management* 267:74–92.
- ⁴⁷⁰ Li, W., Q. Guo, M. K. Jakubowski, and M. Kelly. 2012. A New Method for Segmenting Individual Trees
⁴⁷¹ from the Lidar Point Cloud. *Photogrammetric Engineering & Remote Sensing* 78:75–84.
- ⁴⁷² Meyer, F., and S. Beucher. 1990. Morphological segmentation. *Journal of Visual Communication and Image
Representation* 1:21–46.
- ⁴⁷⁴ Micasense. 2015. MicaSense. <https://support.micasense.com/hc/en-us/articles/215261448-RedEdge-User-Manual-PDF-Download>
- ⁴⁷⁵ Millar, C. I., and N. L. Stephenson. 2015. Temperate forest health in an era of emerging megadisturbance.

- 476 Science 349:823–826.
- 477 Morris, J. L., S. Cottrell, C. J. Fettig, W. D. Hansen, R. L. Sherriff, V. A. Carter, J. L. Clear, J. Clement, R.
478 J. DeRose, J. A. Hicke, P. E. Higuera, K. M. Mattor, A. W. R. Seddon, H. T. Seppä, J. D. Stednick, and S.
479 J. Seybold. 2017. Managing bark beetle impacts on ecosystems and society: Priority questions to motivate
480 future research. Journal of Applied Ecology 54:750–760.
- 481 Negrón, J. F., J. D. McMillin, J. A. Anhold, and D. Coulson. 2009. Bark beetle-caused mortality in a
482 drought-affected ponderosa pine landscape in Arizona, USA. Forest Ecology and Management 257:1353–1362.
- 483 North, M. P., S. L. Stephens, B. M. Collins, J. K. Agee, G. Aplet, J. F. Franklin, and P. Z. Fule. 2015.
484 Reform forest fire management. Science 349:1280–1281.
- 485 Pau, G., F. Fuchs, O. Sklyar, M. Boutros, and W. Huber. 2010. EBImagean R package for image processing
486 with applications to cellular phenotypes. Bioinformatics 26:979–981.
- 487 Pebesma, E., R. Bivand, E. Racine, M. Sumner, I. Cook, T. Keitt, R. Lovelace, H. Wickham, J. Ooms, K.
488 Müller, and T. L. Pedersen. 2019. Sf: Simple Features for R.
- 489 Plowright, A. 2018. ForestTools: Analyzing Remotely Sensed Forest Data.
- 490 Popescu, S. C., and R. H. Wynne. 2004. Seeing the Trees in the Forest: Using Lidar and Multispectral Data
491 Fusion with Local Filtering and Variable Window Size for Estimating Tree Height. PHOTOGGRAMMETRIC
492 ENGINEERING:16.
- 493 Preisler, H. K., N. E. Grulke, Z. Heath, and S. L. Smith. 2017. Analysis and out-year forecast of beetle,
494 borer, and drought-induced tree mortality in California. Forest Ecology and Management. 399: 166-178
495 399:166–178.
- 496 R Core Team. 2018. R: A Language and Environment for Statistical Computing. R Foundation for Statistical
497 Computing, Vienna, Austria.
- 498 Raffa, K. F., B. H. Aukema, B. J. Bentz, A. L. Carroll, J. A. Hicke, M. G. Turner, and W. H. Romme. 2008.
499 Cross-scale Drivers of Natural Disturbances Prone to Anthropogenic Amplification: The Dynamics of Bark
500 Beetle Eruptions. BioScience 58:501–517.
- 501 Raffa, K. F., J.-C. Grégoire, and B. Staffan Lindgren. 2015. Natural History and Ecology of Bark Beetles.
502 Pages 1–40 in Bark Beetles. Elsevier.
- 503 Rouse, W., R. H. Haas, W. Deering, and J. A. Schell. 1973. MONITORING THE VERNAL ADVANCEMENT
504 AND RETROGRADATION (GREEN WAVE EFFECT) OF NATURAL VEGETATION. Type II Report,

- 505 Goddard Space Flight Center, Greenbelt, MD, USA.
- 506 Roussel, J.-R. 2019. lidRplugins: Extra functions and algorithms for lidR package.
- 507 Roussel, J.-R., D. A. (. the documentation), F. D. B. (. bugs and improved catalog features), and A. S. M. (.
508 lassnags). 2019. lidR: Airborne LiDAR Data Manipulation and Visualization for Forestry Applications.
- 509 Seidl, R., J. Müller, T. Hothorn, C. Bässler, M. Heurich, and M. Kautz. 2015. Small beetle, large-scale
510 drivers: How regional and landscape factors affect outbreaks of the European spruce bark beetle. *The Journal*
511 of applied ecology 53:530–540.
- 512 Shiklomanov, A. N., B. A. Bradley, K. M. Dahlin, A. M. Fox, C. M. Gough, F. M. Hoffman, E. M. Middleton,
513 S. P. Serbin, L. Smallman, and W. K. Smith. 2019. Enhancing global change experiments through integration
514 of remote-sensing techniques. *Frontiers in Ecology and the Environment* 0.
- 515 Shin, P., T. Sankey, M. Moore, and A. Thode. 2018. Evaluating Unmanned Aerial Vehicle Images for
516 Estimating Forest Canopy Fuels in a Ponderosa Pine Stand. *Remote Sensing* 10:1266.
- 517 Stephenson, N. 1998. Actual evapotranspiration and deficit: Biologically meaningful correlates of vegetation
518 distribution across spatial scales. *Journal of Biogeography* 25:855–870.
- 519 Stephenson, N. L., A. J. Das, N. J. Ampersee, and B. M. Bulaon. 2019. Which trees die during drought?
520 The key role of insect host-tree selection. *Journal of Ecology*:75.
- 521 USDAFS. 2019, February 11. Press Release: Survey finds 18 million trees died in California in 2018.
522 https://www.fs.usda.gov/Internet/FSE_DOCUMENTS/FSEPRD609321.pdf.
- 523 Vega, C., A. Hamrouni, S. El Mokhtari, J. Morel, J. Bock, J. P. Renaud, M. Bouvier, and S. Durrieu. 2014.
524 PTrees: A point-based approach to forest tree extraction from lidar data. *International Journal of Applied*
525 *Earth Observation and Geoinformation* 33:98–108.
- 526 Young, D. J. N., J. T. Stevens, J. M. Earles, J. Moore, A. Ellis, A. L. Jirka, and A. M. Latimer. 2017.
527 Long-term climate and competition explain forest mortality patterns under extreme drought. *Ecology Letters*
528 20:78–86.
- 529 Zhang, W., J. Qi, P. Wan, H. Wang, D. Xie, X. Wang, and G. Yan. 2016. An Easy-to-Use Airborne LiDAR
530 Data Filtering Method Based on Cloth Simulation. *Remote Sensing* 8:501.