**COMPARISON OF DRY CONIFER FOREST MAPPING: FIA vs SAF vs EVT**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **VEG TYPE** | **TreeMap FIA1** | **LF SAF2** | **LF EVT3** | **COMMENTS** |
| Douglas-fir | -Extensive in W. Cascades  -Doesn’t distinguish wet from dry DF | Mapped Interior Douglas-Fir in dry forest locations | Restricted to Middle Rockies | Mapped concepts differ between products |
| Ponderosa | More extensive in the Blues and Okanogan compared to SAF and EVT |  |  | Distribution similar between products; SAF and EVT are nearly identical (likely a result of the x-walk) |
| Mixed Conifer | Restricted to CA | -Mapped in CA and Klamath  -Mapped less compared to FIA and EVT in CA | -Mapped west-wide  -Splits dry vs. Mesic | Mapped concepts differ between products |
| Grand fir |  | Much more extensive in WA Cascades and ID Panhandle than FIA | Not mapped as its own type; this concept is mapped as mesic mixed con |  |
| Larch | Mapped more extensively than other products |  |  | Relatively minor type |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| OTHER OBSERVATIONS | Eastern types mapped in the west (e.g. loblolly pine) |  |  | Map comparison is confounded -- all products derived from LF EVT map and FIA plots |

1 & 2 - Mapped core dry conifer forest types including grand fir, which could be present today on dry forest sites. Included a few minor dry conifer types (e.g. larch, incense cedar). Did not include oak/pine or juniper types.

3 - Mapped ponderosa pine, dry mixed conifer, and mesic mixed conifer types. Lumped regional variants to simplify display (e.g. Northern Rocky Mountains PIPO lumped w/ Southern Rocky Mountain PIPO)

**SUMMARY OF PROS AND CONS OF DRY CONIFER MAPS:**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **MAP** | **PRO** | **CON** |
| **TreeMap FIA** | * Dominant species identified (except mixed con) * Clear relationship to a plot * Advantages for calculating C? | * To what extent is error in LF inherited in Tree Map? * Doesn’t distinguish wet vs. dry Doug-fir * Maps eastern types in the west |
| **LF SAF** | * Dominant species identified (except in mixed con) | * Not independently mapped |
| **LF EVT** | * Lumping up allows us to pull out types we want and improves accuracy * No x-walk needed * Distinguishes dry vs. mesic mixed conifer | * Can’t identify dominant species * EVTs may not link well to literature |

**SUMMARY RECOMMENDATION** (Kori’s thoughts)

* LF EVT has preferred legend for mapping dry conifer forest
* Better to lump EVTs into preferred types for mapping than to use LF SAF (retains integrity of original mapped classes vs. x-walk)
* FIA may be preferred for linking to literature and for C calculation but need to address issues w/ distinguishing dry vs. wet Douglas-fir and Mixed Conifer
  + We could use LF EVT to split these out.