Canadian Journal of Forest Research
Revue canadienne de recherche forestière

Influence of elevation and site productivity on conifer distributions across Alaskan temperate rainforests

Journal:	<i>Canadian Journal of Forest Research</i>
Manuscript ID	cjfr-2015-0283.R1
Manuscript Type:	Article
Date Submitted by the Author:	19-Oct-2015
Complete List of Authors:	Caouette, John; The Nature Conservancy, Steel, Ashley; Pacific Northwest Research Station, Hennon, Paul; USDA Forest Service Cunningham, Pat; Pacific Northwest Research Station, Pohl, Catherine ; Catherine Pohl Biological Consulting Schrader, Barbara; US Forest Service, Alaska Region
Keyword:	landscape, elevation, biogeography, species distribution models, climate

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts

**Influence of elevation and site productivity on conifer distributions across
Alaskan temperate rainforests**

J.P. Caouette^{1,2}, E.A. Steel³, P.E. Hennon^{4,8}, P.G. Cunningham⁵, C.A. Pohl⁶, B.A. Schrader⁷

¹ *In memorium*

² The Nature Conservancy, 416 Harris Street #301, Juneau, AK, USA

³ Pacific Northwest Research Station, USDA Forest Service, 400 N 34th Street, Seattle, WA
98103, USA, Email asteel@fs.fed.us

⁴ Pacific Northwest Research Station, USDA Forest Service, 11175 Auke Lake Way, Juneau,
AK, USA, Email phennon@fs.fed.us

⁵ Pacific Northwest Research Station, USDA Forest Service, 3200 SW Jefferson Way, Corvallis,
OR, 97331, USA, Email pcunningham@fs.fed.us

⁶ Catherine Pohl Biological Consulting, P.O. Box 21168, Juneau, AK, 99802, USA, Email
catherine.pohl@outlook.com

⁷ Alaska Region, USDA Forest Service, 709 W 9th Street, Juneau, AK, 99801, USA, Email
bschrader@fs.fed.us

⁸ Corresponding Author: Paul Hennon, Forestry Sciences Laboratory, 11175 Auke Lake Way,
Juneau AK, 99801, USA, Email phennon@fs.fed.us, Phone 907 586-8769, Fax 907 586-7848

Note: This study was initiated by the late John Caouette (1964 – 2010) of The Nature
Conservancy. John’s tireless efforts to synthesize and gather support for the idea; to find,
organize, and clean the data; and to provide early reports has been an inspiration to the
coworkers and collaborators he left behind. John’s enthusiasm and drive for this project provided

23 the coauthors of this report with the motivation to carry his work forward in the wake of his
24 untimely death in October, 2010.

Draft

Abstract:

We investigated the influence of landscape factors on the distribution and life stage stability of coastal tree species near the northern limit of their ranges. Using data from 1465 forest inventory plots, we estimated probability of occurrence and basal area of six common conifer species across three broad latitudinal regions of coastal Alaska. By also comparing models across life stages of each species (seedlings, sapling, mature, and dead trees), we explored trends in population stability at this leading edge of climate change. Elevation had a stronger influence on the probability of tree species occurrence than on basal area; site productivity impacted both estimated odds of presence and estimated basal area for most species in at least some regions. Interestingly, there were fairly dramatic differences across species in the degree to which the modeled probability of occurrence differed across the four life stages. Western redcedar, for example, showed relatively stable distributions but other species appear to be in flux, e.g., yellow-cedar which has experienced widespread mortality at low elevations. Differential effects of elevation on live versus dead basal area suggest mountain hemlock and yellow-cedar are shifting upslope in some regions and that Sitka spruce is shifting downslope in the Northwest region.

Key Words: landscape, elevation, species distribution models, climate, biogeography

Introduction

Conifer forests in coastal Alaska at the current northern extent of temperate rainforests in North America are experiencing a variety of landscape-scale pressures related to global climate change, expanding human development, and increasing recreation demands (Haufler et al 2010). Understanding resiliency of these forests in the face of these pressures is critical; yet, our knowledge of landscape dynamics within these forests is limited. Emerging issues in this region include maintaining ecosystem integrity, protecting cultural resources and values, and providing functioning wildlife habitats, as well as identifying potential commodity uses of forestlands (Oakes et al. 2015). An understanding of macro-scale physical and climatic predictors of species distribution and productivity is essential for managing these unique and important forests. Comparisons of realized species niches across life stages provide a first indication of whether and in what ways species distributions may already be shifting. Such macro-scale models can also provide a first step toward a more comprehensive modeling framework that might eventually untangle mechanistic relationships at finer scales (Pearson and Dawson 2003).

Of the various resource management objectives that require detailed spatial information on tree species, perhaps none is as compelling as understanding climate effects and how species are or are not adapting to change. There is growing appreciation of how climate has shaped forests historically, and concern for how existing forests will be impacted by a rapidly changing climate. Because climate change is likely to affect each tree species in a unique manner, it is essential to understand the distribution and habitat requirements of individual tree species in addition to composite plant communities (Iverson et al. 2008, Woodall et al. 2009). Methods for predicting future responses in forests, such as bioclimatic envelopes or climate profiles (e.g., Hamann and

Wang 2006, Rehfeldt et al. 2006), are founded on current factors influencing the spatial distributions of forest tree species.

Species distribution models (SDMs) are frequently used to predict occurrence and abundance of organisms in landscapes where ground plot data are incomplete or where remote sensing cannot adequately identify species. SDMs are used in forest management to estimate species ranges and distributional limits, prioritize restoration and management activities, quantify available resources in a particular area, or identify regions of active management, e.g., where species diversity might be particularly high or where a native species might be particularly vulnerable to competition from an invasive species (Peterson 2003). Models range in complexity from bioclimatic envelopes that are typically constructed on the relationships between coarse species distributions and climate variables to fine-scale species distribution models which may include disturbances, soils, and other available information (Booth et al. 1988). Biotic factors such as interspecies competition, herbivory, and pathogens are rarely explicitly included because of the intricacy of interactions (Elith and Leathwick 2009); however these biotic factors are often implicitly included via effects on plot data (Schroeder et al. 2010).

The coastal temperate rainforests of Alaska (Fig. 1) are largely intact ecosystems and offer an ideal setting to explore natural processes driving the distribution and success of individual tree species. These forests are relatively unique in western North America in that large areas have had no previous logging history; fire is rare and has played a minimal role in contemporary forest development in all but a few areas (Alaback 1988). While there has been considerable attention to forests stressed by drought and other effects of climate change on the trailing edge of tree

species ranges (Mátyás 2010), there is a need to study forests at the latitudinal and elevational leading edge of range shifts. The six most common conifer species in the area reach the northern extent of their respective natural ranges at particular latitudes in Southeast Alaska, or a location to the northwest along the Gulf of Alaska (Fig. 1). Therefore, on-the-ground patterns reflect natural processes driving species distribution and basal area growth at distributional extremes where range shifts, potentially due to climate, are most likely to be detected.

Vegetation in this northernmost extent of the coastal temperate rainforest is still recovering and migrating in response to the last glacial retreat millennia ago as well as responding to current effects of climate change (Peteet 1991). Responses to climate change and other disturbances can include changes in occupancy of particular sites. Responses can also include changes in vigor, growth rates, and density. Basal area, a commonly measured stand-level descriptor of forest structure, can be considered an imperfect index of these types of responses (Cade 1997). We note that occupancy and basal area reflect different ecological processes and likely respond to different suites of environmental variables (Nielson et al. 2005). Conservation and management of forested ecosystems responding to a changing climate rely on accurate descriptions of current tree species distributions across large spatial extents, fine-scale estimates, and estimates of how those geographic patterns may be changing over time. As a prime example, yellow-cedar has experienced intense mortality in the region related to changes in snow cover with climate change (Hennon et al. 2012). Broad-scale models involving life stages of each of the tree species can help inform how their distributions may be changing.

With changing climates, temperature can be a driving factor in determining treeline (Grace et al. 2002) and is a contributing factor at the trailing edge of species ranges (Mátyás 2010). Across the coastal Alaskan temperate rain forest, tree species composition also appears to be controlled at a finer scale by site productivity which is primarily related to soil drainage in this region (Neiland 1971, Alaback 1982, Hennon et al. 1990). For example, shore pine is known to be common in less productive wet, boggy soils; the cedars and mountain hemlock are most competitive at intermediate drainage; and western hemlock and Sitka spruce dominate the most productive, well drained sites. These tendencies as well as the mixed composition of most forests are recognized in local plant association guides (e.g., DeMeo et al. 1992, Develice et al. 1999) but have not been interpreted across broad spatial extents in the context of latitude, elevation, and climate change.

Acquiring empirical data on shifts in tree species distributions at the leading edge of climate change is difficult. Accurate fine-scale data for many drivers of vegetation dynamics (e.g., seasonal temperature extremes, water availability, and soils) are generally unavailable across the range of coastal Alaskan landscapes. Fortunately, the USDA Forest Service's Forest Inventory and Analysis program collects data from a large systematic sample of forested plots across the region (Barrett and Christensen 2011). These data include species presence and absence, basal area by species, number of seedlings and saplings (as judged from size class data) by species, and a simple site productivity classification (productive versus unproductive soils). Elevation data are also widely available. Elevation and site productivity are static and do not change over time, at least not on time scales of management relevance. Changes in the relationships between

trees and these static, landscape features are therefore potential descriptors of changes in realized species distributions.

In this study, we take a simple, transparent, and easily comparable approach to quantifying landscape-scale factors that influence tree species distributions across the temperate rainforests of coastal Alaska. We address the following questions:

- 1) How is elevation, a stationary surrogate for climatic conditions, related to the distribution and basal area of six common coastal Alaskan tree species and does that relationship differ across three major geographic regions?
- 2) Does site productivity have an additional impact on either occupancy or basal area for the six tree species or across the three geographic regions?
- 3) By comparing models for live trees, dead trees, and regeneration, can we see a shift in the relationship of stationary factors to species distributions over time? Are there indications that some species' relationship to elevation may be changing?

We focused on only two stationary predictors of tree species occupancy and basal area over a vast geographic area, elevation and site productivity. By modeling presence versus absence independently of basal area, we distinguished between factors associated with these two distinct life history stages: seedling establishment and tree growth. Independent models for each of six species and across each of three geographic regions allowed explicit comparisons of the effects of our two stationary predictors on multiple species and areas within the leading edge of climate change. Independent models for different life stages of each tree species provided a quantitative

estimate of how relationships between observed tree distributions and stationary landscape conditions may be shifting.

Methods

Region

We segregated the coastal rainforest in Alaska into three regions (Fig. 1). Forests along the Gulf of Alaska west to Kodiak Island were considered to be in the Northwest region. This region is the coldest and has historically had the most snowfall. Weather stations here (station numbers 509685 and 509941) report mean annual maximum temperatures from 1949-2012 of 6.0 and 7.8°C and mean annual snowfall of 4702 and 5664 mm. Forests on the upper panhandle were classified as being in the Middle region. Weather stations in this region (station numbers 503490, 503695, 504092) report mean annual maximum temperatures of 8.8, 9.1, and 9.3°C and mean annual snowfall of 3081, 2210, and 1892 mm from 1949-2012. Forests on the lower panhandle were classified as being in the Southeast region. Weather stations in the Southeast region (station numbers 509919, 504590, 502227) reported mean annual maximum temperatures as high as 9.7 to 10.6°C and mean annual snowfall of only 572 to 1473mm during the same time period. The northern or northwest limits of tree species are known to extend differentially into these regions.

Moderated by the Pacific Ocean that delivers year-round precipitation (Harris et al. 1974, Alaback 1982), a hypermaritime climate has influenced forest structure and composition of coastal Alaska. Terrain is mountainous and has had an active glacial history. These are conifer-dominated ecosystems of low tree species diversity. We studied the six most abundant tree

species, with western hemlock (*Tsuga heterophylla* (Raf.) Sarg.) as the most common species and lesser amounts of Sitka spruce (*Picea sitchensis* (Bong.) Carr.), yellow-cedar (*Callitropsis nootkatensis* (D. Don) D.P. Little), western redcedar (*Thuja plicata* Donn ex D. Don), mountain hemlock (*Tsuga mertensiana* (Bong.) Carr.), and shore pine (*Pinus contorta* Dougl. ex Loud. var *contorta*). Other conifer tree species occur but are either less common or distributed around the fringes of coastal Alaska.

Vegetation data

We used 1465 Forest Inventory and Analysis (FIA) vegetation plots in unmanaged stands: 376 in Northwest Region, 388 in Middle Region, and 701 in Southeast Region. These did not include plots identified as being in timber harvest areas, which were omitted to avoid direct effects of forest management on species composition and existing basal area. Plots used were distributed fairly well across all three broad geographic regions (Fig. 1). Any large geographic gaps without plots were generally in a national park or in US Forest Service wilderness areas.

Live and dead standing trees greater than 12.7 cm (5 in) diameter were recorded from 0.017 ha (1/24 ac) circular plots from 1995 to 2003 (Barrett and Christensen 2011). Saplings (2.5 to 12.7cm diameter) and seedlings (<2.5cm diameter but over 15cm tall) were recorded from 0.0013 ha (1/300 ac) nested microplots. Note that these are size class distinctions, and do not necessarily reflect life stages. Designation of site productivity was made by evaluations of tree heights and site index. Plots judged to have the ability to produce $1.4 \text{ m}^3 \text{ ha}^{-1}$ of wood or more annually were labeled “productive” and those that did not meet this threshold were labelled “unproductive” (USDA FS 1972). Individual plots that were designated with “mixed

productivity” were omitted from analyses where productivity class was a bivariate independent variable. Shore pine and another subspecies (lodgepole pine, *P. contorta* var *latifolia* Englm.) are not distinguished in FIA data; however, shore pine is by far the more common and widespread.

Statistical analysis

We built independent models of tree distribution and basal area as a function of landscape-scale stationary predictors (elevation and site productivity) for each of the six primary tree species listed above and across each of the three regions of coastal Alaska described above. This data-partitioning approach enabled simple interpretation of results and comparisons across regions and species despite extreme natural imbalances in design; some species are not present in some regions. Because of the large number of zeros in the data and because the factors influencing early seedling establishment (probability of presence) may be different from those influencing later tree responses to climate (basal area where present), we modeled distribution and basal area of each tree species separately using a two-step modeling process akin to a hurdle model. Hurdle models have been successfully used on a wide range of problems (e.g., Steel et al. 2012). In the first step, we built a logistic regression model to explain presence-absence patterns or distribution of tree species. In the second step, we modeled basal area of each species.

To examine relationships between elevation and species distribution, we constructed logistic models in which tree presence was a function of elevation. Coefficients from logistics models were transformed for display to show the change in the odds of presence for a 100m gain in elevation. Models to predict basal area used a log-transformed response and a normal

distribution. For these models, the raw regression coefficient is displayed which does not have a simple ecological definition but can be interpreted as a general positive or negative change with increasing elevation. To explore the effects of site productivity, we eliminated sites with mixed productivity classification and refit the models. We then added an indicator variable of site productivity (unproductive versus productive) to the above models and also an interaction term (elevation: productivity). We note that the indicator variable denotes a change in site classification from unproductive to productive. Again, coefficients for the logistic model are transformed to display the change in odds when considering an unproductive versus a productive site. Raw coefficients are displayed for the log linear model. To explore the third question of indications that the relationship to elevation may be changing over time for some species, we used additional information on presence and absence of seedlings, saplings, and dead trees in each plot as well as basal area of dead trees in each plot. We created independent models of presence-absence for live trees, dead trees, seedlings, and saplings as well as independent models of log(basal area) for dead trees and live trees. Life stage models were built using the original data set with all site productivity classes included.

Because of the large sample size and the exploratory nature of these analyses, we did not test for significance in a formal manner. We instead compared parameter estimates and their associated confidence intervals. Where confidence intervals overlapped with zero we note that the relationship was indistinguishable from zero and where confidence intervals did not overlap with zero we conclude that a relationship likely exists. Where confidence intervals failed to overlap with each other or with zero, we conclude that observed relationships are different from one another.

Results

The presence of tree species in FIA plots in the three regions corresponded well to previously published natural information on ranges of four of the species (Fig. 1). For example, inventory plots detected western redcedar as being restricted to the Southeast region (it occurred on four plots just north of this border), which marks its northern extent (Andersen 1953). Small populations of shore pine and yellow-cedar are known to extend far into the Northwest region (Peteet 1991, Hennon and Trummer 2001, respectively), however these species were not detected in FIA plots included in our analyses in this region.

Relationship of elevation with distribution and basal area of six common Alaska tree species.

Looking across all FIA plots in a region, the patterns of occupancy as a function of elevation differed across species and across regions (Fig. 2). The percentage of plots in which a particular species was present varied dramatically with elevation for most species (Fig. 3).

Western hemlock, western redcedar, and shore pine were more likely to be present in plots at lower elevations and absent in plots at higher elevations, in those regions where the species occurred (Fig. 2). Mountain hemlock followed the opposite tendency. It was generally found at higher elevations across all regions (Fig. 2, 3). Presence of Sitka spruce was unrelated to elevation in the Middle and Southeast regions in our sample, suggesting that it was similarly present across the elevation range. It was, however, more common at low elevations in the Northwest region (Fig. 2). Basal area of each species (where present) did not vary by elevation

(Fig. 4). The only exception was mountain hemlock in the Middle region where there was an indication of greater basal area at higher elevations.

Model coefficients describe how either probability of species presence or basal area differs as a function of elevation. They supported and quantified what we observed in Figures 2-4. Most elevation coefficients were significantly different from zero when predicting presence-absence (Fig. 5). For most species, the coefficient for the presence/absence model was negative, indicating reduced odds of being present as elevation increases. The exception was mountain hemlock which had a large positive coefficient for elevation in all regions; the odds of this species being present in an FIA plot increased with elevation. In the middle region, for example, we estimate that the odds of mountain hemlock presence nearly double for every increase in 100m of elevation over the observed range. Sitka spruce was the one species to show a dramatic interaction with region. The transformed elevation coefficient was effectively one, indicating no effect of elevation on the odds of presence in a particular FIA plot, for both the Middle and Southeast regions but it was strongly negative in the Northwest region.

There were fewer strong relationships between elevation and basal area (where a species was present)(Fig. 5). Western hemlock and mountain hemlock again had opposite relationships with elevation; basal area of western hemlock was reduced as elevation increased and basal area of mountain hemlock increased with increasing elevation, though model coefficients for the Northwest region were indistinguishable from zero (Fig. 5). There was again an interaction between elevation and region for Sitka spruce with a negative effect of elevation on basal area

only in the Northwest region. There was an indication that basal area of western redcedar tends to be lower at higher elevations.

Relationship of site productivity to distribution and basal area

When added to a model that already contains elevation, an indicator of site productivity (unproductive versus productive) generally had additional explanatory power for both species presence/absence and basal area (Fig. 6). The odds of western hemlock and Sitka spruce presence were higher in productive areas. Other species were more likely to be present in unproductive areas. The two cedar species, for example, showed a reduced probability of presence on productive sites after accounting for the effect of elevation (Fig. 6).

Where species were present, site productivity classification also had a strong effect on basal area for Sitka spruce and western hemlock; however, there were indications of regional differences in how western hemlock responded to site productivity. There were also regional differences in how yellow-cedar responded to site productivity with site productivity having a notable positive relationship with basal area in the Middle region but not in the Southeast region. Western redcedar basal area was positively correlated with site productivity in the one region where it was present (Southeast region). There was no apparent effect of site productivity on basal area of mountain hemlock or shore pine in any region though both species are frequently present on unproductive sites (Table 1).

There were few noteworthy interactions between site productivity and elevation when predicting species presence/absence. The only exceptions were yellow-cedar (in the Southeast and Middle

regions), western redcedar (in the Southeast Region) and western hemlock (in the Northwest region). In these cases, there was an indication that the effect of elevation differed across productivity classes. For example, yellow-cedar presence had a strongly negative relationship with elevation at unproductive sites in both the Southeast and Middle regions; at productive sites there was a marginally negative relationship with elevation in the Middle region and a fairly positive relationship with elevation in the Southeast region. Western redcedar presence probability in the Southeast region and western hemlock presence probability in the Northwest region were also more negatively associated with elevation at unproductive than at productive sites. There were no significant interactions when predicting the logarithm of basal area. Due to the limited number of coefficients that could be distinguished from zero, these results are not displayed.

Stability in relationships with elevation across lifestages

Analysis of the relationships between elevation and presence of live trees, dead trees, saplings, and seedlings for each species revealed patterns of distributional stability or change for the six tree species (Fig. 7). The coefficient values can be interpreted as the change in the odds of a species being present for every 100m increase in elevation by live trees, dead trees, saplings, and seedlings and for each species. Where the coefficients differ across lifestages, it is an indication that the relationship of that species' distribution to elevation is shifting over time (Fig. 7). Western hemlock had relatively similar relationships with elevation across life stages in the Northwest and Southeast regions. In the Middle region, smaller trees were more likely to be present at higher elevations than mature and dead trees. In the Southeast region, seedlings of western hemlock were present at somewhat lower elevations than the other life stages. There

was a trend for dead yellow-cedar to be found at lower elevation, and for live trees and saplings and seedlings to be found at progressively higher elevation; the strongest negative relationship with elevation was for the dead trees and the weakest for seedlings and saplings. Dead mountain hemlock occurred at somewhat lower elevations than other lifestages in the Northwest region. The odds of Sitka spruce and shore pine presence as a function of elevation indicated relative stability for the four life stages, except that the odds of live Sitka spruce tree presence was reduced at low elevations in the Northwest region (Fig. 7).

The relationship between basal area and elevation was not dramatically different for dead versus live trees (where present) for most species and in most regions (Fig. 8). As for the presence-absence models above, we compared the coefficients between live and dead tree basal area within each species to assess whether the relationship of that species' productivity to elevation is stable. As in figures 5 and 6, positive values for these coefficients indicate increasing basal area with elevation for live or dead trees, conversely negative values suggest reduced basal area with increasing elevation. The positive effect of elevation was dramatically stronger for live versus dead basal area for mountain hemlock in both the middle and Southeast regions. Yellow-cedar, in Southeast regions, had a slightly positive relationship with elevation for live trees yet there was no effect of elevation on dead basal area. In interpreting these models, we recognize that dead standing trees used in our analysis may remain standing for various lengths of time in inventory plots according to tree species, elevation, and productivity class and therefore differences in parameters estimated across life stages may reflect multiple processes in addition to climate change.

Discussion

Elevation was a strong predictor of the distribution of six common conifer tree species across the expanse of the coastal temperate rainforest in Alaska, an area at the leading edge of climate change. Elevation was, however, a better predictor of occurrence than of basal area. Our simple yet quantitative models of the current realized niche for each species agreed well with published qualitative descriptions of species occurrence across the region (e.g., Hultén 1968, Vierick and Little 2007). Nested within these broad trends, a fine-scale indicator of site productivity refined our predictions of occurrence for almost every species within all relevant regions. For some species and within some regions, site quality also had a significant effect on basal area. By comparing models across life-stages, we observed indications, for some species and in some regions, of changing relationships between species distributions and elevation that may be indicative of a changing climate. Interestingly, for other species, we observed no indication of shifting species distributions (Table 1). Our findings can be applied to gain insight into species of particular interest, for example to understand changes in the distribution of yellow-cedar which has been impacted across portions of the region throughout the 20th century.

Biogeography and forest management at the leading edge

The broad spatial arrangement of tree species, especially at their northern or northwestern-most range limits in Alaska, is probably a result of distinct adaptations to particular climate factors as well as differing migration histories. Therefore, patterns at this leading edge provide a unique opportunity to observe range shifts as a result of climate change and other disturbances. Each of our six tree species has natural ranges that extend far south of Alaska along the Pacific Coast to California (Burns and Honkala 1990). Moisture deficits, possibly combined with fire, may pose

the greatest risk of potential range retractions at the trailing edge of climate change in California, as none of these species is tolerant to drought or fire. However, precipitation is not typically limiting at low elevation in the northern portions of these species' ranges. Here, climate may influence the elevational patterns of these trees by affecting their reproductive success and competitive ability more than by imposing heat or drought to exceed their physiological limits.

At this leading edge of the climate envelope, elevation was a clear surrogate for latitude. The occurrence of several tree species showed a strong association with elevation. Two of the three species (western redcedar and shore pine) that were most often found at lower elevation also have natural ranges that did not extend far to the northwest into Alaska. The third species, Sitka spruce which has the most extensive range, had a tendency to occur at low elevations, but this pattern was only present in the most northerly region. Mountain hemlock was most common at higher elevations in all three regions in Alaska. The weaker relationship between basal area and elevation suggests that climate and other factors related to elevation do not substantially affect tree growth, either number or size of stems, in the same way as they affect seedling initiation. The greater basal area of mountain hemlock at higher elevation combined with the negative coefficient for probability of presence on productive sites is consistent with the observation that mountain hemlock is only competitive on low productivity sites at low elevations (Martin et al. 1995)

Given more detailed knowledge of range limits, and occurrence by elevation and productivity class, various forest management strategies in coastal Alaska may be employed to favor tree species on particular sites. However, adapting forest management practices at species range

edges is in the early stages of development (Milad et al. 2013). With robust distribution models of tree species focusing on patterns at the limits of current species ranges, forest management strategies could be developed for favoring regeneration and competition of species at their current northern or upper elevational limits. Conservation methods might be employed to protect trees at these limits, but various harvesting strategies could also be used to encourage natural regeneration or, in combination with artificial regeneration (planting), to enhance migration (Pedlar et al. 2012). The role of natural disturbance such as windthrow, landslides, and glacial rebound in favoring migration of tree species needs to be investigated and related to active forest management. High resolution species distribution models and associated GIS layers will undoubtedly be a foundation for developing conservation and management strategies. Our results can serve as inputs to these models, estimating occurrence and abundance where there are no on-the-ground data.

Fine-scale effects of site quality

Site quality or productive potential is tied closely to soil moisture, a function of climate, soils, and micro-topography. Site quality therefore operates at a fine spatial scale, nested within elevation and climate, to influence the distribution and abundance of tree species. Forest productivity is positively correlated with soil moisture in many forests of the world where water is often limiting (Gholz et al. 1990). The opposite relationship is found in coastal Alaska, where there is abundant year-round precipitation and droughts are relatively rare (Stephens et al. 1969). In coastal Alaska, bogs and other forested peatlands that have developed on gentle slopes or in soils with restricted drainage support less live conifer biomass, more open canopy conditions, and a unique and diverse composition of tree and understory species (Neiland 1971). The cedars,

mountain hemlock, and particularly shore pine tolerate marginal sites with poor drainage but cannot compete with the faster growing trees on the favorable drained soils (Ruth and Harris 1979). We found western hemlock, western redcedar, yellow-cedar, and Sitka spruce to have higher basal area on productive than unproductive sites, which is consistent with previous observations and plant classification schemes (Neiland 1971, DeMeo et al. 1992, Martin et al. 1995).

Reduced competition can also influence the tendency of particular species to occupy marginal sites. Western hemlock, for example, appeared to expand its niche to less productive conditions in the Northwest Region where western redcedar is absent and shore pine and yellow-cedar populations are very limited. Sitka spruce extends even further west beyond the other species on Kodiak and Afognak Islands where it has no competition with conifers in a leading and slowly expanding range edge (Griggs 1934). Improved hydrologic and soils data could be used with forest inventory data to refine our results on how conifers respond across the drainage gradient from bog to upland forest beyond the simple productive-unproductive classes that we used here.

Implications for a species in decline

Yellow-cedar is known to have experienced an intense mortality focused on lower elevations in Alaska (Hennon et al. 2012). In the warmest region of our study, we found that the relationship between elevation and yellow-cedar occurrence differed substantially among life stages (i.e., more dead trees at lower elevation, more regeneration at higher elevation), indicative of an unstable, shifting distribution (Fig. 7). The latitudinal and elevational limits of the intensive yellow-cedar death are considered to be controlled by snow accumulation with inadequate snow

leading to fine root freezing injury during cold weather in late winter or early spring (Hennon et al. 2012). Snowpack may also protect yellow-cedar regeneration from deer browse by keeping deer populations in check (White et al. 2009), or simply by covering seedlings during the non-growing season when deer feed on them. These snow effects could explain the more abundant yellow-cedar seedlings that we detected at higher elevation.

Fine-scale site productivity is also important in controlling both the distribution of yellow-cedar and the occurrence of its intensive mortality. We do not have a clear understanding of all the mechanisms that contribute to our finding of varying competitive abilities on sites that are productive (well-drained soils) and unproductive (saturated soils). However, growth of the two cedar species may be favored on saturated soils by having a unique adaptation for acquiring nutrients there through cation mobilization of nitrate (D'Amore et al. 2009).

Our findings suggest that even lands designated for conservation status and not influenced by activities such as road building or timber harvesting may be expected to have dynamic vegetation alteration, as species experience shifting distributions, possibly initiated through climate change. Some such protected areas impacted by yellow-cedar mortality are already expressing successional changes as yellow-cedars are replaced by other species such as western hemlock (Oakes et al. 2014). We note that caution should be used in attempting to interpret population dynamics of long-lived tree species from forest plot data because of the possibility of longer-term episodic reproduction or mortality (Lertzman 1995) and factors unrelated to climate that can cause tree mortality.

475 *Climate as a factor in future tree species distributions*

476 Shifts across life stages in the relationship between the distribution of particular tree species with
477 respect to latitude and elevation may suggest population expansion or contraction in response to
478 a changing climate. We observed indications of such shifts not only for yellow-cedar but also
479 for mountain hemlock and Sitka spruce (Table 1) and similar results have been found by others.
480 For example, by comparing the geographic distribution of seedlings and tree biomass from
481 inventory plots in the eastern US, Woodall et al. (2009) found the mean latitude of seedlings to
482 be 20 km north of tree biomass for northern species, but southern species appeared static. As in
483 our study, results on life stages should be interpreted cautiously because seedlings and saplings
484 represented size classes and not necessarily recent regeneration. Coldest mean temperature of
485 the month, growing degree days, and moisture indices are useful in predicting vegetation ranges
486 in northern Europe (Sykes and Prentice 1996) and western North America (Shafer et al. 2001).
487 For coastal Alaska, we would add snow accumulation (or snowpack) as an important controlling
488 climate factor of conifer occurrence and abundance.

489
490 The climate of coastal Alaska is expected to become warmer and slightly wetter in the next
491 century (Wolken et al. 2011). Forest trees will experience warmer winters, longer growing
492 seasons, and as the mean winter temperature warms above freezing, considerably reduced snow
493 accumulation in some areas. The region is predicted to have the greatest loss of days below
494 freezing of any area of North America in the 21st century (Meehl, et al. 2004) because current
495 winter mean temperatures hover close to the 0°C freezing threshold. Species reliant on snow for
496 either greater competitive status (mountain hemlock) or for protection from direct weather injury
497 (yellow-cedar) are likely to experience diminished suitable habitat. We found both of these

species to be associated with higher elevations in Alaska, especially for mountain hemlock. Both tree species have also been projected to lose habitat in British Columbia as other conifer species from lower elevation would be expected to shift upward (Hamann and Wang 2006). Our study found western hemlock, Sitka spruce, western redcedar, and shore pine to be associated with low elevations in Alaska, and have extensive ranges to the south, suggesting that they may be favored by the projected climate during the next century. These tree species may benefit directly by warmer conditions but so could individual insects (e.g., spruce aphid, Powell and Parry 1976), pathogens (e.g., dwarf mistletoe, Barrett et al. 2012), and herbivores (e.g., deer, White et al. 2009) to offset gains in productivity.

The current distributions of forest trees reflect the realized ecological niche of each species, the culmination of their adaptation to environmental factors, competition with other tree species, interaction with other biotic factors, and migration from historic distributions. Untangling these complex interactions will be challenging; however, our quantification of their associations with several stationary factors should form a basis for understanding edaphic and climate niche requirements of coastal conifers. By comparing live versus dead tree basal area and occupancy across multiple life stages, we revealed possible maladaptation to climate and possible distribution contraction or expansion for some species and not others. Our results provide a convenient glimpse of fluctuating populations across latitude, elevation, and site productivity. Our analysis suggests instability of yellow-cedar, mountain hemlock, and Sitka spruce. Western hemlock, western redcedar, and shore pine species appear to have more stable distributions (Table 1). Each of our tree species are found in mixed-species communities but they are likely to respond individually to climate change, as is suggested by the fossil record (Davis and Shaw

521 2001). Our models of each independent tree species enable us to begin imagining how
522 communities across whole landscapes might shift and re-arrange under a changing climate.

523

Draft

Acknowledgments

We wish to thank Tara Barrett and Ken Winterburger for guidance with forest inventory plot data, Rob Develice and Robert Pattison for help in interpreting the northwest limits of tree species, Melinda Lamb who produced the Figure 1 map, and Tara Barrett and Lauren Oakes who made helpful suggestions on an early manuscript draft. We appreciate the financial assistance from the USFS Region 10 Regional Office and oversight by The Nature Conservancy for their support to John Caouette.

Literature cited

- Alaback, P.B. 1982. Dynamics of understory biomass in Sitka spruce-western hemlock forests of Southeast Alaska. *Ecology*. **63**: 1932-1948.
- Andersen, H.E. 1953. Range of western redcedar (*Thuja plicata*) in Alaska. U.S. Dep. Agric., For. Serv., Juneau, AK. Technical Note No. 22. 2 p.
- Barrett, T.M., and Christensen, G.A. 2011. Forests of southeast and south-central Alaska, 2004-2008: five year forest inventory and analysis report. Gen. Tech. Rep. PNW-GTR-835. U.S. Dep. Agric., Forest Service. Pacific Northwest Research Station. Portland, OR. 156 p.
- Barrett, T.; Latta, G., Hennon, P., Eskelson, B.N.I., and Ternesgen, H. 2012. Modeling host-parasite distributions under changing climate: *Tsuga heterophylla* and *Arceuthobium tsugense* in Alaska. *Can. J. For. Res.* **42**: 642-656.

- 547
- 548 Booth, T.H., Nix, H.A., Hutchinson, M.F., and Jovanovic, T. 1988. Niche analysis and tree
549 species introduction. *For. Ecol. Man.* **23**: 47-59.
- 550
- 551 Burns, R.M., and Honkala, B.H. 1990. *Silvics of North America. Vol. 1, conifers.* US. Dep.
552 Agric., Forest Service, Agriculture handbook 654. Washington, DC. 675p.
- 553
- 554 Cade, B.S. 1997. Comparison of tree basal area and canopy cover in habitat models: subalpine
555 forest. *Journal of Wildlife Management* **61**: 326-336.
- 556
- 557 D'Amore, D.V., Hennon, P.E., Schaberg, P.G., and Hawley, G. 2009. Adaptation to exploit
558 nitrate in surface soils predisposes yellow-cedar to climate change-induced decline while
559 enhancing the survival of redcedar: a new hypothesis. *Forest Ecology and Management.* **258**:
560 2261-2268.
- 561
- 562 Davis, M. B., and Shaw, R. G. 2001. Range shifts and adaptive responses to Quaternary climate
563 change. *Science* **292**: 673-679.
- 564
- 565 DeMeo, T., Martin, J., and West, R.A. 1992. *Forest plant association management guide,*
566 *Ketchikan Area, Tongass National Forest.* U.S. Dep. Agric., For. Serv. Alaska Region, Juneau,
567 AK. R10-MB-210. 405p.
- 568

- DeVelice, R.L., Hubbard, C.J., Boggs, K., Boudreau, S., Potkin, M., Boucher, T., and Wertheim, C. 1999. Plant community types of the Chugach National Forest: southcentral Alaska. USDA Forest Service, Chugach National Forest, Alaska Region Technical Publication R10-TP-76. Anchorage, AK. 375 p.
- Elith, J., and Leathwick, J.R. 2009. Species distribution models: ecological explanation and predictions across space and time. *Ann. Rev. Ecol. Syst.* **40**: 677-697.
- Grace, J., Berninger, F., and Nagy, L. 2002. Impacts of climate change on the tree line. *Annals of Botany*. **90**: 537-544.
- Griffin, J.R., and Critchfield, W.B. 1972. The distribution of forest trees in California. USDA For. Serv., Pacific Southwest forest and range experiment station, Berkeley, CA. Research Paper PSW-82. 114 p.
- Griggs, R.F. 1934. The edge of the forest in Alaska and the reasons for its position. *Ecology*. **15**: 80-96.
- Hamann, A., and Wang, T. 2006. Potential effects of climate change on ecosystem and tree species distribution in British Columbia. *Ecology*. **87**: 2773-2786.

Harris, A.S., Hutchison, O.K., Meehan, W.R., Swanston, D.N., Helmers, A.E., Hendee, J.C., and
Collins, T.M. 1974. The Forest Ecosystem of Southeast Alaska 1. The Setting. General
Technical Report PNW-GTR-12. USDA Forest Service, Juneau, AK.

Haufler, J.B., C.A. Mehl, and S. Yeats. 2010. Climate change: anticipated effects on ecosystem
services and potential actions by the Alaska Region, U.S. Forest Service. Ecosystem
Management Research Institute, Seeley Lake, Montana, USA.

Hennon, P.E., D'Amore, D.V., Schaberg, P.G., Wittwer, D.T., and Shanley, C.S. 2012. Shifting
climate, altered niche, and a dynamic conservation strategy for yellow-cedar in the North Pacific
coastal rainforest. *BioScience*. **63**: 147-158.

Hennon, P.E., Hansen, E.M., and Shaw, C.G. III. 1990. Dynamics of decline and mortality of
Chamaecyparis nootkatensis in southeast Alaska. *Can. J. Bot.* **68**: 651-662.

Hennon, P.E., and Trummer, L.M. 2001. Yellow-cedar (*Chamaecyparis nootkatensis*) at the
northwest limits of its range in Prince William Sound, Alaska. *Northwest Science*. **75**: 61-72.

Hultén, E. 1968. Flora of Alaska and neighboring territories. Stanford Press. Stanford, CA. 1008
p.

- 611 Iverson, L.R., Prasad, A.M., Mathews, S.N., and Peters, M. 2008. Estimating potential habitat for
612 134 eastern US tree species under six climate scenarios. *Forest Ecology and Management*. **254**:
613 390-406.
- 614
- 615 Lertzman, K.P. 1995. Forest dynamics, differential mortality and recruitment probabilities.
616 *Journal of Vegetation Science*. **6**: 191-204.
- 617
- 618 Martin, J.R., Trull, S.J., Brady, W.W., West, R.A., and Downs, J.M. 1995. Forest plant
619 association management guide, Chatham Area, Tongass National Forest. U.S. Dep. Agric., For.
620 Serv. Alaska Region, Juneau, AK. R10-TP-57. 405p.
- 621
- 622 Mátyás, C. 2010. Forecasts needed for retreating forests. *Nature*. **464**: 1271.
- 623
- 624 Meehl, G.H., Tebaldi, C., and Nychka, D. 2004. Changes in frost day simulations of 21st century
625 climate. *Climate dynamics*. **12**: 495-511.
- 626
- 627 Milad, M., Schaich, H., and Konold, W. 2013. How is adaptation to climate change reflected in
628 current practice of forest management and conservation? *Biodiversity and conservation*. **22**:
629 1181-1202.
- 630
- 631 Neiland, B.J. 1971. The forest-bog complex in Southeast Alaska. *Vegetatio*. **22**: 1-63.
- 632

Nielson, S.E., Johnson, C.J., Heard, D.C., and Boyce, M.S. 2005. Can models of presence-absence be used to scale abundance? Two case studies considering extremes in life history. *Ecography*. **28**: 197-208.

Oakes, L.E., Hennon, P.E., Ardoin, N.M., D'Amore, D.V., Ferguson, A.J., Steel, E.A., Wittwer, D.T., and Lambin. E.F. 2015. Conservation in a social-ecological system experiencing climate-induced tree mortality. *Biological Conservation*. In press.

Oakes, L., Hennon, P., O'Hara, K. and Dirzo, R. 2014. Long-term changes in a temperate forest impacted by climate change. *Ecosphere*. **5(135)**: 1-28.

Powell, W., and Parry, W.H. 1976. Effects of temperature on overwintering populations of the green spruce aphid *Elatobium abietinum*. *Ann. Appl. Biol.* **82**: 209-219.

Pearson, R.G., and Dawson T.P. 2003. Predicting the impacts of climate change on the distribution of species: are bioclimate envelope models useful? *Global Ecology and Biogeography*. **12**: 361-371.

Pedlar, J.H., McKenney, D.W., Audin I., Beardmore, T., Beaulieu, J., Iverson, L., O'Neill, G.A., Winder, R.S., and Ste-Marie, C. 2012. Placing forestry in the assisted migration debate. *BioScience* **62**: 835-842.

- Peteet, D.M. 1991. Postglacial migration history of lodgepole pine near Yakutat, Alaska. *Can. J. Bot.* **69**: 786-796.
- Peterson, A.T. 2003. Predicting the geography of species' invasions via ecological niche modeling. *Quarterly Review of Biology.* **78**: 419-433.
- Rehfeldt, G.E., Crookston, N.L., Warwell, M.V., and Evans, J.S. 2006. Empirical analyses of plant-climate relationships for the western United States. *Int. J. Plant Sci.* **167**: 1123-1150.
- Ruth, R.H., and Harris, A.S. 1979. Management of western hemlock-Sitka spruce forests for timber production. U.S. Dep. Agric., For. Serv., Pacific Northwest Forest and Range Experiment Station. Portland, OR. General Technical Report PNW-88. 197p.
- Shafer, S.L., Bartlein, P.J., and Thompson, R.S. 2001. Potential changes in the distributions of western North America tree and shrub taxa under future climate scenarios. *Ecosystems.* **4**: 200-215.
- Schroeder, T.A., Hamann, A., Wang, T., and Coops, N.C. 2010. Occurrence and dominance of six Pacific Northwest conifer species. *Journal of Vegetation Science.* **21**: 586-596.
- Steel, E.A., Jensen, D.W., Burnett, K.W., Christiansen, K., Firman, J.C., Feist, B.E., Anlauf, K., and Larsen, D.P. 2012. Landscape characteristics and coho salmon (*Oncorhynchus kisutch*)

- 677 distributions: explaining abundance versus occupancy. Canadian Journal of Fisheries and
678 Aquatic Sciences. **69**: 457-468.
- 679
- 680 Stephens, F.R., Gass, C.R., Billings, R.F., and Paulson, D.E. 1969. Soils and associated
681 ecosystems of the Tongass. U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service. Alaska Region
682 report. Juneau, AK. 139p.
- 683
- 684 Sykes, M.T., and Prentice, I.C. 1996. Climate change, tree species distributions and forest
685 dynamics: a case study in the mixed conifer/northern hardwoods zone of northern Europe.
686 Climate Change. **34**: 161-177.
- 687
- 688 US Department of Agriculture, Forest Service. 1972. Forest survey handbook FSH 4809.11. US
689 Government Printing Office. Washington, DC. 279 p.
- 690
- 691 Vierick, L.A., Little, E.L. 2007. Alaska trees and shrubs. Second edition. University of Alaska
692 Press. Fairbanks, AK. 359 p.
- 693
- 694 White, K.S., Pendleton, G.W., and Hood, E. 2009. Effects of snow on Sitka black-tailed deer
695 browse availability and nutritional carrying capacity in southeastern Alaska. Journal of Wildlife
696 Management. **73**: 481-487.
- 697
- 698 Wolken, J.M., Hollingsworth, T.N., Rupp, S.T., Chapin, F.S., Trainor, S.F., Barrett, T.M.,
699 Beever, E.A., Sullivan, P.F., McGuire, A.D., Euskirchen, E.S., Hennon, P.E., Beever, E.A.,

700 Conn, J.S., Crone, L.K., D'Amore, D.V., Fresco, F., Hanley, T.A., Kielland, K., Kruse, J.J.,
701 Patterson, T., Schuur, E.A.G., Verbyla, D.L., and Yarie, J. 2011. Evidence and implications of
702 recent and projected climate change on Alaska's forest ecosystems. *Ecosphere*. **2(11)**: 1-35.
703
704 Woodall, C.W., Oswalt, C.M., Westfall, J.A., Perry, J.A., Perry, C.H., Nelson, M.D., and Finley,
705 A.O. 2009. An indicator of tree migration in forests of the eastern United States. *Forest Ecology*
706 *and Management*. **257**: 1434-1444.

Draft

Table 1. A summary of modeled tree distributions by species, region, and lifestage. The three regions are Northwest (NW), Middle (M), and Southeast (SE) as described in Figure 1. Note that regional presence is defined as presence in more than 5 plots within the region. Arrows describe parameters for which the 95% confidence intervals do not overlap zero. Grey indicates that the 95% confidence interval is extremely close to zero. The direction of the arrow indicates the effect of increasing elevation or of productive site classification. The effect of site productivity classification was assessed in models that already contained elevation. The effects of interactions are summarized simply as presence of a significant interaction between elevation and site productivity in models to predict presence / absence of the species (PA) or basal area. There were no significant interaction effects in models of basal area. Results of models describing the effects of elevation on probability of presence by lifestage were summarized by describing the lifestage that differed from the others.

Figure Captions.

Figure 1. Map of coastal Alaska indicating the location of forest inventory and analysis (FIA) plots, north or northwestern limits for each of the main tree species, and the regions (Northwest, Middle and Southeast) used in our analysis.

Figure 2: Distribution of elevation (m) for plots in which each of six tree species was present versus absent, by region. Solid line indicates median value; boxes identify the center quartiles of the data; and whiskers designate one-and-a-half times the interquartile range. Presence data were not plotted for a particular region and species if there were fewer than 5 plots in which the species was present in that region. Regions are defined in Figure 1.

Figure 3. Percentage of sites with species present across 150 m elevation classes for each of the six common conifer species and each of the three regions. Regions are defined in Figure 1. TSHE = western hemlock; THPL = western redcedar ; CANO = yellow-cedar; TSME = mountain hemlock; PISI = Sitka spruce; PICO = shore pine.

Figure 4: Basal area (m^2/ha) by elevation (m), across six species and three regions, for plots in which the species was present. Dashed lines describe a locally weighted scatterplot smoothing for visual inspection of trends. Data were not plotted for a particular region and species if there were fewer than 5 plots in which the species was present in that region. Regions are defined in Figure 1.

Figure 5: Effects of elevation on species presence / absence and on basal area where present. For presence / absence (a), transformed coefficients representing the change in odds of species

presence for a 100m gain in elevation are presented. For basal area (b), coefficients describe the effect of a change in elevation on $\log(\text{basal area})$ using a linear regression model assuming normal errors. TSHE = western hemlock; THPL = western redcedar ; CANO = yellow-cedar; TSME = mountain hemlock; PISI = Sitka spruce; PICO = shore pine. Whiskers describe 95% confidence intervals around each parameter estimate. Regions are defined in Figure 1.

Figure 6: Regression coefficients for productivity in regression models to describe (a) presence/absence using a logistic model and (b) $\log(\text{basal area})$ using a linear regression model assuming normal errors. Regression coefficients for the logistic model are transformed to describe the change in odds of presence for a productive versus unproductive site. In both cases, the subset of plots classified as “mixed productivity” were not used in model building and productivity was added to a model that already contained log-transformed elevation. TSHE = western hemlock; THPL = western redcedar ; CANO = yellow-cedar; TSME = mountain hemlock; PISI = Sitka spruce; PICO = shore pine. Whiskers describe 95% confidence intervals around each parameter estimate. Regions are defined in Figure 1.

Figure 7: Transformed regression coefficients for elevation in logistic regression models to across lifestage and region. Transformed coefficients can be interpreted as the change in odds of presence for a 100m increase in elevation. Lifestages are identified at the center of each bar as dead (DEAD), live (LIVE), sapling (SAPL) or seedling (SEED). Vertical grey lines visually differentiate the three regions. Whiskers represent 95% confidence intervals around the parameter estimate. Where confidence intervals appear to be absent, they are simply smaller than the size of life stage label. Regions are identified as in Figure 1.

Figure 8: Regression coefficients for elevation in linear regression models assuming normal errors to describe log (basal area) across life stage and region. Life stages are identified at the center of each bar as dead (DEAD) versus live (LIVE). Vertical grey lines visually differentiate the three regions. Whiskers describe 95% confidence intervals around each parameter estimate. Where confidence intervals appear to be absent, they are simply smaller than the size of life stage label. Regions are identified as in Figure 1.

Draft

	Western hemlock (TSHE)			Western redcedar (THPL)	Yellow-cedar (CANO)		Mountain hemlock (TSME)			Sitka spruce (PISI)			Shore pine (PICO)	
Presence by region ^a	NW	M	SE	SE	M	SE	NW	M	SE	NW	M	SE	M	SE
Increasing elevation on probability of presence	↓	↓	↓	↓	↓		↑	↑	↑	↓			↓	↓
Elevation on BA where present (by region)		↓	↓	↓	↓		↑	↑		↓				
Higher site quality on probability of presence ^b		↑	↑	↓	↓	↓	↓	↓	↓	↑	↑	↑	↓	↓
Higher site quality on BA where present ^c	↑	↑	↑	↑	↑					↑	↑	↑		
Interactions site quality & elevation	PA				PA PA									
Elevation on probability of presence by lifestage						Dead lower	Dead lower			Live lower				
Elevation on BA by lifestage							Dead lower	Dead lower						

254x190mm (96 x 96 DPI)

279x215mm (300 x 300 DPI)

287x321mm (72 x 72 DPI)

272x507mm (300 x 300 DPI)

287x321mm (72 x 72 DPI)

291x372mm (72 x 72 DPI)

283x323mm (72 x 72 DPI)

363x323mm (72 x 72 DPI)

331x372mm (72 x 72 DPI)