

Characteristics and distribution of potential ash tree hosts for Emerald Ash Borer.

David W. MacFarlane and Shawna Patterson Meyer

Department of Forestry, Michigan State University, East Lansing, MI 48824. May 2, 2003

Introduction

The emerald ash borer (EAB)(*Agrilus planipennis*), is a recently discovered (July 2002) exotic insect pest, which has caused the death of ash trees (*Fraxinus spp.*) in the Detroit Metropolitan area. Six Michigan counties, including Livingston, Macomb, Monroe, Oakland, Washtenaw, and Wayne counties, have been quarantined to regulate the movement of live ash trees and ash tree products (Haack et al. 2002). The borer is also established in Windsor, (Essex County) Canada. Most recently (February 2003) a small population was confirmed in nearby Toledo, Ohio. If emerald ash borer populations are not contained and eventually eradicated, the ash resource could be devastated. Ash trees are one of the more widely planted trees in urban areas of the U.S. (Ottman and Kielbaso 1976, Giedraitis and Kielbaso 1982) and occur in many different forest ecosystems (Harlow et al. 1991). According to the USDA Forest Inventory and Analysis (FIA) database (http://fia.fs.fed.us/dbrs_setup.htm) there are over 802.5 million ash trees on timberlands in Michigan alone. In urban areas, dead and dying trees will pose hazards to people and property and will require removal, often a costly process. In natural forests, EAB may dramatically change forest biodiversity and forest stand dynamics. Substantial economic losses will be sustained by the wood products and horticultural industries through direct destruction of the resource and quarantines affecting the movement of ash trees and products.

Unfortunately, little is known regarding the rate of spread of EAB populations (Haack et al. 2002), but rate and direction of spread is likely to be correlated with the spatial distribution and status of the ash tree host. General information regarding the abundance, health and distribution of ash trees is available through the U.S.D.A. Forest Service's FIA and Forest Health Monitoring (FHM) programs, but the resolution of this data is coarse, particularly in urban ecosystems. The purpose of this report is to summarize what is currently known regarding the potential spatial distribution and characteristics of various species of ash trees and to evaluate this information with specific regard to assessing the relative risk of ash populations to EAB.

The urban ash resource

Much of the damage caused by EAB to date has occurred in urban-suburban areas and it is important to address the distribution of ash in urban ecosystems. Urban ecosystems are often stressful to trees and are also common launch points for exotic species. Ash trees have been a popular street tree for decades and were widely planted to replace elms killed by Dutch elm disease. particularly green ash Green ash(*Fraxinus pennsylvanica*), the most common species, is tolerant of salt, drought stress, compacted (anoxic) soils and a variety of soil pH conditions ranging from acid to alkaline (McComb 1949). This wide ecologic amplitude allows the species to occupy a large natural geographic range, ranging from riparian flats in Montana and Saskatchewan, south to Texas, and across the entire

eastern U.S. This natural stress tolerance has pre-adapted green ash to grow in urban environments. Soil root pits on city streets are often in compacted, poorly drained soils with a generally high pH. Tolerance to alkalinity is particularly important in urban settings where calcium leachate from concrete accumulates in the tree root pit, causing often extremely high pH. Similarly salt tolerance has pre-adapted green ash to urban conditions in areas where snowfall accumulates, because the rock salt, that is used to melt ice and snow, accumulates in snow piles around urban trees. Other ash species have proven hardy in urban environments as well (Street Tree Fact Sheets 1989).

The popularity of ash as an urban tree began in 1940s with the introduction of the “Marshall Seedless” cultivar of green ash, which was not only tolerant of urban ecosystem, but, as a male clone, eliminated the messy cleanup associated with ash seed mast. Other cultivated varieties of green ash and white ash subsequently became popular street trees (Table 1). European ash (*Fraxinus excelsior*) has been used in place of green or white ash in some cities. Eurasian flowering ash (*Fraxinus ornus*) is sometimes used as an ornamental in the Pacific Northwest (Harlow et al. 1991) and “Modesto ash” (*F. velutina* var. ‘Modesto’) is a common street tree in California and other western cities. The popularity of ash cultivars, particularly green ash, continued to rise nationally through the 1980’s (Giedraitis and Kielbaso 1982), except in the southern U.S. where ash has not been commonly used as a street tree (Ottman and Kielbaso 1976, Giedraitis and Kielbaso 1982). The greatest popularity has been in the north central region of the U.S (Giedraitis and Kielbaso 1982). Ash trees are still abundant in many cities in the eastern central and western parts of the country, although green ash may be declining in popularity relative to white ash (*Fraxinus americana*) cultivars (as seen in Table 1), possibly due to both the knowledge that green ash is over-planted and the attractive purple fall foliage color in white ash cultivars. In a recent study (Boris and Kielbaso 1999), white ash ranked 2nd and 4th amongst trees recommended for Michigan streets (Table 1).

In assessing potential risk of urban forests to EAB, both the abundance of ash and the nature of ash trees must be considered. Data abstracted from a 1994 study of the demography and health of trees in Michigan cities (Table 2) revealed that several cities that are currently within the core zone of EAB infestation have substantial components of white and green ash trees on their streets. The genetic diversity of planted ash is often quite low. For example, only 5 green and 4 white ash cultivars (Table 1) were determined to be common in urban ecosystems (Jim Kielbaso, pers. com.). If Michigan cities are representative of the urban forest resource in other parts of the country, then the combined abundance and low genetic diversity of ash should enhance the risk of damage by EAB in urban ecosystems nationwide.

Anecdotal reports have suggested that certain ash cultivars may be more resistant to the EAB than others. Green ash may be more susceptible or more attractive to EAB than white ash, but this has not yet been evaluated and could partly reflect the greater abundance of green ash in urban environments, as Table 2 suggests. In other words, green ash would have to be *disproportionally* colonized by EAB relative to its abundance to be considered more susceptible than white ash. Specific analysis of local density and

site conditions under which different ash cultivars are being attacked is needed, as well as an understanding of EAB host preference, to assess relative susceptibility of ash species.

Table 1. Ash tree cultivars recommended for Michigan streets in 1999.

Species	var.	Year	origin	1999 Rank (top 100)
F. pennsylvanica		na	na	66
	“Marshall Seedless”	1946	Utah, USA	36
	“Summit”	1957	Minnesota, USA	*
	“Patmore”	1975	Manitoba, CA	15
	“Urbanite”	1987	Illinois, USA	98
	“Cimmaron”	1992	Ohio, USA	39
F. americana		na	na	23
	“Autumn Purple”	1956	Wisconsin, USA	4
	“Rosehill”	1966	Missouri, USA	*
	“Autumn Applause”	1975	Illinois, USA	2
	“Champaign County”	1975	Illinois, USA	*

(data from Boris and Kielbaso 1999 and Street Tree Fact Sheets 1989). * Indicates that the cultivar is not currently in the top 100 trees recommended.

Table 2. Estimated percentage of live street trees which are ash in selected Michigan cities in and around the zone infested by the emerald ash borer (EAB).

City	% streets sampled [†]	% W. ash	% G. ash	White & Green ash
Ann Arbor	1.54%	4.0%	10.0%	14.0%
Detroit	0.04%	0.9%	17.5%	18.4%
Gross Pt. Woods	4.63%	3.1%	5.7%	8.8%
Lincoln Park	4.10%	0.2%	4.4%	4.6%
Livonia	1.19%	7.2%	0.7%	7.9%
Pontiac	2.15%	0.0%	23.2%	23.2%
Warren	1.08%	0.5%	1.9%	2.4%
Woodhaven	3.97%	12.8%	16.4%	29.2%

(unpublished data from J. Kielbaso, related to Michigan Forest Health Report 1994). [†] % of total linear distance of streets in the city.

Ash in natural forest systems

An understanding of the distribution and condition of potential ash hosts in the U.S. is essential to assessing the potential risk of forest ecosystems to devastation by EAB. With an introduced pest, investigations of its native range and host preferences are

usually a preferred starting point, but little information on EAB is available. Preliminary investigation suggests that EAB is found on *F. chinensis*, *F. rhynchophylla* (a.k.a., *F. chinensis* var. *rhynchophylla*), *F. mandshurica* and possibly some other *Fraxinus* species (Haack et al. 2002). These ash species are found in a variety of climates across most of China, in all provinces except Xinjiang and Tibet (i.e., western China) (Dr. Xie Yingping, College of Life Science and Technology of Shanxi University, pers. com), thus, the spatial extent of EAB risk cannot be easily inferred from broad scale native host distribution. It should be possible, however, to use information regarding the distribution and health of ash populations in the U.S. to map potential risk. Demographic information, regarding ash tree age, health and population density along with physiographic information such as soils, site hydrology and climate, can be used as a surrogate for predicting the relative risk of EAB infestation. In the absence of specific quantitative assessments of insect biology or insect-host relationships, host-based risk analysis may provide the only available information for assessing risk.

Much is known about the characteristics and natural distribution of ash trees that grow wild in forests and woodlands. There are 16 or 17 arborescent species of *Fraxinus* (Harlow et al. 1991), depending on phenotypic and genetic relationships amongst the ash species (Wright 1944, 1959a, 1959b). Harlow et. al (1991) list white ash and green ash as being taxonomically “important” species of ash in the U.S., but also list a number of species of lesser importance, including black ash (*F. nigra*), ranging from southeastern Canada to northeastern U.S.; Carolina ash (*F. caroliniana*), found on the coastal plain from northeastern Virginia, south to Florida and west to southeastern Texas; pumpkin ash (*F. profunda*), found on the coastal plain from southern Maryland to northern Florida, west to Louisiana and north to southern Illinois; blue ash (*F. quadrangulata*), found on dry limestone uplands in Ohio and the Upper Mississippi valleys; Oregon ash (*F. latifolia*), ranging along the west coast from southern British Columbia to southern California; and single-leaf ash (*F. anomala*) and velvet ash (*F. velutina*), in the arid southwestern U.S. Stewart and Krajicek (1973) list six of these species, white, pumpkin, blue, black, green and Oregon, as commercially important.

There has long been confusion regarding the identification of ash species in the field (Wright 1944, Wright 1959a, Wright 1959b). Green ash and red ash are common names often used interchangeably to describe morphs of *F. pennsylvanica*, although taxonomists have been unable to agree over the years whether red ash is a subspecies or separate species of green ash (Wright 1944, Wright 1959b, Harlow et al. 1991). Similarly, Oregon ash, velvet ash and Carolina ash are close relatives of the more widespread green ash and have all been classified as both separate species and sub-species of green ash (Wright 1944, Wright 1959b). Green and white ash, the two most commonly recognized species, are often confused in the field (Wright 1959a), and have been known to hybridize, complicating identification. Many forest inventories separate white and green ash based upon landscape position (i.e., upland and lowland sites, respectively) or do not attempt to differentiate ash species at all. If ash species becomes important for EAB risk assessment, one might be tempted to refine existing databases describing ash species by landscape position. However, this would likely be either redundant or logically circular. Also, if species identification is incorrectly assessed by field crews in infested areas,

there will be an intractable bias in the predictions of risk models calibrated with faulty species data.

Information regarding *Fraxinus* species other than green, black and white ash trees in the literature is scarce. Here, we assume that species-specific characteristics referred to in this report reflect a greater than usual effort to identify ash to the species level by investigators. Below we outline the various factors which might be used to differentiate natural host tree distribution, abundance and vigor as potential spatial indicators of risk for EAB.

Physical and genetic characteristics of ash

The physical-genetic properties of ash trees should be meaningful for EAB risk assessment if genetically-based resistance to the borer becomes evident. Stewart and Krajicek (1973) noted that white ash has superior strength qualities which differentiate it commercially from other ash species, and this may relate to the physical-chemical properties of the wood. Genetically, white ash is more distinct than many of the other ashes listed (Wright 1959a), although it has one close relative in the rare Texas ash (*F. texensis*). Since white ash is the most commercially important of the ash species, potential resistance of white ash would bode well for the timber resource. Black ash, sometimes marketed as “brown ash”, and pumpkin ash seem to be differentiable from other ash trees (Stewart and Krajicek 1973). Green, Carolina, velvet and Oregon ashes are believed to be genetically related (Wright 1944, Wright 1959b). It may be useful to consider these latter species together from a standpoint of genetic resistance, at least initially, before more detailed studies are undertaken. This latter point also relates to the genetic diversity of ash cultivars in cities, since green ash cultivars, in the east, and velvet ash cultivars (i.e., ‘Modesto’) in the west, were selected from already closely related species.

Physiographic site conditions

White ash is generally a species of mesophytic uplands in the north eastern and north central U.S., but is also found on lowlands as well (Fowells 1965, Buchholz 1981, Harlow et al. 1991). Along a gradient of soil types, white ash typically occupies wet-mesic to dry-mesic site conditions, with a general preference for brown and grey-brown podzolic soils (Fowells 1965). White ash is drought sensitive, and as such, is only found on higher slopes positions when there are seeps and ephemeral streams to enhance moisture content of the soil (Woodcock et al. 1993). Elliot (1953, cited from Wright 1959) noted that white ash in Lower Michigan is found on podzolic soils underlain by heavy clay and high water tables, but is nearly absent on lighter soils underlain by well-drained glacial drift. Forests growing on lighter soils are more prone to wildfire and, since white ash is severely affected by fire (Henning and Dickmann 1996), this may help limit its presence on such sites. Another study showed white ash to be limited to areas underlain by a compacted glacial till at a depth of less than 20 inches, which supports a perched water table in rainy periods (Stout 1952). Van Breeman et al. (1997) found that white ash canopy dominance was highest where the silt fraction of the soil was highest.

Van Breeman et al. (1997) and Finzi et al. (1998) found white ash to be most abundant in areas of Connecticut forests where total soil calcium [Ca] and magnesium [Mg] concentrations measured in the study were highest. These areas also had the lowest quantities of exchangeable iron [Fe] and aluminum [Al] measured, indicating that ash has a preference for richer soils with higher pH (Van Breeman et al. 1997). Under deep shade, white ash seedling mortality was noted to be much higher in non-calcareous soils versus calcareous, which also suggests that [Ca], in particular, is important for the development of this species (Kobe 1996). Thus, in general, white ash seems fairly sensitive to both soil fertility and available water and should be less abundant and more stressed outside of moist, fertile environments.

White ash also occurs on lowlands, generally in areas where gley soils are present in the subsoil and where flood duration is limited (Bucholz 1981). Fowells (1965) noted that on the lowlands of the coastal plain, white ash is usually limited to slightly elevated ridges in major stream bottoms. In the central region it is most common on slopes along major streams, although it also found in many upland situations.

Green ash is generally a bottomland species (Wright 1959b) which prefers alluvial soils in floodplains along rivers and streams. In an old-growth Indiana eastern hardwood forest, green ash was found where ephemeral spring ponds remained the longest (Badger et al. 1998). Geographically, green ash has a wide ecological distribution (Stewart and Kajicek 1973), conferred by its resistance to salt, flooding, drought (Mueli and Shirley 1937) and high alkalinity (McComb 1949). Because of this stress tolerance, green ash is commonly planted in strip mine reclamations (Fowells 1965). Green ash is also an important component of the Great Plains prairie-woodland ecosystems (Hansen and Hoffman 1988) and is one of most commonly planted species in the Great Plains shelterbelts, because it can persist on dry soils once established (Harlow et al. 1991). Hence, while green ash is principally a wetland species, it is capable of surviving under a wide range of conditions.

Black ash is typically a hydric species occurring in bogs, swamps, along small streams, in poorly drained depressions and other poorly drained sites with high water tables (Fowells 1965). Black ash can grow in both low pH (less than 4.1) and high pH (greater than 5.5) soil conditions (Fowells 1965). Black ash prefers wet muck and shallow organic peat, although it is also found on fine sands and loams underlain by clay that impede surface drainage. It may occasionally occur on uplands ash a minor component on wet mineral soils (Erdmann et al. 1987).

Pumpkin ash and Carolina ash are trees of flooded bottomlands. Oregon ash is found on both moist, well-drained uplands (Stewart and Kajicek 1973) and rich alluvial bottomlands (Harlow et al. 1991). Blue ash is typically found on dry, limestone uplands and is tolerant of high pH and drought (Harlow et al. 1991). Velvet ash is found in washes, canyons and stream banks in the arid west, as well as desert woodlands between 2,500 to 7,000 feet above sea level (Harlow et al. 1991). Single-leaf ash is found in dry canyons and foothills in desert woodlands to 6,500 feet (Harlow et al. 1991).

Ash abundance, population dynamics and associations with other species

The potential susceptibility of different forested areas to EAB can be considered as a function of ash abundance and vigor in different forest community types. Such knowledge should provide a baseline perspective on the health of the ash resource beyond the current EAB infestation and allow for an assessment of potential risk for different ash tree populations.

White ash trees are rarely found in great abundance in the forest, rather they are more typically a minor component of many forest community types. Wright (1956a), for example, noted that white ash was listed as a component species of 26 cover types recognized by the Society of American Foresters for the eastern U.S. He also noted that white ash usually comprises about 3 to 4 % of stand volume but is rarely completely absent on any appropriate site. Some of the major associate species of white ash are eastern white pine (*Pinus strobus*), northern red oak (*Quercus rubra*), white oak (*Q. alba*), sugar maple (*Acer saccharum*), red maple (*A. rubrum*), yellow birch (*Betula alleghaniensis*), American beech (*Fagus grandifolia*), black cherry (*Prunus serotina*), American basswood (*Tilia americana*), eastern hemlock (*Tsuga canadensis*), American elm (*Ulmus americana*), and tulip poplar (*Liriodendron tulipifera*) (Fowells 1965, Stewart and Krajcek 1973). In the south, white ash occurs on loamy ridges and bottoms with hickories (*Carya spp.*), willow (*Salix spp.*), sweetgum (*Liquidambar styraciflua*), swamp chestnut oak (*Quercus michauxii*) and other oaks (*Quercus spp.*). At the northern limits of its range it occurs with white pine and the beech-birch-maple-hemlock mixture, as a scattered tree (Harlow et al. 1991). White ash is also an important component of pioneer forests regenerating on fallow agricultural lands (Wright 1959a, Meiners and Gorchoff 1998).

Black ash occurs in a number of associations with other trees across its range. Primack (2000) found that that associations of black ash, ironwood (*Ostrya virginiana*), musclewood (*Carpinus caroliniana*) and basswood that were located primarily along river bends that were inundated from 1-27% of the time. A study by Erdmann et al. (1987) revealed that black ash is most frequently associated with American elm-red maple-ash forest cover type, a long-lived sub-climax on somewhat poorly drained mineral soils. Seedlings and sprouts of black ash are usually the only hardwood regeneration occurring in gaps in the elm-maple-ash type growing on wet organic soils. The elm-red maple-black ash type grades into an almost pure black ash type on poorly drained sites with organic peat and muck soils, where it has been considered as the climax species (Erdmann et al. 1987). Tardif and Bergerson (1999) noted pure stands of black ash in the northern portion of its range, along lakes and rivers. Black ash communities on boreal forest floodplains were identified by Tardif and Bergeron (1992), who used a cluster analysis to produce four vegetation types: (1) black ash/speckled alder (*Alnus rugosa*)/bog willow (*Salix pedicellaris*), (2) black ash/balsam poplar (*Populus balsamifera*)/ostrich fern (*Matteuccia struthiopteris*), (3) black ash/pussy willow (*Salix discolor*)/sensitive fern (*Onoclea sensibilis*), and (4) black ash/speckled alder/sensitive fern. In northern Lower Peninsula of Michigan, water-covered northern white cedar (*Thuja occidentalis*) lowlands were also found to have high percentages of black ash

(Gates and Erlanson 1925). Gates (1942) found that black ash-red maple stands reach only about 35' in height before replacement by northern white cedar. Black ash is also occasionally found as a scattered tree in stands of balsam fir (*Abies balsamea*), black spruce (*Picea mariana*), eastern hemlock-yellow birch, white spruce (*Picea glauca*)-balsam fir-paper birch (*Betula papyrifera*), and tamarack (*Larix laricina*) (Fowells 1965).

Species most commonly associated with green ash are box-elder (*Acer negundo*), red maple, pecan (*Carya illinoensis*), sugarberry (*Celtis laevigata*) sweetgum, American sycamore (*Platanus occidentalis*), cottonwood (*Populus deltoides*), quaking aspen (*Populus tremuloides*), black willow (*Salix nigra*), willow oak (*Quercus phellos*), and American elm. (Fowells 1965, Stewart and Krajicek 1973). Oregon ash is most commonly associated with red alder (*Alnus rubra*), black cottonwood (*Populus trichocarpa*), willow, big leaf maple (*Acer macrophyllum*), Oregon white oak (*Quercus garryana*) and Douglas-fir (*Pseudotsuga menziesii*) (Stewart and Krajicek 1973, Harlow et al. 1991). Pumpkin ash is found with bald cypress (*Taxodium distichum*) and water tupelo (*Nyssa aquatica*). Blue ash is found with northern red oak, mockernut hickory (*Carya tomentosa*), sweetgum, white oak, white ash, slippery elm (*Ulmus rubra*), American elm and sugar maple (Stewart and Krajicek 1973). Velvet ash is found in association with black cottonwood, Fremont cottonwood (*Populus fremontii*), salt cedar (*Tamarisk pentandra*) on low land riparian areas (source: Nevada Gap Analysis, Utah State University) and in association with desert oaks, such as canyon live oak (*Quercus chrysolepis*) and desert scrub oak (*Q. turbinella*), and ponderosa pine (*Pinus ponderosa*). Single-leaf ash is found in shrubby woodlands and in ponderosa pine forests (Harlow et al. 1991).

A number of studies suggest that ash abundance and vigor are related to disturbance and successional patterns in the landscape (Fowells 1965, Taylor 1971, Ronald 1972, Hansen and McComb 1958, Langlais and Begin 1993, Ward 1997, Arevalo et al. 2000, Lesica 2001, Battaglia et al. 2002). Taylor (1971), for example, noted that large scale disturbance of the landscape increased both the distribution and the relative importance of both white and green ash species in Michigan, relative to pre-settlement vegetation. In a Minnesota oak forest, black ash was originally a minor component, but in years following a catastrophic wind event its basal area increased 900% (Arevalo et al. 2000). In an Ohio Nature Preserve, a look at gap dynamics revealed that white ash is important in larger and more recent canopy gaps (versus older, smaller gaps (Spies 1987). Fowells (1965) noted that the proportion of ash trees usually decreases with increasing stand age and crown closure in mixed stands, due to slower growth and decreasing tolerance as the trees age. In combination, these studies suggest that one can expect that ash will be more abundant, with a younger and more vigorous population, in more open and more recently disturbed forests. Conversely, ash trees should be less abundant and declining in older, less disturbed forest communities. Thus, given different forest ages and community types, EAB might be faced with either a more vigorous and more abundant host versus a weaker, but more difficult to locate host.


Trends in ash population dynamics in areas unaffected by EAB are critical to consider when evaluating potential susceptibility of ash populations and the relative damage

caused by EAB. For example, a declining population may have less vigorous, and thus more susceptible, members, although a relationship between tree vigor and EAB colonization has not yet been established. On the other hand, it might be possible that more vigorous hosts are preferred by EAB, as was found in the case of lilac borer (*Podosesia syringae*) (Santamour and Steiner 1986), which attacks ash trees, lilacs and other plants in the olive family. The condition of the host is also critical to understand, because the notion of risk implies that there is something to lose, and so risk is most appropriately evaluated relative to potential value. For example, one might consider the relative damage caused by EAB to be high in a declining population, if it is unlikely to rebound, or low if the resource is already considered to be in poor shape anyway. Conversely, the potential loss associated with a well-established resource may be relatively low if it is believed that it will rebound easily after infestation, or high, if a developing resource may be lost before its full potential is realized.

Since the 1920s, there has been an overall concern regarding “ash decline” (Woodcock et al 1993, Ward 1997), with many causal elements identified, but unproven, including ozone air pollution and “ash yellows” (Luley et al. 1992, Feeley et. al 2001). For example, the ash yellows was detected in only 11 of 145 trees exhibiting external signs of the disease (Feeley et. al 2001). Woodcock et al. (1993) suggested that white ash in the northeastern U.S. was declining on dry-mesic sites, located on steep slopes, because these sites were more vulnerable to drought. Ward (1997), on the other hand, suggested that white ash decline was caused by a decline in ash reproduction and lower canopy tree survival as forests age in the absence of substantial disturbance. While ash may be declining in some parts of the landscape, we found that ash populations have been on the rise over the last 2 decades in Michigan, the epicenter of the outbreak of EAB, with the total number of ash trees on timberlands estimated to be 649.4 million trees in 1980, 692.9 million in 1993 and 802.5 million in 2000 (although the last estimate was computed from a smaller percentage of the total permanent inventory plots in Michigan and is missing some tree size classes (Figure 1), data from http://fia.fs.fed.us/dbrs_setup.htm). This trend includes an increase in almost every size class of tree (diameter at breast height, dbh, see Figure 1), thus the value of the resource is increasing.

Hence, at least in the vicinity of the current outbreak, it may be prudent to consider the total risk of EAB to ash populations in the context of a currently increasing resource base, rather than against a general background of decline in the health of ash populations.

Fig. 1. 20 year demographic change for ash trees in Michigan



Conclusion

This report highlights some potential risk factors related to ash host characteristics and spatial distribution to potential risk from EAB. Many of these host-based risk factors identified cannot be completely evaluated without understanding the population dynamics and host preferences of EAB. However, more detailed assessments of ash tree host distribution and health are needed and are essential for understanding the potential risk of natural and urban forests to EAB.

Below is a summary of major findings regarding ash tree health, distribution and potential risk for EAB:

- *Urban areas with a significant component of ash trees are at a high level of risk.
- *Green and velvet ash cultivars are major components of urban forests, in all areas but the southeastern U.S. The ash resource in urban forests has a low genetic diversity which enhances risk.
- *White ash cultivars may have some resistance to EAB.
- *Ash species cover a wide range of site types in the U.S. and occur as a minor component of many forest types. White, blue and Oregon ash are found on fertile uplands and river terraces; green, black, Carolina and pumpkin along river bottoms and in wetlands (black is most abundant in bogs); and velvet and single-leaf ash in dry semi-deserts and canyons.
- * Maturing second growth forests on fertile uplands contain fewer, less vigorous ash trees, but contain much of the economic value in ash wood products nationally. White ash is by far the most important species economically.
- *Younger more open forests tend to have a greater number of more vigorous ash trees.
- * The potential devastation of EAB should not be considered in light of a “declining” ash resource. Ash populations are not declining in Michigan, where EAB was introduced. The general phenomenon referred to as “ash decline” may be a natural successional process, which is not occurring equally across differing landscapes.

References

- Arevalo, J. R., DeCoster, J. K., McAlister, S. D., and Palmer, M. W. 2000. Changes in two Minnesota forests during 14 years following catastrophic windthrow. *Journal of Vegetative Science* 11:833-840.
- Badger, K. S., Ruch, D. G. Schoultz, A., Taylor, J. E., and Jones, B. E. 1998. Structure and composition of Ginn Woods, an old-growth forest in East-Central Indiana. *Proceedings of the Indiana Academy of Science* 107:1-15.
- Battaglia, L. L., Minchin, P. R., and Pritchitt, D. W. 2002. Sixteen years of old field succession and re-establishment of a bottomland hardwood forest in the lower Mississippi alluvial valley. *Wetlands* 22: 1-17.
- Boris, K.M. and Kielbaso, J.J. 1999. Green Industry Evaluation of Michigan Urban

- Trees. Michigan State University Extension Bulletin E2708, September, 1999.
- Buchholz, K. 1981. Effects of minor drainages on woody species distributions in a successional floodplain forest. *Canadian Journal of Forest Research* 11: 671-676.
- Elliott, J. C. 1953. Composition of upland second growth hardwood stands in the tension zone of Michigan as affected by soils and man. *Ecological Monographs* 23:271-288.
- Erdmann, G. G., Crow, T. R., Peterson, R. M., and Wilson, C. D. 1987. Managing black ash in the Lake States. USDA Forest Service Gen. Tech. Rep. NC-115.
- Feeley, C.J., Hart, E.R., Thompson, J.R., Harrington, T.C. 2001. Occurrence, associated symptoms, and potential insect vectors of the ash yellows phytoplasma in Iowa, U. S. *J. arbor.*, 27(6): 331-340.
- Finzi, N. C., Van Breemen, N., and Canham, C. D. 1998. Canopy tree-soil interactions within temperate forests: species effects on soil carbon and nitrogen. *Ecological Applications* 8: 440-446.
- Fowells, H. A. 1965. *Silvics of Forest Trees of the United States*. USDA Agriculture Handbook No. 271.
- Gates, F. C. 1942. The bogs of northern Lower Michigan. *Ecological Monographs* 12:213-254
- Gates, F. C. and Erlanson, C. O. 1925. Enlarged bases in *Fraxinus nigra* in Michigan. *Botanical Gazette* 80:107-110.
- Giedraitis, J.P. and Kielbaso, J.J. 1982. *Municipal Tree Management*. Urban Data Service Reports, Vol. 14, No. 1. Washington, D.C.: International City Management Association, January, 1982.
- Haack, R.A., Jenek, E., Liu, Hoping, Marchant, K.R., Petrice, T.R., Poland, T.M. and Ye. The emerald ash borer: A new exotic pest in North America. *Newsletter of the Michigan Entomological Society*, Vol. 47, # 3 and 4, September 2002.
- Hansen, N. J. and McComb, A. L. 1958. Growth of planted green ash, black walnut, and other species in relation to observable site characteristics in southern Iowa. *Journal of Forestry* 56: 473-480.
- Harlow, W. M., Harrar, E. S., Hardin, J. W., and White, F. M. 1991. *Textbook of Dendrology* Eighth Ed.

- Henning, S.J. and Dickmann, D.I. 1996. Vegetative responses to prescribed burning in a mature red pine stand. *Northern Journal of Applied Forestry* 13: 140-146.
- Kim, E. 1988. Radial growth patterns of tree species in relation to environmental factors. Ph.D. Dissertation, Yale University, CT, 201 pp.
- Kobe, R. K. 1996. Intraspecific variation in sapling mortality and growth predicts geomorphic variation in forest composition. *Ecological Monographs* 66: 181-201.
- Langlais, D. and Begin, Y. 1993. The effects of recent floods and geomorphic processes on red ash populations, upper St. Lawrence estuary, Quebec. *Estuarine, Coastal, and Shelf Science* 37: 525-538. (In Tardif, J. and Bergerson, Y. 1999)
- Lesica, P. 2001. Recruitment of *Fraxinus pennsylvanica* (Oleaceae) in Eastern Montana woodlands. *Madrono* 48: 286-292.
- Luley, C.J., Mielke, M.E., Castello, J.D., Cummings, C.J., Appleby, J. and Hatcher, R. 1992. Ash crown condition and the incidence of ash yellows and other insects and diseases in Illinois, Iowa, Missouri and Wisconsin. *Plant Disease*: 76 (12): 1209-1212.
- McComb, A. L. 1949. Some fertilizer experiments with deciduous forest tree seedlings on several Iowa soils. *Iowa Agricultural Experiment Station Bulletin* 369: 405-448.
- Meiners, S. J. and Gorchoy, D. L. 1998. Effects of distance to *Juniperus virginiana* on the establishment of *Fraxinus* and *Acer* seedlings in old fields. *American Midland Naturalist* 139:353-364.
- Michigan Forest Health: Supplemental Report. 1994. Edited by C. Randall. Published by Michigan Department of Natural Resources, Forest Management Division, August 1995.
- Mueli, L. J. and Shirley, H. L. 1937. The effect of seed origin on drought resistance on green ash in the Prairie-Plains States. *Journal of Forestry* 35:1060-1062.
- Ottman, K.A. and Kielbaso, J.J. 1976. Managing Municipal Trees. Urban Data Service Report 11-76. Washington, D.C.: International City Management Association, November, 1976.
- Primack, A. G. B. 2000. Simulation of climate-change effects on riparian vegetation in the Pere Marquette River, Michigan. *Wetlands* 20:538-547.
- Rheinhardt, R., Whigham, D., Khan, H., and Brinson, M. 2000. Vegetation of headwater wetlands in the inner coastal plain of Virginia and Maryland. *Castanea* 65:21-35.

- Ronald, W.G. 1972. Range extension of black ash, *Fraxinus nigra* Marsh., in Manitoba. Canadian Field Naturalist 86: 73-74.
- Santamour, F.S. and Stenier, K.C. 1986. Borer damage in green ash trees from different provenances. J. arbor., 12(8): 199-201.
- Spies, T.A. 1987. Gap dynamics in an Ohio *Acer-Fagus* forest and speculations on the geography of disturbance. In Runkle, J.R. and Denslow, J.S. (Eds.) Canopy gaps in forest ecosystems. A symposium held in Columbus, Ohio, August, 1987. Canadian Journal of Forest Research 1990, 20: 632-641.
- Street Tree Fact Sheets. 1989. edited by H.D. Gerhold, W. N. Wandell, N.L. Lacasse, R.D. Schein. Published by Penn State College of Agriculture.
- Stewart, H.A. and Krajicek, J.E. 1973. Ash...an American wood. U.S.D.A. Forest Service research bulletin, FS-216, March 1973.
- Stout, B. B. 1952. Species distribution and soils in the Harvard Forest. Harvard Forest Bulletin 24. 29 pp.
- Tardif, J. and Bergerson, Y. 1999. Population dynamics of *Fraxinus nigra* in response to flood-level variations in northwestern Quebec. Ecological Monographs 69: 107-125.
- Tardif, J. and Bergeron, Y. 1992. Ecological analysis of black ash (*Fraxinus nigra*) stands on the shore of Lake Duparquet, northern Quebec. Canadian Journal of Botany 70: 2294-2302.
- Taylor, S. M. 1971. Ecological separation and post-settlement habitat changes of *Fraxinus americana* and *Fraxinus pennsylvanica* in Washtenaw County, Michigan. Abst. in American Journal of Botany 58: 466-467.
- Van Breemen, N. Finzi, N. C., and Canham, C. D. 1997. Canopy tree-soil interactions within temperate forests: effects of soil elemental composition and texture on species distributions. Canadian Journal of Forest Research 27: 1110-1116.
- Woodcock, H., Patterson, W. A. III, and Davies, K. M. Jr. 1993. The relationship between site factors and white ash (*Fraxinus americana* L.) decline in Massachusetts. Forest Ecology and Management 60:271-290.
- Ward, J S. 1997. White ash (*Fraxinus americana* L.) survival and growth in unmanaged upland forests. In Pallardy, S. G., Cecich, R. A., and Garrett, H. G. (Ed.) Proceedings of the 11th central hardwood forest conference. Columbia, MO. USDA Forest Service General Technical Report No. NC-188: 220-230.
- Wright, J. W. 1944. Ecotypic differences in red ash. Journal of Forestry 42: 591-59

Wright, J. W. 1959a. Silvical characteristics of white ash (*Fraxinus americana*). USDA Forest Service Northeastern Forest Experiment Station Paper No. 123. Darby, PA.

Wright, J. W. 1959b. Silvical characteristics of green ash (*Fraxinus pennsylvanica*). USDA Forest Service Northeastern Forest Experiment Station Paper No. 126. Darby, PA.