Spruce budworm (Choristoneura fumiferana) outbreaks: a story of population dynamics, environmental conditions, and defoliation

## **Morgane Henry**

### **Co-authors: Dr. Brian Leung & Dr. Patrick James**



morgane.henry2@mail.mcgill.ca

### Forest insect outbreaks: a global concern



### Forest insect outbreaks: a global concern

Damage economically important tree species

### Carbon release

### Influence fire risk



Introduction

Methodology

Results

2

### Spruce budworm (Choristoneura fumiferana)

Moth native to eastern Canada and USA

Larvae feed on spruce and fir

Univoltine species (one brood per year)

Cyclical outbreaks every  $\sim 30-40$  years



Jerald E. Dewey, USDA Forest Service, United States



3

Goal

Methodology



Frequency of defoliation by spruce budworm from 1954 to 1988. (Williams & Birdsey, 2003)

Introduction

### **Outbreak Dynamics**



Adapted from Kunegel-Lion & Lewis, 2020

Summary 5

### Outbreak at the local scale



## Outbreak at the local scale





How do environmental conditions impact the development of an outbreak?



How do larvae densities and defoliation

relate to one another?

In	tra	<b>A</b> 11	<u>ot</u> i	n
		M M	<b>U</b> U	

7



### How do environmental conditions impact 1 the development of an outbreak?

Estimate the growth rate of each time-series using a state-space model (Humbert et al., 2009)

Assess the impact of environmental predictors with multiple regression

**Environmental predictors** 



Topography (elevation, slope)



Moisture regime (drainage)



Tree proportion (balsam fir, white spruce, black spruce, and hardwood species)

## **Population growth rates**

1





Temperature has the largest impact on growth rate

Spatial structure not entirely explained

By adding "latitude" as a predictor, we increase  $R^2$  by 10%





How do larvae densities and defoliation relate to one another?

Introduction Goal Methodology Results	
---------------------------------------	--

### How do larvae densities and 2 defoliation relate?

Aerial surveys of defoliation (SOPFIM)

Optimize "best time-lag"

Effect of environmental conditions



Methodology 2

# 2 Influence of forest structure on defoliation

Best time-lag: cumulative densities <u>3 years</u> prior observed defoliation

Budworm densities explain most of the variance

Balsam fir and black spruce have opposite effects



### Predicting probability of defoliation

### Predicting probability of defoliation



### Predicting probability of defoliation



#### Take home messages

Larvae densities data contain very valuable information for making prediction

Spatial structure in growth rates

3 years time-lag

Importance of forest composition for defoliation risk

## Next steps and potential application

Earlier forecast of defoliation

Uncertainty modelling

Inform management strategies

Introduction

Goal

Methodology

Results

Summary

16

### Thank you!

Questions?: morgane.henry2@mail.mcgill.ca

#### **Supervisors**

Brian Leung (McGill) Patrick James (University of Toronto)

<u>Committee member</u> Daniel Kneeshaw (UQAM)

Lab mates from the Leung lab & the James lab



Fonds de recherche Nature et technologies Québec 🍻 🌸

jameslab.ca leung-lab.github.io/leunglab

## State-space modelling approach

Hierarchical model

Model natural variation in ecological processes separately from observation error.



Correlation structure model 1

	, act	SPIUCE ASE	Mill 1010	tion	tronflev	apruce	wood ear	DD 506	2 D
lat	0.27	0.11	ov 0.03	ං 0.15	<sub>م</sub> . 0.16	-0.34	-0.79	1	3
ack	spruce	0.02	0.13	0.04	-0.04	-0.26	-0.24	- 0.6	5
	ba	Isamfir	0.16	0.1	-0.02	-0.11	-0.19	- 0.4	↓ <u>2</u>
elevation				0.23	-0.18	-0.05	-0.47	- 0	
Slopefrom				omElev	-0.08	-0.04	-0.21	0.2	2 4
white				spruce	-0.1	-0.13	0.6	6	
Hardwood							0.3	0.8	8



Temperature has the largest impact on growth rate

Spatial structure not entirely explained (latitude was a better predictor)





Latitude explains most of the variance

Latitude is a proxy for multiple environmental variables

Positive effect of hardwood proportion on growth rate (?)



Summary

11

\*\*\*

## Interaction model 1



### **Determination of the best lag**

General model : defoliation  $\sim$  lagged L2

1. Discrete

2. Cumulative

- 3. Weighting functions
  - $\succ$  Negative exponential
  - ➢ Gamma

Use "optim" in R to estimate the best parameters of each weighting functions.



## **Best lag**

Cumulative: L2 densities 3 years prior to observed defoliation Multiplicative: bigger impact if L2 densities stay high Weighting function: factors derived from a gamma distribution of parameters shape = 9.0, scale = 0.2

Defoliation ~  $0.26*\log(L2_{t-1}) + 0.58*\log(L2_{t-2}) + 0.13*\log(L2_{t-3})$