

# Forest dynamics and climate sensitivity of an endangered Carolina hemlock community in the southern Appalachian Mountains, USA

David A. Austin, Saskia L. van de Gevel, and Peter T. Soulé

**Abstract:** During the last century, the eastern United States has functionally lost two major tree species (American chestnut and American elm), two more, eastern and Carolina hemlock, will likely be functionally extinct during much of their ranges by 2050. Carolina hemlock forests are geographically limited to high elevations in the southern Appalachian Mountains and are considered to be endangered. We collected forest stand, composition, and tree age data at the beginning of a hemlock woolly adelgid (HWA) infestation. Prior to the arrival of HWA, Carolina hemlocks were healthy and densely populated in the overstory and understory. While Carolina hemlock regenerated successfully and continuously from 1850 to 2010, the development of this Carolina hemlock forest will be altered by the HWA and may result in an increase in the density of northern red oak, white oak, mountain laurel, and Catawba rhododendron. Carolina hemlocks prefer cool, wet summers with older trees experiencing greater reductions in radial growth than younger trees during droughts. This study demonstrates that dendrochronological techniques can provide critical annual information on Carolina hemlock forest development and tree age–climate response. Our results provide a multicentury perspective for conservation efforts and management of Carolina hemlock forests in the southern Appalachian Mountains.

**Key words:** *Tsuga caroliniana*, endangered tree species, dendrochronology, invasive species, hemlock woolly adelgid, old-growth forests.

**Résumé :** Au cours des cent dernières années, l'est des États-Unis a fonctionnellement perdu deux espèces majeures d'arbres (le châtaigner d'Amérique et l'orme d'Amérique), et deux autres, la pruche du Canada et la pruche de la Caroline, seront fonctionnellement probablement éteintes du territoire d'ici 2050. Les forêts de pruche de la Caroline sont géographiquement limitées aux hautes altitudes dans le sud des Appalaches et elles sont considérées en voie de disparition. Les auteurs ont récolté des données sur le peuplement forestier, la composition et l'âge des arbres au début d'une infestation par le puceron lanigère de la pruche (PLP). Avant l'arrivée du PLP, les pruches de la Caroline étaient en santé et densément peuplées dans l'étage dominant et le sous-étage. Alors que la pruche de la Caroline s'était régénérée avec succès et de manière continue de 1850 à 2010, le développement de cette forêt de pruche de la Caroline sera modifié par le PLP et il pourrait en résulter une augmentation de la densité du chêne rouge, du chêne blanc, du kalmia à feuilles larges et du rhododendron pourpre. Les pruches de la Caroline préfèrent des hivers frais et humides, les arbres plus âgés subissant des réductions plus importantes de la croissance radiale que les individus plus jeunes durant les périodes de sécheresse. Cette étude démontre que les techniques de dendrochronologie peuvent fournir une information annuelle importante sur le développement de la forêt de pruche de la Caroline et la réponse en fonction de l'âge de l'arbre et du climat. Leurs résultats fournissent une perspective multiséculaire des efforts de conservation et de la gestion des forêts de pruches de Caroline dans le sud des Appalaches. [Traduit par la Rédaction]

**Mots-clés :** *Tsuga caroliniana*, espèce d'arbres en voie d'extinction, dendrochronologie, espèce envahissante, puceron lanigère de la pruche, forêt ancienne.

## Introduction

Carolina hemlock (*Tsuga caroliniana* Engelm.) is a long-lived tree species endemic to small, isolated populations in Virginia, Georgia, Tennessee, North Carolina, and South Carolina, USA (James 1943; Rentch et al. 2000). The

typical habitat of Carolina hemlock is along exposed ridges in the southern Appalachian Mountains (James 1943). Carolina hemlock can occur in pure or mixed stands at elevations between 600 and 1500 m a.s.l. However, Carolina hemlock also occurs streamside along

Received 4 November 2015. Accepted 20 December 2015.

D.A. Austin, S.L. van de Gevel, and P.T. Soulé. Department of Geography and Planning, Appalachian Tree Ring Lab, Appalachian State University, Boone, NC 28608, USA.

**Corresponding author:** Saskia L. van de Gevel (email: [gevelsv@appstate.edu](mailto:gevelsv@appstate.edu)).

moist, cool ravines (Humphrey 1989). The Carolina hemlock range is limited in the southern United States by high summer temperatures, historically frequent fires, and the limited areas of cliffs and rock outcroppings (Jetton et al. 2008). Conversely, its range to the north is restricted by lower summer precipitation and less frequent fires that lead to increased hardwood competition (Jetton et al. 2008).

Carolina hemlock and eastern hemlock (*Tsuga canadensis* L.) were thought to be closely related species because of range overlap (Szafer 1949). However, LePage (2003) and Orwig and Foster (1998) noted that based on cone shape, cone-scale, and seed morphologies, the two species are very distinct and only distantly related. Carolina hemlock is more closely related to Asian hemlock species and western North America hemlock species than to eastern hemlock (LePage 2003).

Carolina hemlock plays an important ecological role in the southern Appalachian Mountains as a foundation species (Ellison et al. 2005; Havill et al. 2008). The Carolina hemlock overstory creates microclimates in the understory that have uniformly low seasonal light level variability and relatively small daily temperature fluctuations (James 1943; Rentch et al. 2000; Jetton et al. 2008). The ability of Carolina hemlock to modify stand soil conditions and microclimate by depositing acidic litter and maintaining low light levels in the understory influences fundamental community and ecosystem characteristics (Rentch et al. 2000).

Carolina hemlock and eastern hemlock are both susceptible to the hemlock woolly adelgid (HWA; *Adelges tsugae*). HWA threatens to eliminate Carolina hemlock throughout its limited native range. The invasive insect has spread unimpeded since its initial infestation in Richmond, Virginia, during the early 1950s (Morin et al. 2009). HWA causes needle loss, bud mortality, and tree mortality within a decade by defoliating the tree (McClure 1991; Orwig et al. 2002). HWA populations increase rapidly because they are parthenogenetic (all individuals are female and capable of reproduction), complete two generations each year, and have no known natural enemies in eastern North America (Orwig and Foster 1998). They also are capable of rapid dispersal by wind, birds, deer, and human activity such as logging (McClure 1990). It is likely that eastern hemlock and Carolina hemlock species may become functionally extinct during the next 50 years (Beane et al. 2010; Vose et al. 2013).

Land managers have tried multiple HWA control efforts (Jetton et al. 2008). However, eastern hemlock and Carolina hemlock forests have already been impacted by HWA and may suffer a similar fate as the American chestnut (*Castania dentata* (Marsh)) and other functionally extinct forest species (Vose et al. 2013). Fortunately, most of the short-term impacts of HWA-induced mortality appear to be localized and land managers can begin to

strategically implement conservation decisions that address changes in ecosystem structure and function on multiple scales (Vose et al. 2013). Carolina hemlock forests should be studied while the research opportunity exists. Research is limited in Carolina hemlock forest ecology (James 1943; Humphrey 1989; Rentch et al. 2000; Jetton et al. 2008). This study augments existing Carolina hemlock ecology research with climate-growth comparisons between younger and older trees. Understanding the dynamics of the Carolina hemlock forest at the site level will provide insight about the anticipated changes across the species' range. By collecting forest information at the beginning of an HWA infestation, this study provides critical information for establishing baseline data of Carolina hemlock forest stand structure, composition, and climate sensitivity that will likely face drastic changes in the near future.

Our primary objectives were: (i) to quantitatively document the current composition, structure, and age of a Carolina hemlock forest at Bluff Mountain, North Carolina, and (ii) to determine whether the climate-growth relationship of Carolina hemlock is influenced by tree age.


## Materials and methods

### Study area

Bluff Mountain Nature Preserve in Ashe County, North Carolina, is a high-elevation (1067 to 1550 m a.s.l.) area of ecological significance in the Blue Ridge Mountains (Skeate 2004; van de Gevel et al. 2012) (Fig. 1). The Blue Ridge Mountains range in elevation from approximately 300 m to 1800 m a.s.l. and support some of the highest biodiversity in North America (NCNHP 1999). The preserve, owned and managed by The Nature Conservancy since 1978 (Skeate 2004), is part of a small collection of old-growth forest preserves in the Blue Ridge Mountains (Nash 1999; van de Gevel et al. 2012). Many of the vegetation assemblages characteristic of the Blue Ridge Physiographic Province inhabit Bluff Mountain, including: rock outcrop communities, a Carolina hemlock forest, dwarf oak (*Quercus* spp.) forests, and a southern Appalachian fen (van de Gevel et al. 2012). More than 48 endangered, threatened, or rare vascular plant species have been identified at Bluff Mountain (Tucker 1972; NCNHP 1999; Skeate 2004). Humphrey (1989) identified old Carolina hemlock trees on Bluff Mountain and provided broad baseline population information about a different Carolina hemlock stand from this study.

The climate at Bluff Mountain is classified as Cfb under the Köppen climate classification system (Christopherson 2009). The average January temperature is approximately 0.7 °C with average July temperatures of 20 °C (PRISM Climate Group 2015). Yearly average temperatures are approximately 10 °C and annual precipitation averages 125 cm (PRISM Climate Group 2015). July and August have the highest average monthly precipitation (approximately

**Fig. 1.** Map of the natural range of Carolina hemlock (blue) and eastern hemlock (green) in the southeastern United States. This study was conducted at Bluff Mountain Nature Preserve, North Carolina (36.397°N, 81.548°W, red circle). Map source data was collected from the US Census Bureau and the US Department of Agriculture. Map was created in ArcMap 10.3.1 by Tina Ball. [Colour online.]



12 cm each month) (PRISM Climate Group 2015). Annual snow accumulation averages 71 cm (SCONC 2015). The average growing season length in Ashe County, North Carolina, is 139 days (SCONC 2015).

#### Field methods

We established five 0.05 ha fixed-radius plots at Bluff Mountain, North Carolina. The plots were located in a forest stand with >50% Carolina hemlock in the canopy (Fig. 2). We tallied all tree stems  $\geq 5$  cm dbh by species in each plot. We recorded tree diameter at breast height (dbh; 1.37 m) and crown class for each tree to quantify the vertical and basal area structure of the Carolina hemlock stand. We based crown class categories (overtopped, intermediate, codominant, and dominant) on the amount and direction of intercepted sunlight (Oliver and Larson 1996). We collected two radial cores from every tree below 30 cm height to determine establishment dates, growth rates, and radial growth patterns. We also recorded global positioning system (GPS) points from the center of each plot. We established a nested understory 0.01 ha subplot in the center of each overstory plot. Stems  $\geq 1$  m in height and less than 5.0 cm dbh were tallied as saplings, and stems <1 m in height were tallied as seedlings. We also visually estimated percentage cover of mountain laurel (*Kalmia latifolia* L.) and Catawba rhodo-

dendron (*Rhododendron catawbiense* Michx.) to the nearest 5% in each 0.01 ha subplot.

#### Laboratory methods

We calculated density, basal area (dominance), and importance values for each tree species (Cottam and Curtis 1956). Importance values were calculated as the average of the relative density and relative dominance.

We processed increment cores following standard dendroecological techniques (Stokes and Smiley 1968). We measured annual growth rings from all Carolina hemlock cores to the nearest 0.001 mm with WinDendro image analysis software (version 2009C; Regent Instruments). We statistically verified crossdating accuracy using the computer program COFECHA and 50 year segments lagged successively by 25 years (Holmes 1983; Grissino-Mayer 2001). We developed two Carolina hemlock tree-ring chronologies from 25 young (44–61 years old) and 25 old (103–176 years old) trees (Table 1). We wanted to have a minimum 40 year gap in age between the young and old trees in the two chronologies. We detrended each series using the program ARSTAN to remove the influence of tree age, microsite, and local stand dynamics (Cook 1985; Cook and Holmes 1996). We applied a Friedman super smoother to all cores to preserve long-term trends and minimize the effects of suppressed

**Fig. 2.** Carolina hemlock forest at Bluff Mountain, North Carolina. Carolina hemlocks are found in disjunct populations along exposed ridges in the southern Appalachian Mountains. Photograph taken by David Austin. [Colour online.]



**Table 1.** Characteristics of the young (44–61 years old) and old (103–176 years old) *Tsuga caroliniana* chronologies from Bluff Mountain, North Carolina.

Chronology	Number of trees	Maximum age	Mean age	Minimum age	Series intercorrelation	Mean sensitivity
Old	25	176	135	103	0.581	0.247
Young	25	61	54	44	0.515	0.205

growth or abrupt growth increases. We used a flexible alpha-level or base enhancement of 3 (Friedman 1984).

#### Climate analysis

We analyzed the climate – radial growth relationship of the young and old Carolina hemlock chronologies using Pearson’s correlation analysis between the growth index and climate variables: mean monthly maximum temperature, monthly total precipitation, and monthly Palmer Drought Severity Index (PDSI) values. PDSI is often used in dendroclimatic studies (e.g., Copenheaver et al. 2011; Harley et al. 2011; Pederson et al. 2015) because it is a good measure of available soil moisture conditions during the growing season (Alley 1984). We analyzed the climate–growth relationships during the period AD 1895–2010 for the old Carolina hemlock chronology and AD 1951–2010 for the young chronology. This is the first study to explore the differences in Carolina hemlock climate-growth relationships based on tree ages (younger versus older trees). We obtained data for monthly mean maximum temperature and monthly total precipitation from the PRISM Climate Group (2015). The PRISM data represents a grid cell at 36.397°N, 81.548°W and 981 m a.s.l. We obtained PDSI data for the northern mountains region of North Carolina (NC02) from the National Climate Data Center (NCDC 2011).

## Results


### Forest composition and structure

Carolina hemlock was the most abundant, dominant species, and important species in the forest canopy (Table 2; Fig. 3). Northern red oak (*Quercus rubra* L.) and white oak (*Quercus alba* L.) also were important and dominant canopy species. These three species represent over 95% of trees at the study site (Table 2). The next most abundant species were northern red oak and white oak. The most abundant species in the understory stratum was Carolina hemlock, representing 93% of saplings and 41% of seedlings. Catawba rhododendron and mountain laurel covered approximately 50% of the understory layer.

We cored and dated 357 trees. The oldest trees (>250 years old) were white oaks and northern red oaks, whereas the oldest Carolina hemlock was 189 years old. The age of the forest and the strong relationship between tree age and diameter is indicative of an old-growth stand (Tyrrell and Crow 1994; Pederson 2010; Hart et al. 2012). Tree size generally increased with age for all species (Fig. 4). The largest tree was a 176 year-old Carolina hemlock with a dbh of 50.5 cm (Fig. 4A). Tree establishment was continuous for Carolina hemlock, white oak, and northern red oak after 1820 and more abundant

**Table 2.** Density (number of trees·ha<sup>-1</sup>), dominance (basal area; m<sup>2</sup>·ha<sup>-1</sup>), and importance of trees (mean of relative density and relative dominance) by species at Bluff Mountain, North Carolina.

Species	Density (stems·ha <sup>-1</sup> )	Relative density (%)	Dominance (m <sup>2</sup> ·ha <sup>-1</sup> )	Relative dominance (%)	Relative importance (%)
<i>Tsuga caroliniana</i>	1048	65	21	49	57.3
<i>Quercus rubra</i>	220	14	11	25	19.4
<i>Quercus alba</i>	176	11	9	21	15.8
<i>Acer rubrum</i>	92	6	1	3	4.5
<i>Carpinus caroliniana</i>	36	2	0	1	1.5
<i>Betula lenta</i>	12	1	0	0	0.4
<i>Castanea dentata</i>	12	1	0	0	0.4
<i>Acer pensylvanicum</i>	8	0	0	0	0.3
<i>Prunus serotina</i>	4	0	0	0	0.4
Total	1608	100	43	100	100

**Fig. 3.** Canopy class distributions per hectare of Carolina hemlock (*Tsuga caroliniana*), red oak (*Quercus rubra*), and white oak (*Quercus alba*). Canopy class categories are based on the amount and direction of intercepted light. Other species included *Acer rubrum*, *Carpinus caroliniana*, *Betula lenta*, *Castanea dentata*, *Acer pensylvanicum*, and *Prunus serotina* and represented less than 10% of the forest canopy structure. [Colour online.]

from 1935 to 1980 (Fig. 4). Carolina hemlocks have been regenerating successfully during the last 150 years.

#### Radial growth and climate response

The temporal pattern of radial growth of Carolina hemlock is absent of any long-term trends (Fig. 5). While the old and young chronologies are closely related ( $r = 0.549$ ,  $p < 0.001$ ), there is greater variance evident in the older trees during their concurrent growth period.

Both the young and old trees respond negatively to spring and summer maximum temperatures (Fig. 6). The strongest relationships between the young chronology and temperature were with July temperature and average summer temperature. The old chronology had a significant relationship with both May temperature and average summer temperature. Overall, younger trees were more responsive to maximum temperatures than the older trees. The negative response of young and old

trees to spring and summer temperatures with a positive response to precipitation during the same months is a function of available moisture.

The old chronology was more sensitive to precipitation and PDSI than the young chronology (Fig. 6). There was a weak positive response between radial growth and growing season precipitation, with the strongest relationship in May for older trees and July for the younger trees (Fig. 6). As the PDSI is a water-balance-based measure of drought severity (Alley 1984), positive summer values are generally reflective of cooler, wetter conditions, and negative values warmer and drier. There was a consistently strong and positive relationship between radial growth and moisture availability throughout the growing season, peaking in August (Fig. 6). However, there were differences in response by tree age, with the older trees consistently recording stronger relationships with PDSI values.


#### Discussion

##### Carolina hemlock forest development and succession


Carolina hemlock has a narrow geographic range and only establishes along ridges and rock outcroppings (Humphrey 1989; Rentch et al. 2000; Jetton et al. 2008), thus their populations are relatively small compared with the extensive areas dominated by eastern hemlock (Levy and Walker 2014) and are more likely to become endangered from HWA. While the disjunct locations of Carolina hemlock populations may allow more protection from the transmission of HWA from other Carolina hemlock forests, once HWA is established, small population dynamics may lead to increased infestation (Levy and Walker 2014).

Although HWA has been present at Bluff Mountain since 2006, measures of forest composition and structure (basal area, density, and importance values) are similar to those recorded for a healthy Carolina hemlock forest in Virginia (Rentch et al. 2000) and a healthy eastern hemlock forest in Delaware (Eschtruth et al. 2006). The Bluff Mountain Carolina hemlock forest and the Delaware eastern hemlock forest (Eschtruth et al. 2006) had a high density of hemlock reported in the understory both

**Fig. 4.** Diameter–age relationships of 357 trees at Bluff Mountain, North Carolina. Carolina hemlock (*Tsuga caroliniana*) (A), red oak (*Quercus rubra*), and white oak (*Quercus alba*) had significant relationships ( $r^2 = 0.45 - 0.55$ ,  $p < 0.001$ ) between size and age of the trees (B). Other species included *Acer rubrum*, *Carpinus caroliniana*, *Betula lenta*, *Castanea dentata*, *Acer pensylvanicum*, and *Prunus serotina*. [Colour online.]



**Fig. 5.** Radial growth chronologies (index) from Carolina hemlock (*Tsuga caroliniana*) trees at Bluff Mountain, North Carolina. Carolina hemlock is divided into two chronologies, young (AD 1950–2010) and old (AD 1847–2010). The mean radial growth is standardized to 1.0 (black line). [Colour online.]




before and after HWA infestation. In the absence of HWA, Carolina hemlock would continue to outcompete hardwood species in the understory and forest canopy (Eschtruth et al. 2006).

The absence of oak species in the understory indicates that oaks are currently not successfully regenerating. However, the forest composition is likely to change as Carolina hemlock continues to be affected by the HWA. The codominant oak species will claim the canopy space created by HWA-induced hemlock mortality. A transition from a hemlock-dominated forest to a hardwood forest has been reported in New England (Orwig et al. 2002, 2008, 2013; Eschtruth et al. 2006) and is likely to occur at Bluff Mountain with the removal of Carolina hemlock by HWA.

We observed several traits indicative of gap-phase dynamics. A large increase in tree establishment between 1935 and 1980 was likely caused by gaps formed from American chestnut tree death due to chestnut blight (*Cryphonectria parasitica* (Murrill), frequent ice storms, tornado damage, and tropical storms (van de Gevel et al. 2012). Although the tree ages and basal area at Bluff Mountain are within the range reported for old-growth hemlock forests, the high stem density at Bluff Mountain is similar to those reported in younger stands (Tyrrell

**Fig. 6.** Significant relationships ( $r = \pm 0.2$ ,  $p < 0.05$ , dashed lines) between Carolina hemlock (*Tsuga caroliniana*) and maximum temperature (A), precipitation (B), and Palmer Drought Severity Index (C) at Bluff Mountain, North Carolina. Carolina hemlock is divided into two age classes, young (44–61 years old) and old (103–176 years old). The growing season is from April–September. The monthly variables are listed on the x-axis, with variables preceded by “p” representing months from the previous year.



and Crow 1994; Hart et al. 2012). The exposed nature of Bluff Mountain makes trees prone to extreme storms, which likely limits the frequency of trees reaching larger diameter classes but creates ideal conditions for tree establishment.

#### Dendroclimatology

The climate–growth relationships of older Carolina hemlock at Bluff Mountain are similar to those found in eastern hemlock (Abrams et al. 2000; D’Arrigo et al. 2001; Hart et al. 2010; Pederson et al. 2015; Saladyga and Maxwell 2015). Carolina and eastern hemlock respond to cool, wet summers despite differences in their habitat types and species genetics. Specifically, the Carolina hemlock at Bluff Mountain are located on the edge of a cliff at a high elevation (1550 m), whereas eastern hemlock are often found in low-elevation (0–730 m) cove forests between 33°N and 48°N latitude (Cook and Jacoby 1977; Abrams et al. 2000; D’Arrigo et al. 2001; Hart et al. 2010; Saladyga and Maxwell 2015). One factor that con-

tributes to age-related difference in climate response is the ability of Carolina hemlock trees to respond to early summer conditions. Older trees respond to available moisture earlier in the growing season than younger trees (Copenheaver et al. 2011). During May (spring), moisture availability is more important for the growth of the old trees compared to the young. Conversely, during July (summer) moisture availability is more important for growth of the young trees compared with the old (Ford and Vose 2007). The old chronology had significant relationships with May temperature, precipitation, and PDSI. The young chronology was less responsive to May temperature. The difference in summer temperature response between the young and old trees may be a function of differences in canopy structure. Dominant trees intercept more incoming solar radiation than younger subcanopy trees, thus creating a lag between canopy and subcanopy temperatures.

Another factor that may cause age-related differences in climate response is root biomass. Older Carolina hemlocks with established root systems at deeper soil levels have been shown to be more sensitive to soil moisture availability (measured by the PDSI) (Copenheaver et al. 2011). PDSI incorporates a modeled measure of moisture availability in the lower soil levels that is similar to the conditions experienced by old trees with extensive root networks (Copenheaver et al. 2011). Younger trees typically have less biomass and less developed root systems (Copenheaver et al. 2011; Walker et al. 2014).

## Conclusions

Forest inventory and dendroecological analyses allowed us to determine the establishment sequence of an old-growth Carolina hemlock forest in the southern Appalachian Mountains. Prior to the arrival of HWA, Carolina hemlocks were healthy and densely populated in the overstory and understory. While Carolina hemlock regenerated successfully and continuously from 1850 to 2010, the development of this Carolina hemlock forest will be altered by the HWA and may result in an increase in the density of northern red oak, white oak, mountain laurel, and Catawba rhododendron.

The small range of Carolina hemlock makes the species particularly vulnerable to HWA and climate shifts. Because Carolina hemlocks prefer cool, wet summers (Berdanier and Clark 2015), projected climate change in the Appalachian Mountains (i.e., increased warming) will create more stress, especially for those trees infested with HWA. Further, there will likely be differential impacts from drought, with older Carolina hemlock trees experiencing greater reductions in radial growth than younger trees. This is the first dendroclimatic study to explore the differences in Carolina hemlock climate-growth relationships based on tree ages (younger versus older trees).

This study demonstrates that dendrochronological techniques can provide critical annual information on dynamic forest development and climate shifts and provides a multi-century perspective for conservation efforts and management of Carolina hemlock forests in the southern Appalachian Mountains. Given the continuing threats to forest health from HWA, Carolina hemlock forests in the southern Appalachian Mountains should be continuously monitored to record changes in successional patterns and forest health.

## Acknowledgements

This research was supported through Appalachian State University from the Graduate Research Associate Mentoring (GRAM) award, Julian Yoder and Stephen Vancendak fellowships, and a University Research Council Grant. The North Carolina Chapter of The Nature Conservancy provided permission to conduct fieldwork at

the Bluff Mountain Nature Preserve. Tina Ball provided invaluable cartographic support. The authors would like to thank the reviewers of this manuscript for their excellent comments and recommendations. We also thank Benjamin Riddle, Aaron Chapman, Reece Brown, Johnathan Sugg, and Tim Federal for field and lab assistance.

## References

- Abrams, A.D., van de Gevel, S.L., Dodson, R.C., and Copenheaver, C.A. 2000. The dendroecology and climatic impacts for old-growth white pine and hemlock on the extreme slopes of Berkshire Hills, Massachusetts, U.S.A. *Can. J. Bot.* **78**(7): 851–861. doi:10.1139/b00-057.
- Alley, W.M. 1984. The Palmer drought severity index: limitations and assumptions. *J. Clim. Appl. Meteorol.* **23**(7): 1100–1109. doi:10.1175/1520-0450(1984)023<1100:TPDSIL>2.0.CO;2.
- Beane, N.R., Heitzman, E., and Schuler, T.M. 2010. Stand dynamics of an old-growth eastern hemlock-hardwood forest in West Virginia. *Nat. Areas J.* **30**(1): 64–72. doi:10.3375/043.030.0107.
- Berdanier, A.B., and Clark, J.S. 2015. Multi-year drought-induced morbidity preceding tree death in Southeastern US forests. *Ecol. Appl.* [In press.]
- Christopherson, R.W. 2009. *Geosystems: an introduction to physical geography*. Pearson Hall, New Jersey.
- Cook, E.R. 1985. A time series analysis approach to tree-ring standardization. Ph.D. dissertation, University of Arizona, Tucson, Ariz.
- Cook, E.R., and Jacoby, G.C. 1977. Tree-ring-drought relationships in the Hudson Valley, New York. *Science*, **198**(4315): 399–401.
- Cook, E.R., and Holmes, R.L. 1996. Guide for computer program ARSTAN. Pages 75–87 *In* The international tree ring data bank program library version 2.0 user's manual. Edited by H.D. Grissino-Mayer, R.L. Holmes, and H.C. Fritts. University of Arizona, Tucson, Ariz.
- Copenheaver, C.A., Crawford, C.J., and Fearer, T.M. 2011. Age-specific responses to climate identified in the growth of *Quercus alba*. *Trees*, **25**: 647–653. doi:10.1007/s00468-011-0541-2.
- Cottam, G., and Curtis, J.T. 1956. The use of distance measures in phytosociological sampling. *Ecology*, **37**(3): 451–460.
- D'Arrigo, R.D., Schuster, W.S.F., Lawrence, D.M., and Cook, E.R. 2001. Climate-growth relationships of eastern hemlock and chestnut oak from Black Rock Forest in the Highlands of Southeastern New York. *Tree-Ring Res.* **57**(2): 183–190.
- Ellison, A.M., Bank, M.S., Clinton, B.D., Colburn, E.A., Elliott, K., Ford, C.R., and Webster, J.R. 2005. Loss of foundation species: consequences for the structure and dynamics of forested ecosystems. *Front. Ecol. Environ.* **3**(9): 479–486. doi:10.1890/1540-9295(2005)003[0479:LOFSCF]2.0.CO;2.
- Eschtruth, A.K., Cleavitt, N.L., Battles, J.J., Evans, R.A., and Fahey, T.J. 2006. Vegetation dynamics in declining eastern hemlock stands: 9 years of forest response to hemlock woolly adelgid infestation. *Can. J. For. Res.* **36**(6): 1435–1450. doi:10.1139/x06-050.
- Ford, C.R., and Vose, J.M. 2007. *Tsuga canadensis* (L.) Carr. mortality will impact hydrologic processes in southern Appalachian forest ecosystems. *Ecol. Appl.* **17**(4): 1156–1167. doi:10.1890/06-0027.
- Friedman, J.H. 1984. A variable span smoother (No. LCS-TR-5). Stanford University CA Lab for Computational Statistics.
- Grissino-Mayer, H.D. 2001. Assessing crossdating accuracy: a manual and tutorial for the computer program COFECHA. *Tree-Ring Res.* **57**: 67–83.
- Harley, G.L., Grissino-Mayer, H.D., and Horn, S.P. 2011. The den-



- drochronology of *Pinus elliottii* in the lower Florida Keys: chronology development and climate response. *Tree-Ring Res.* **67**(1): 39–50. doi:10.3959/2010-3.1.
- Hart, J.L., van de Gevel, S.L., Sakulich, J., and Grissino-Mayer, H.D. 2010. Influence of climate and disturbance on the growth of *Tsuga canadensis* at its southern limit in eastern North America. *Trees*, **24**: 621–633. doi:10.1007/s00468-010-0432-y.
- Hart, J.L., Clark, S.L., Torreano, S.J., and Buchanan, M.L. 2012. Composition, structure, and dendroecology of an old-growth *Quercus* forest in the tablelands of the Cumberland Plateau, U.S.A. *For. Ecol. Manage.* **266**: 11–24.
- Havill, N.P., Campbell, C.S., Vining, T.F., LePage, B., Bayer, R.J., and Donoghue, M.J. 2008. Phylogeny and biogeography of *Tsuga* (Pinaceae) inferred from nuclear ribosomal ITS and chloroplast DNA sequence data. *Systematic Botany*, **33**(3): 478–489. doi:10.1600/036364408785679770.
- Holmes, R.L. 1983. Computer assisted quality control in tree-ring dating and measurement. *Tree-Ring Bull.* **43**: 69–78.
- Humphrey, D.L. 1989. Life history traits of *Tsuga caroliniana* Engelm. (Carolina hemlock) and its role in community dynamics. *Castanea*, **54**(3): 172–190.
- James, R.L. 1943. Carolina hemlock: wild and cultivated. *Castanea*, **24**: 112–134.
- Jetton, R.M., William, S.D., and Whittier, W.A. 2008. Ecological and genetic factors that define the natural distribution of Carolina hemlock in the southeastern United States and their role in ex site conservation. *For. Ecol. Manage.* **255**: 654–661.
- LePage, B.A. 2003. A new species of *Tsuga* (Pinaceae) from the middle Eocene of Axel Heiberg Island, Canada, and an assessment of the evolution and biogeographical history of the genus. *Bot. J. Linn. Soc.* **141**: 257–296. doi:10.1046/j.1095-8339.2003.00131.x.
- Levy, F., and Walker, E.S. 2014. Pattern and rate of decline of a population of Carolina hemlock (*Tsuga caroliniana* Engelm.) in North Carolina. *Southeast. Nat.* **13**(6): 46–60.
- McClure, M.S. 1990. Role of wind, birds, deer, and humans in the dispersal of hemlock woolly adelgid (Homoptera: Adelgidae). *Environ. Entomol.* **19**: 36–43. doi:10.1093/ee/19.1.36.
- McClure, M.S. 1991. Density-dependent feedback and population cycles in *Adelges tsugae* (Homoptera: Adelgidae) on *Tsuga canadensis*. *Environ. Entomol.* **20**: 258–264. doi:10.1093/ee/20.1.258.
- Morin, R.S., Liebhold, A.M., and Gottschalk, K.W. 2009. Anisotropic spread of hemlock woolly adelgid in the eastern United States. *Biol. Invasions*, **11**: 2341–2350. doi:10.1007/s10530-008-9420-1.
- Nash, S. 1999. *Blue Ridge 2020 — an owner's manual*. The University of North Carolina Press, Chapel Hill, N.C.
- National Climatic Data Center (NCDC). 2011. US Department of Commerce, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, Asheville, N.C. <http://www.ncdc.noaa.gov>.
- North Carolina Natural Heritage Program (NCNHP). 1999. An Inventory of the significant natural areas of Ashe County, North Carolina. <http://www.ncnhp.org/Images/Ashe10-10-2005.pdf> [accessed May 2011].
- Oliver, C.D., and Larson, B.C. 1996. *Forest stand dynamics*. Updated ed. J. Wiley, New York.
- Orwig, D.A., and Foster, D.R. 1998. Forest response to the introduced hemlock woolly adelgid in southern New England, USA. *J. Torr. Bot. Soc.* **125**(1): 60–73.
- Orwig, D.A., Foster, D.R., and Mausel, D.L. 2002. Landscape patterns of hemlock decline in New England due to the introduced hemlock woolly adelgid. *Journal of Biogeography*, **29**: 1475–1487. doi:10.1046/j.1365-2699.2002.00765.x.
- Orwig, D.A., Cobb, R.C., D'Amato, A.W., Kizlinski, M.L., and Foster, D.A. 2008. Multi-year ecosystem response to hemlock woolly adelgid infestation in southern New England forests. *Can. J. For. Res.* **38**(4): 834–843. doi:10.1139/X07-196.
- Orwig, D.A., Plotkin, A.A.B., Davidson, E.A., Lux, H., Savage, K.E., and Ellison, A.M. 2013. Foundation species loss affects vegetation structure more than ecosystem function in a northeastern U.S.A. forest. *PeerJ*, **1**: e41.
- Pederson, N. 2010. External characteristics of old trees in the Eastern Deciduous Forest. *Natural Areas Journal*, **30**(4): 396–407. doi:10.3375/043.030.0405.
- Pederson, N., D'Amato, A.M., Dyer, J.M., Foster, D.R., Goldblum, D., Hart, J.L., Hessl, A.E., Iverson, L.R., Jackson, S.T., Martin-Benito, D., McCarthy, B.C., McEwan, R.W., Mladenoff, D.J., Parker, A.J., Shuman, B., and Williams, J.W. 2015. Climate remains an important driver of post-European vegetation change in the eastern United States. *Global Change Biol.* **21**(6): 2105–2110. doi:10.1111/gcb.12779. PMID:25477234.
- PRISM Climate Group. 2015. <http://www.prism.oregonstate.edu/> [last accessed August 2015].
- Rentch, J.S., Adams, H.S., Coxe, R.B., and Stephenson, S.L. 2000. An ecological study of a Carolina Hemlock (*Tsuga caroliniana*) community in Southwestern Virginia. *Castanea*, **65**(1): 1–8.
- Saladyga, T., and Maxwell, R.S. 2015. Temporal variability in climate response of eastern hemlock in the Central Appalachian Region. *Southeastern Geographer*, **55**(2): 143–163. doi:10.1353/sgo.2015.0014.
- State Climate Office of North Carolina (SCONC). 2015. <http://climate.ncsu.edu/climate/climdiv.php> (last accessed August 2015).
- Skeate, S. 2004. *A guide to northwest North Carolina*. Parkway Publishers, Boone, N.C. 215 p.
- Stokes, M.A., and Smiley, T.L. 1968. *An introduction to tree-ring dating*. University of Arizona Press, Tucson, Ariz.
- Szafer, W. 1949. Studies on the genus *Tsuga* Carr. in the tertiary Europe. *Bull. Acad. Pol. Sci. Lett. Ser. B*, **3**: 23–51.
- Tucker, G.E. 1972. The vascular flora of Bluff Mountain, Ashe County, North Carolina. *Castanea*, **37**(1): 2–26.
- Tyrrell, L.E., and Crow, T.R. 1994. Structural characteristics of old-growth hemlock-hardwood forests in relation to age. *Ecology*, **75**: 370–386. doi:10.2307/1939541.
- van de Gevel, S.L., Hart, J.L., Spond, M.D., White, P.B., Sutton, M.N., and Grissino-Mayer, H.D. 2012. American chestnut (*Castanea dentata*) to northern red oak (*Quercus rubra*): forest dynamics of an old-growth forest in the Blue Ridge Mountains, USA. *Botany*, **90**(12): 1263–1276. doi:10.1139/b2012-100.
- Vose, J.M., Wear, D.N., Mayfield, A.E., and Nelson, C.D. 2013. Hemlock woolly adelgid in the southern Appalachians: control strategies, ecological impacts, and potential management responses. *For. Ecol. Manage.* **291**: 209–219. doi:10.1016/j.foreco.2012.11.002.
- Walker, D.M., Copenheaver, C.A., and Zink-Sharp, A. 2014. Radial growth changes following hemlock woolly adelgid infestation of eastern hemlock. *Ann. For. Sci.* **71**(5): 595–602. doi:10.1007/s13595-014-0367-3.