



Maddie Baughn, J.T. Richardson, Justin Bellissimo, Courtney Stevens, Tim Rice, Hannah Thompson, Savannah Plummer, Emily Hudson, Sophia Prevost, Hannah Roy, Bri-Anne Conley, Hunter Sanborn

All columns should have *exactly* the same width and be separated from each other by *exactly* the same amount of white space.

Introduction

We are doing this investigation because we want to see how our White Pine Trees have changed over time. We want to know if they have improved in health or have gotten more unhealthy.

We also believe that by looking back at the data we have collected, we can look for patterns to help us better understand what is happening to our climate and forests.

We hear a lot of negative warming. We know that glo and fear that this may negat trees in Gilmanton. Our rese fear. We believe that our dat needles and trees' health.



Materials and

Be brief, and opt for photo possible to illustrate organism, protocor, or experimenta design. Viewers don't want to read about the gruesome details, however fascinating you might find them.

Blah, blah. Blah, blah, blah. Blah, blah, blah. Blah, blah, blah.

Blah, blah. Blah, blah, blah. Blah, blah, blah.

How Have Gilmanton's White Pine Trees Changed Over Time?

Results

We conducted this investigation because we wanted to see how our white pine trees have grown over time.

The first comparison that we examined was if there was a relationship between how tall our white pine trees have grown and how wide they've grown.

Trees Have Grown (m) and How Wide They Have Grown (cm)?		
1996-1997	19.2	11.1
1997-1998	24.66	10.84
1998-1999	23.1	11.6
1999-2000	21.2	12
2000-2001	25.5	12.8
2001-2002	26.1	12.4
2002-2003	26.9	21.2
2003-2004	27.9	13
2004-2005	28.9	13.4
2005-2006	30.5	13.9
2006-2007	30.4	15.3
2007-2008	30.9	14.9
2008-2009	32.04	15.4
2009-2010	27.3	16.94
Average:	26.6	13.8

These results showed that as the Average height for years 1996-2010 increased. so did the dbh.

Next, we investigated Total Percent Needle Damage over time.

These results tell us that there were years when our needles were extremely healthy (2004, 2008) and other years when we saw as much as nearly 8% of the needles overall damaged (2001, 2002).

We then examined the overall change in our Pixel Sized Sampling Plot's Canopy and Ground Cover.

From 1996 to 2005, the data above seems to be inconsistent. However, since 2005, the comparison clearly shows that as the canopy became more dense, the amount of ground cover was reduced. This is due to the lesser amount of sunlight reaching the ground.

Team members conversing abou

For the final comparison, we tried to look for a relationship between the Canopy Cover, Ground Cover and Total Damage.

Conclusions

Our team believed that we would find that our needles and trees would show more signs of damage more recently due to increasing levels of greenhouse gasses. What we found was that even though there is some slight increasing and decreasing in the height and dbh numbers (students error, perhaps?), the general trend is that the trees are growing steadily taller and wider.

We also found out that since 2005, the canopy in our PSSP is extremely closed, over 90%! This means that the trees have grown so tall and so tight together that it is hard for sunlight to penetrate to the ground. The data supports the fact that the forest has indeed changed in the past fifteen years.

When we tried to look for a trend in the Total Percent Damage over time, we found none. In fact, there seemed to be years when the needles were extremely healthy (2004, 2008) and years when there was much more damage (2001, 2002). This raised the question if the needles are not cumulatively affected by pollution, then what might have caused the spikes in the data?

This leads us to look at other factors, such as: Was there anything going on at the school property that might have caused a sudden change in the health of our trees? A new septic system leach field? Extension of the softball and soccer field? Or, could this damage be more influenced by the amount of rain that we got in those summers, by higher or lower temperatures, or by **High Ozone Exceedence Days?**

This photo illustrates the thickness of the canopy.

Literature cited

Forest Watch Data Books: 1196-2010

Acknowledgments

We thank I. Güor for laboratory assistance, Mary Juana for seeds, Herb Isside for greenhouse care, and M.I. Menter for questionable statistical advice. Funding for this project was provided by the Swarthmore College Department of Biology, a Merck summer stipend, and my mom. [Note that people's titles are omitted.]

For further information

Please contact *mfougere@gilmanton.k12.nh.us* or Martha Carlson at *forestwatch@sr.unh.edu*. More information on this and related projects can be obtained at http://www.forestwatch.sr.unh.edu.

