



Mojave Desert Network Integrated Upland Monitoring

2012 Pilot Study for Mojave National Preserve

Natural Resource Technical Report NPS/MOJN/NRTR—2013/827



ON THE COVER

Joshua tree wooded scrubland monitoring plot, Mojave National Preserve
Photograph by: Jean J. Pan, NPS

Mojave Desert Network Integrated Upland Monitoring

2012 Pilot Study for Mojave National Preserve

Natural Resource Technical Report NPS/MOJN/NRTR—2013/827

Jean J. Pan, Ph.D. and Nita Tallent, Ph.D.

National Park Service
Mojave Desert Network
601 Nevada Highway
Boulder City, NV 89005

November 2013

U.S. Department of the Interior
National Park Service
Natural Resource Stewardship and Science
Fort Collins, Colorado

The National Park Service, Natural Resource Stewardship and Science office in Fort Collins, Colorado, publishes a range of reports that address natural resource topics. These reports are of interest and applicability to a broad audience in the National Park Service and others in natural resource management, including scientists, conservation and environmental constituencies, and the public.

The Natural Resource Technical Report Series is used to disseminate results of scientific studies in the physical, biological, and social sciences for both the advancement of science and the achievement of the National Park Service mission. The series provides contributors with a forum for displaying comprehensive data that are often deleted from journals because of page limitations.

All manuscripts in the series receive the appropriate level of peer review to ensure that the information is scientifically credible, technically accurate, appropriately written for the intended audience, and designed and published in a professional manner. This report received informal peer review by subject-matter experts who were not directly involved in the collection, analysis, or reporting of the data. Data in this report were collected and analyzed using methods based on established, peer-reviewed protocols and were analyzed and interpreted within the guidelines of the protocols.

Views, statements, findings, conclusions, recommendations, and data in this report do not necessarily reflect views and policies of the National Park Service, U.S. Department of the Interior. Mention of trade names or commercial products does not constitute endorsement or recommendation for use by the U.S. Government.

This report is available from the Mojave Desert Network Inventory and Monitoring website (<http://science.nature.nps.gov/im/units/mojn/index.cfm>) and the Natural Resource Publications Management website (<http://www.nature.nps.gov/publications/nrpm/>). To receive this report in a format optimized for screen readers, please email irma@nps.gov.

Please cite this publication as:

Pan, J. J., and N. Tallent. 2013. Mojave Desert Network integrated upland monitoring: 2012 pilot study for Mojave National Preserve. Natural Resource Technical Report NPS/MOJN/NRTR—2013/827 National Park Service, Fort Collins, Colorado.

Contents

	Page
Figures.....	v
Tables.....	vii
Appendices.....	ix
Executive Summary.....	xi
Acknowledgments.....	xii
Acronyms.....	xiii
1 Introduction.....	1
1.1 Vital Signs	1
2 Methods.....	3
2.1 Sampling Frames	3
2.2 Travel Cost Scenarios.....	5
2.3 Field Methods	6
2.4 Data Summary	8
3 Results.....	11
3.1 Travel Cost Scenarios.....	11
3.2 Office and Support Staff Costs.....	14
4 Issues and Implementation Recommendations.....	15
4.1 Travel and Field Time	15
4.1.1 Field Time.....	15
4.1.2 Travel Time to Field Sites.....	18
4.1.3 Field Crews	18
4.2 Field Procedures	18
4.2.1 Transect-related Procedures.....	18

Contents (continued)

	Page
4.2.2 Soil Sampling Point Procedure	19
Literature Cited	21

Figures

	Page
Figure 1. Joshua tree (<i>Yucca brevifolia</i> var. <i>jaegeriana</i>) wooded scrubland community at Mojave National Preserve.....	2
Figure 2. The first 35 sites selected from the GRTS survey design draw for Mojave National Preserve.	4
Figure 3. Standard macroplot and transect layout for integrated upland monitoring.	7
Figure A1. Spatial distribution of vegetation types at Mojave National Preserve based on the 30-m Multi-Resolution Land Characteristics Consortium (MRLC) National Land Cover Dataset (NLCD).	A-2
Figure B1. Least cost travel paths to 35 GRTS sites from the Cima Road exit off of interstate 15 generated by the travel time cost surface model.	B-2
Figure C1. Locations of established macroplots within the Joshua tree (<i>Yucca brevifolia</i> var. <i>jaegeriana</i>) wooded scrubland community at Mojave National Preserve.....	C-2
Figure C2. Mean a) % cover and b) species richness of species for each life form by macroplot.	C-3
Figure C3. Mean total % cover by macroplot.....	C-6
Figure C4. Mean % cover of live and dead species/functional group by macroplot.	C-7
Figure C5. Mean proportion of quadrats infested by target invasive species by macroplot.	C-8
Figure C6. Mean % cover for invasive and native species by macroplot.....	C-9
Figure C7. Mean % cover of soil surface features per macroplot.	C-11
Figure C8. Mean a) % cover and b) proportion of quadrats of soil disturbance features per macroplot from the point-intercept and invasives species frequency quadrats procedures, respectively.	C-12
Figure C9. Mean number of canopy gaps for a given size category per macroplot.	C-13
Figure C10. Mean gap size and total gap length per transect by macroplot for a) canopy and b) basal gaps.	C-14
Figure C11. Mean number of basal gaps for a given size category per macroplot.	C-15

Figures (continued)

	Page
Figure C12. Mean values for a) pH and b) electrical conductivity (EC) by macroplot.....	C-16
Figure D1. Macroplot overview photo for macroplot 9.....	D-1
Figure D2. Macroplot overview photo for macroplot 115.....	D-2
Figure D3. Macroplot overview photo for macroplot 121.....	D-3
Figure D4. Macroplot overview photo for macroplot 233.....	D-4

Tables

	Page
Table 1. Time estimates for each field data collection procedure, field data management, and revisit set-up with a 2-person crew.	12
Table 2. Estimated costs of field data collection by vital sign with a 2-person crew.	13
Table 3. Network staff cost estimates for the IU protocol.	14
Table 4. Cost estimates, including hike times, to conduct different subsets of the IU procedures per macroplot and 35 macroplots.	17
Table B1. Travel time cost surface model estimates for one-way hiking, driving, and total travel time to 35 potential field sites selected in the GRTS draw.....	B-3
Table B2. Estimated round-trip hiking costs for 35 sites from the MOJA GRTS draw for a 2-person crew.	B-5
Table B3. Estimated round-trip hiking costs for 35 sites from the MOJA GRTS draw for a 3-4 person crew, consisting of one GS-5 field technician and 2-3 SCA interns.	B-5
Table B4. Time and cost estimates for conducting the Soil Measurements procedure in the field vs. in the office.....	B-5
Table B5. Cost estimates for initial macroplot set-up, including pre-reconnaissance of potential field sites.	B-6
Table B6. Scenarios for crew schedules for a crew of two.	B-6
Table C1. Mean % cover per macroplot of shrub and tree species found across four macroplots in 2012.....	C-4
Table C2. Mean % cover per macroplot of invasive species found across four macroplots in 2012.....	C-8
Table C3. Frequency of quadrats for dead vs. live, spatial location, and phenophase of invasive species found across four macroplots in 2012.	C-10
Table C4. Dominant qualitative soil characteristics for four monitored macroplots in 2012.....	C-18
Table C5. Joshua tree (<i>Yucca brevifolia</i> var. <i>jaegeriana</i>) count within established macroplots.....	C-19

Appendices

	Page
Appendix A: Travel Time Cost Surface Model.....	A-1
Appendix B: Travel Cost Scenarios Tables	B-1
Appendix C: MOJA Macroplot Data from the Pilot Study	C-1
Appendix D: Macroplot Overview Photographs from the 2012 Pilot Study.....	D-1

Executive Summary

The Integrated Upland (IU) Monitoring Protocol of the Mojave Desert Network Inventory and Monitoring Program (MOJN I&M) is one of the long-term monitoring protocols developed for the National Park Service “Vital Signs Monitoring Program,” a long-term ecological monitoring program that will provide rigorous, scientifically-based information on the status and trends of park ecosystems. Data from this program are intended to help park managers evaluate complex and challenging resource issues and make sound decisions that result in long-term protection of park resources. Information on park resource conditions will also be useful for park planning, research, education, and public awareness.

Twenty priority park vital signs - indicators of ecosystem health - that represent a broad suite of ecological phenomena operating across multiple temporal and spatial scales were identified for MOJN I&M (Chung-MacCoubrey et al. 2008). The IU protocol (Pan et al. Unpublished Report [a]) addresses seven of these prioritized vital signs, including vegetation change, invasive plants, and soil-related vital signs. The focus of the IU protocol is upland shrub communities. Shrub communities were chosen because this physiognomic class collectively represents a large proportion of each park and captures several focal communities of interest (e.g., Joshua tree, creosote bush, and sagebrush), thus providing a common theme among parks. Each of the seven parks in the network, in collaboration with the MOJN I&M, selected a target upland community for monitoring. The Joshua tree wooded scrubland community was selected for monitoring at Mojave National Preserve (MOJA).

A pilot study for the IU protocol (Pan et al. Unpublished Report [a]) was conducted in the spring and summer of 2012. The objectives of the pilot study were to: 1) estimate time in the field needed to travel to field sites, establish macroplots, and conduct field measurements, and 2) test field methods and standard operating procedures (SOPs) in sites within target communities. In this report, findings and a data summary of the pilot study for MOJA are presented. Cost estimates were generated for conducting field procedures, travel to field sites, and different crew staffing scenarios. At MOJA, four macroplots were successfully established and all field procedures implemented. The time to implement various field procedures ranged from around 30 min (Site Assessment for Invasive Plants) to up to 360 min (Soil Measurements) for a two-person field crew. The average estimated cost for each macroplot revisit (hiking time to field site plus field data collection, *not including driving time*) was \$576, for a total of approximately \$20,160 for 35 spatially randomly selected field sites. We found that shrub species composition varied greatly across macroplots, detected four of the seven target status and trends invasive species on the macroplots, and compared qualitative and quantitative soil parameters across macroplots. Issues and recommendations to improve the IU protocol are discussed. Primary recommendations include:

- ✓ Increase the monitoring interval for soil procedures, including basal/canopy gaps.
 - Analyze one soil sample per sampling point.
- ✓ Increase the monitoring interval for repeat photographs to every 3-4 monitoring periods (9-12 year intervals).

Acknowledgments

We thank the Mojave National Preserve staff for their support before, during, and after our field work. We appreciate their arranging and meeting with us to discuss park safety procedures. In particular, we thank Debra Hughson for facilitating our research permit, Neal Darby for his assessment of potential field sites, David Nichols and the archaeology team for clearing field sites, Kirk Gebicke for helping us contact park neighbors, and Lisa Wilson, Steve Carlson, and the Hole in the Wall Interagency Fire Center for housing.

The field work could not have been done without our dedicated field crew: Student Conservation Association (SCA) interns Ashley Popham, Craig Rowell, Petra Murdoch, Heather Benedict, and Karin Edwards (contract botanist). Janel Brackin (MOJN I&M Science Communicator) and Bob Truitt (MOJN I&M Data Manager) provided much time on data entry, clean-up, and QA/QC. Natasha Antonova, GIS specialist at the North Coast and Cascades Network Inventory and Monitoring Program, ran the travel time cost surface model. We are grateful for the guidance that Kirk Sherill, developer of the travel time cost surface model, provided. We thank Lise Grace, technical editor at the North Coast and Cascades Network Inventory and Monitoring Program, for formatting the report and guiding us through the publication process.

Acronyms

BSC	Biological soil crust
DEM	Digital Elevation Model
DEVA	Death Valley National Park
DOQQ	Digital Orthophoto Quarter Quad
EC	Electrical conductivity
GIS	Geographic Information Systems
GPS	Global positioning system
GRBA	Great Basin National Park
GRTS	Generalized Random Tessellation Stratified
I&M	NPS Inventory and Monitoring Program
IRMA	NPS Integrated Resource Management Applications Portal
IU	MOJN I&M Integrated Upland Monitoring Protocol
JOTR	Joshua Tree National Park
LAKE	Lake Mead National Recreation Area
MANZ	Manzanar National Historic Site
MOJA	Mojave National Preserve
MOJN	Mojave Desert Network
MRLC	Multi-Resolution Land Characteristics Consortium
NLCD	National Land Cover Dataset
NPS	National Park Service
PARA	Grand Canyon-Parashant National Monument
PMTS	Percent of Maximum Travel Speed
SCA	Student Conservation Association
SOP	Standard operating procedure

Acronyms (continued)

TTCSM	Travel Time Cost Surface Model
USGS	United States Geological Survey

1 Introduction

The parks of the Mojave Desert Network Inventory and Monitoring Program (MOJN I&M) are faced with increasing pressures from air pollution, habitat loss, fragmentation, and altered disturbance regimes (e.g., fire, land development; Chung-MacCoubrey et al. 2008). Climate models also predict significant climatic changes, with increasing temperatures and decreasing precipitation, for the southwestern United States (Seager et al. 2007, Archer and Predick 2008). The presence and composition of vegetation depends on a multitude of abiotic and biotic factors including climate, resource availability, and soil microbial community. This makes vegetation and the soils associated with it good general indicators of environmental change across parks (Vasek and Lund 1980, Janssens et al. 1998, Klironomos 2002, Hereford et al. 2006).

The Integrated Upland (IU) monitoring protocol was designed to provide the status and trends of natural resources (vegetation, soil, and invasive plants; see *Section 1.1 Vital Signs*) in upland shrub communities at all seven MOJN parks: Death Valley National Park (DEVA), Great Basin National Park (GRBA), Joshua Tree National Park (JOTR), Lake Mead National Recreation Area (LAKE), Manzanar National Historic Site (MANZ), Mojave National Preserve (MOJA), and Grand Canyon-Parashant National Monument (PARA). Monitoring focuses on a target upland shrub community within each park. Data collected from IU monitoring plots will serve two very important purposes: 1) providing a quantifiable framework from which to build adaptive management policies, and 2) providing a baseline from which to establish additional scientific studies (e.g., those addressing cause and effect relationships). With a basic understanding of the park resources and processes affecting them, land managers can make more informed decisions about how to conserve these resources into the future.

We conducted a pilot study of the IU Monitoring Protocol at six of the MOJN parks (DEVA, GRBA, JOTR, LAKE, MOJA, PARA) and full implementation of the protocol at the smallest park (MANZ). This report describes the activities and findings of the 2012 pilot study for the IU Monitoring Protocol at Mojave National Preserve (MOJA), where we focused on the **Joshua tree** (*Yucca brevifolia* var. *jaegeriana*) **wooded scrubland community** (Figure 1). The objectives of the pilot study were to: 1) estimate time in the field needed to travel to field sites, establish macroplots, and conduct field measurements, and 2) test field methods and standard operating procedures (SOPs) in randomly selected sites within target communities. *We used the information collected during our pilot study to: 1) evaluate different travel cost scenarios to conduct IU monitoring (see Section 3 Results; Appendix B - Travel Cost Scenarios Tables), and 2) examine the data collected from the SOPs (see Appendix C).* During the pilot study, we established a limited number of macroplots in order to test field methods, establish monitoring plots, and collect data in the communities that were selected for monitoring.

1.1 Vital Signs

After a series of vital signs scoping workshops, 20 priority park vital signs - indicators of ecosystem health - that represent a broad suite of ecological phenomena operating across multiple temporal and spatial scales were identified and ranked for MOJN I&M (Chung-MacCoubrey et al. 2008). The IU protocol directly addresses seven highly ranked vital signs out of the 20, which we broadly categorize as vegetation change, invasive plants, and soils (ranking out of 20):

- Vegetation change (2)
- Invasive/exotic plants (3)
- Soil-related:
 - Soil chemistry (9)
 - Soil hydrologic function (10)
 - Soil erosion and deposition (11)
 - Soil surface disturbance (12)
 - Biological soil crusts (13)



Figure 1. Joshua tree (*Yucca brevifolia* var. *jaegeriana*) wooded scrubland community at Mojave National Preserve. Photo provided by Neal Darby (NPS, Mojave National Preserve).

2 Methods

Here, we describe how potential field sites were randomly selected using a Generalized Random Tessellation Stratified (GRTS; see *Section 2.1 Sampling Frames*) design, how time and cost estimates were generated for travel cost scenarios (see *Section 2.2 Travel Cost Scenarios*), the field methods used for data collection (see *Section 2.3 Field Methods*), data quality assurance and control (QA/QC), data processing, and data analyses (see *Section 2.4 Data Summary*). These procedures are described in full in the MOJN IU protocol SOPs (Pan et al. Unpublished Report [b]).

2.1 Sampling Frames

We utilized the GRTS survey design to select potential field sites for the IU protocol pilot study. This design produces a randomly selected set of sites that are spatially balanced across the monitored community and then takes into account the spatial distribution of field sites during data analysis. New GRTS survey designs may be used for full implementation of IU monitoring.

In order to select potential field sites, we first determined the spatial distribution of the target upland community at MOJA, the **Joshua tree wooded scrubland community**. MOJA selected this community because of its special management concern [“monitoring the extent, density, and age distribution of the Joshua tree woodland” (NPS 2002)] and sensitivity to environmental change.

The spatial distribution of the Joshua tree wooded scrubland community was evaluated using the Central Mojave Vegetation Map (Thomas et al. 2004), the best available vegetation map for MOJA. The Joshua tree wooded scrubland community at MOJA covers 132,514 ha (327,448 ac), ranging in elevation from 800-1,900 m (2,600-6,300 ft). Using Geographic Information Systems (GIS), we created a 100 m buffer around the park boundary, which was removed from the spatial distribution of the target community to ensure that any sites selected would be within the park boundary. Where possible, we also eliminated target vegetation areas that were too small to support the 1 ha macroplot. The remaining area served as the sampling frame for the GRTS site selection (see Figure 2) and is considered the population of inference.

We used a stratified random GRTS survey design at MOJA in order to accommodate the park’s interest in the Joshua tree population at different elevations. The Joshua tree wooded scrubland community was stratified into three elevation bands, 800-1250 m (2624-4101 ft), 1250-1550 m (4101-5085 ft), and >1550 m (>5085 ft); the number of sites drawn for each stratum was proportional to the size of its area. We had an initial draw of 35 sites for each park (Figure 2) based on power analyses (see Pan et al. Unpublished Report [a] for details), with an oversample of 250 sites, which allows for elimination of sites due to sampling frame errors arising from map inaccuracies (e.g., non-target vegetation type, site on private land; see Pan et al. Unpublished Report [a]), as well as the addition of sites in the future.




Figure 2. The first 35 sites selected from the Generalized Random Tessellation Stratified (GRTS) survey design draw for Mojave National Preserve.

For the pilot season, we generated a list of potential field sites by selecting a subset of field sites that were within 2 miles of a road from the initial draw of 35 sites. We then used a Digital Elevation Model (DEM) and satellite imagery (available in Google Earth) to conduct office reconnaissance on the potential field sites, eliminating any sites that were unsuitable (e.g., unsafe, inaccessible). The remaining sites were then provided to park staff for further input. If park staff deemed a site inappropriate for long-term monitoring (e.g., culturally-sensitive, unsafe), then the field site was rejected. If needed, a replacement site was added from either the remaining sites in the initial draw or from the oversample. A finalized list of potential field sites was provided to the park as part of the park research permit and before field work was started.

Potential field site visitation order was determined by MOJN I&M office staff. Field sites could also be rejected after field crews physically visited sites (see Pan et al. Unpublished Report [b], *SOP 6 – Site Characterization*). If a field site was rejected by the crew, then they proceeded to the next site on the list of potential sites. If a site was acceptable, then a macroplot was established and data were collected.

2.2 Travel Cost Scenarios

We evaluated travel to field sites (time and/or distance) using a travel time cost surface model (TTCSM; Appendix A), the number of field crew members, field crew schedule (e.g., 8 vs. 10 hour work days), and local vs. traveling crew in the travel cost scenarios. TTCSM and crew-related scenarios were conducted after the pilot study (and based loosely on field experience from the pilot study, such as estimates of travel time to different park units) to provide a cost estimate for full implementation of the IU protocol. In contrast, scenarios proposed for initial establishment of macroplots, field procedures, and subsequent revisits that consist primarily of field data collection, were based on pilot study time estimates.

Estimates for initial establishment of macroplots included all costs associated with the establishment of macroplots, including office and field reconnaissance of potential field sites, and macroplot set-up. We assumed that 50 potential field sites would be evaluated through office reconnaissance and 40 sites through field reconnaissance.

We ran a TTCSM on the first 35 field sites from the GRTS draw in ArcGIS (see *Section 2.1 Sampling Frames*). A TTCSM determines the shortest reasonable route to a field site and estimates the travel time to the site, given certain parameters (Sherrill et al. 2010). Five primary datasets were used in the model: trails (MOJA), roads (MOJA), boundary and NPS lands datasets (NPS Lands Resources Division), vegetation (Multi-Resolution Land Characteristics Consortium National Land Cover Dataset), and DEM (USGS). An impediment value (i.e., how much the impediment obstructs a person from walking the maximum speed) is given for parameters within each layer (see *Appendix A – Travel Time Cost Surface Model* for detailed specifications). Driving speeds were set to the speed limit for paved roads (70 mph for freeways and 55 mph for other paved roads), 35 mph for unpaved maintained roads, and 10 mph for unmaintained 4x4 roads. Since hiking/walking speeds are likely to vary with field crew members, we ran the model using three maximum hiking speeds, 2, 2.5, and 3 mph. The starting point for travel to all field sites was the Cima Road exit off of Interstate 15.

The costs for field crew travel time and field data collection/data management were estimated separately to show the cost of each component. Field data collection estimates were further separated by SOP and vital sign to allow for independent assessment under different monitoring scenarios (e.g., revisit periods). Field data collection times were estimated from field work during the pilot study.

The scenarios that we examined for crew schedule were 8-hour days for 5 days week, 10-hour days for 4 days a week, and 10-hour days for 8 days over a 2-week field tour. Crew travel time was estimated from the MOJN I&M office at LAKE, Boulder City, NV, to each park unit. Given the varying distances to the MOJN park units, travel was estimated to take 1-2 days of each week or 2-week field tour. Travel to MOJA will be closer to 1 day per field tour. Estimates of per diem

for NPS employees were not included in the hourly rates, but are presented separately as part of this scenario. Backcountry per diem was estimated at \$20 per person per night.

Crews may be based at the park that they are working in for the field season, instead of returning to the MOJN I&M office at the end of each field tour. In this scenario, crews can either be temporarily based at the park unit that is being monitored and return to the MOJN I&M office after all field work is completed or be park-based; in both cases, minimal travel is anticipated.

The cost of field crew time was estimated for a GS-5 field technician and 1-3 volunteer natural resource interns (e.g., Student Conservation Association interns). We used an hourly wage estimate of \$22 per hour for the GS-5 position and \$14 per hour for interns. A GIS specialist would be needed to assist with office reconnaissance of potential field sites and to generate recommended travel routes to field sites. The hourly wage estimate for a GS-11 GIS specialist is \$39. Wage estimates included benefits, when applicable.

2.3 Field Methods

A brief description of each field data collection procedure is presented in this section. The vegetation change vital sign is measured using the point-intercept procedure (SOP 8) and repeat photographs procedure (SOP 13). The invasive species vital sign is measured using the point-intercept procedure (SOP 8), invasive species frequency quadrats procedure (SOP 10), and the site assessment for invasives procedure (SOP 12). The soils vital signs are primarily measured using procedures in *Soil Measurements* (SOP 11), with the exception of the soil erosion and deposition vital sign, which is measured with the basal/canopy gaps procedure (SOP 9). For specific details on the macroplot design and SOPs, see Pan et al. (Unpublished Report [b]).

Each macroplot was 100 m by 100 m (Figure 3). Within each macroplot, we established three parallel, 50-m transects spaced 25 m apart. The origin and end of each transect and the corner of the macroplot closest to the origin of transect 1 were permanently marked with rebar, labeled with a tag, and the spatial location recorded using a GPS.

Three procedures were implemented on transects (referred to hereafter as transect-related procedures): the point-intercept, basal/canopy gaps, and invasive species frequency quadrats. The point-intercept procedure was used to measure vegetation, including target invasive plants, soil surface features, soil disturbance features, and biological soil crust (BSC) at points every 1 m along the transect. Identifiable vegetation was recorded to the species-level for shrubs and target invasive species; other identifiable vegetation was recorded by life form (i.e., grasses, forbs, or trees) or within a designated category (e.g., litter). Hereafter, species refers to both plant species and designations within life forms (e.g., annual grass, perennial grass) for plant cover. We used the basal/canopy gaps procedure to measure the potential for soil erosion by recording all gaps created by perennial plant bases and canopies along the transect that were ≥ 0.2 m.




Figure 3. Standard macroplot and transect layout for integrated upland monitoring. Locations on the edge of the macroplot indicated by an “*” are sampling locations for soil parameters. The number next to the “*” is the sampling location number.

Seven target established invasive species were prioritized for monitoring at MOJA: *Brassica tournefortii* (Sahara mustard), *Bromus rubens* (red brome), *Bromus tectorum* (cheatgrass), *Erodium cicutarium* (redstem filaree), *Salsola* spp. (Russian thistle), *Schismus* spp. (Mediterranean grass), and *Sisymbrium irio* (London rocket). Frequency of target status and trends (S&T) invasive species and soil disturbance were assessed by placing 0.25 by 0.25 m quadrats every 1 m along transects. Presence of target S&T species was further assessed using a patterned walk in the macroplot (SOP 12).

Soil parameters (SOP 11 - Soil Measurements) were sampled at 12 regularly spaced sampling points along the perimeter of each macroplot (Figure 3). At each soil sampling point, soil measures (except soil compaction readings) were taken for a vegetated (soil underneath vegetation) and barren (soil was not underneath vegetation) soil sample. Soil erosion will be assessed as direct and potential soil erosion (from the basal/canopy gaps procedure). We were not able to directly measure soil erosion during the pilot study because our assessment depends on the relative difference in soil height between monitoring periods at each of the rebar stakes (“soil erosion pin” method; Pan et al. Unpublished Report [b]). Canopy gap measurements can be used to assess the potential for wind erosion and basal gap measurements, the potential for water erosion.

One photograph was taken of each transect and one overview photograph was taken of the macroplot, all focusing on the vegetation, as described in the repeat photos procedure (SOP 13, Pan et al. Unpublished Report [b]). Similarly, soil erosion specific photographs and an overview photograph of the macroplot focusing on the soil were taken and will, in future years, be used to assess soil erosion.

2.4 Data Summary

In this section, we describe the procedures used after data were collected in the field, starting with data entry, and continuing through QA/QC, data processing, and analysis. All measured variables were processed to provide macroplot-level estimates, making the macroplot the unit of replication and analysis.

QA/QC of data involved three main steps: verification, validation, and certification. During the pilot study, data were collected on hardcopy field forms. Data verification involved ensuring that data were accurately entered from the hardcopy field forms into the electronic database. To do this, each data field form was manually double-entered into the Infopath data entry system. Two different MOJN I&M staff entered each hardcopy field form into a SharePoint site using a Microsoft (MS) InfoPath front-end form. Digital files of the field forms were downloaded in a MS XML file format and converted to Excel and csv file formats in MS Excel 2010. Matching flat files for each field form were compared using the “Compare” procedure in SAS (SAS Institute, Inc.), which highlighted any differences in data entry between the two files. Differences between the files were manually checked against the paper field form and corrected in one flat file, which became the “official” digitized copy for the field form. Data validation involved checking the verified data files to ensure that the data values for each field were reasonable (e.g., pH values not >14, plant codes matched a species or group, recorded categories were valid for the field). We completed a 100% verification and manual validation check for data collected during the pilot study. Data certification requires that the MOJN I&M Program Manager sign off on the data, at which point, the data are ready for analysis and made available for distribution as appropriate.

All data were processed to provide macroplot-level estimates of the measured variables, making the macroplot the unit of replication. Results are presented for individual macroplots or averaged across monitored macroplots. For transect-related procedures (i.e., point-intercept, basal/canopy gaps, invasive species frequency quadrats), the data were first averaged across a transect and then averaged across all three transects to derive a macroplot-level measure. To determine absolute % cover of variables for a transect using the point-intercept procedure, we counted the number of times a species/category was recorded across the 50 points (every 1 m along the transect), divided the number by the total number of points (50), and then multiplied by 100. For invasive species frequency quadrats, we counted the number of quadrats per transect in which each target invasive species was found and divided that number by the total number of quadrats (50) to obtain a frequency per transect. Invasive species live/dead status, spatial distribution, and phenophase frequencies were calculated for only those quadrats where the invasive species was present on a transect (e.g., frequency for presence under canopy is the number of quadrats where the species is found under canopy divided by the total number of quadrats on the transect in which the species was found).

Soil parameters collected along the 12 soil sample points were categorized as vegetated or barren and averaged across the 12 points to obtain a macroplot-level estimate. In certain instances (e.g., sample location on bedrock, no soil could be obtained), there were fewer than 12 soil sampling points, so data were averaged over all available points. For qualitative soil data, we determined the dominant category and present the range of categories observed across the sampling points.

3 Results

A summary of the travel cost scenarios is presented in this section. For more detailed information, including data collected during the pilot study, refer to *Appendix B – Travel Cost Scenario Tables* and *Appendix C – MOJA Macroplot Data from the Pilot Study*. For ease of presentation, travel cost scenarios were estimated for a 2-person crew, the minimum number of people needed for most procedures. However, with a larger field crew, field procedures can be conducted simultaneously, resulting in less time spent at a particular field site.

3.1 Travel Cost Scenarios

Travel cost scenarios were broken into three non-overlapping components: travel (driving and hiking) to field sites, initial macroplot establishment, and field data collection costs. *Not including any driving travel* (see below for explanation), estimated total costs for the initial year of monitoring ranged from \$560 to \$896 per macroplot based on a 2-person crew for each procedure. For the randomly selected 35 sites from the GRTS draw, the average cost per macroplot was \$674¹ during the initial establishment and the total cost was \$23,590. Estimated cost for macroplot revisits (hiking time to field sites plus field data collection) averaged \$576 per macroplot, and totaled \$20,160 for the 35 macroplots. It is anticipated that five macroplots will be re-measured each field season to estimate crew measurement error. The estimated cost for the re-measurement of the five macroplots is \$2,880. More detailed cost estimates, including a breakdown by vital signs, and scenarios for travel, field crew number, crew schedule, and local vs. traveling crew, are described below and in *Appendix B -Travel Cost Scenarios Tables*.

Travel costs are assumed recurring costs for monitoring and will not decrease with time or experience. We focused on hiking time in our travel scenario rather than total travel time (driving plus hiking) because the travel time cost surface model calculated travel time from a single starting location (the Cima road exit off of I-15; see Appendix B). Driving times for the 35 GRTS sites ranged from ~3 to 94 min (Appendix B). However, driving times will be highly dependent on the proximity of field sites (e.g., one drive may lead to multiple field sites), how sites are scheduled to be visited, and where the field crews are based. In some cases, the most substantial driving times may be from the MOJN I&M office to the park.

Hiking time and costs estimates are likely to be more consistent as they are measured from the nearest point off the road to the field site. Actual one-way hiking time estimates ranged from >5 to 173 min (hike distances are provided in Appendix B). When we categorized the 35 GRTS field sites by hiking times, we found that most (89%) of the field sites were accessible within a 60 min hike under the 2.5 mph model (Appendix B). Estimated costs for round-trip hiking to potential field sites at MOJA ranged from \$36 (<30 min hike one-way) to \$198 (165 min hike one-way) for a 2-person crew. With a crew of three or four people, which may be needed during macroplot establishment, estimated round-trip hiking costs ranged from \$49-63 to \$275-352 per site, respectively.

¹ Macroplot cost was calculated by taking the average hiking cost (\$63, as determined from Table B2) and the midpoint of the cost range for establishment (\$111) and field work (\$500).

Estimates for all field data collection that was conducted during the pilot study, including field data management, ranged from \$428-572 per macroplot for a 2-person crew. Individual estimates of time by field procedure showed that the basal/canopy gaps and soil measurements procedures were the most time consuming (Table 1).

Table 1. Time estimates for each field data collection procedure, field data management, and revisit set-up with a 2-person crew. Estimates are based on average to high density vegetation communities. Total time for all field procedures ranged from 660-900 min. Less dense communities, like creosote shrublands, will take less time, particularly for the point-intercept and basal/canopy gaps procedures, where times may be less than half the current estimate. Costs are in dollars.

SOP	Time Estimate	Time Estimate (min) for 3 Transects/12 Points	Cost Estimate (GS-5)	Additional Crew Member Cost	Total Cost per SOP
Point-intercept (8)	20-30 min/transect	60-90	22-33	14-20	36-53
Basal/Canopy Gaps (9)	60-75 min/transect	180-225	66-83	41-51	107-134
Invasive Species Frequency Quadrats (10)	30-45 min/transect	90-135	33-50	20-31	53-81
Soils Measurements (11)	20-30 min/point	240-360	88-132	54-82	142-214
Site Assessment for Invasive Species (12)	30 min	30	11	7	18
Repeat Photos (13)	60 min	60	22	14	36
Field Data Management (field QA/QC, data download)	60 min/day		22	14	36
Revisit set-up*		15-30	5-11	3-7	8-18

*Upper estimate includes soil revisit set-up.

When field data collection costs were calculated by vital sign, **we found that costs were greatest for the soil-related vital signs and lowest for the vegetation change vital sign** (Table 2). On average, the cost for each of the seven vital signs ranged from \$56-76 per macroplot. The cost per soil vital sign varied greatly, with soil surface disturbance and biological soil crust being negligible (embedded into point-intercept and invasive species frequency quadrats) to soil erosion deposition ranging from \$113-140 per macroplot. We also compared the cost of conducting soil procedures in the field vs. collecting soil and conducting procedures in the office. Estimated costs for soil procedures in the field ranged from \$142-214, while soil collection in the field plus office measurements ranged from \$260-486 per macroplot (Appendix B). Despite issues with the electrical conductivity meter² in the field, data did not vary greatly between samples measured in the field vs. in the office (data not shown).

² It was difficult to get a stable reading on the electrical conductivity meter under windy or hot conditions. The meter seemed to overheat when temperatures were above 100° F.

Table 2. Estimated costs of field data collection by vital sign with a 2-person crew. Travel and data management costs are not included. Soil surface disturbance and biological soil crust data collection are completely embedded in the point-intercept and invasive species frequency quadrats and are individually negligible. Costs are in dollars.

Vital Sign (rank)	Estimate of Time for SOPs (min)	Cost Estimate (GS-5)	Additional Crew Member Cost	Total Costs per Macroplot
Vegetation change (2)	110-140	40-51	25-32	65-83
Invasive Plants (3)	120-165	44-61	27-37	71-98
Soil chemistry (9)	240-360	88-132	54-82	142-214
Soil hydrologic function (10)				
Soil erosion & deposition (11)	190-235	70-86	43-54	113-140
Soil surface disturbance (12)	Negligible	---	---	---
Biological soil crusts (13)	Negligible	---	---	---

Costs associated with initial establishment of a macroplot are non-recurring and only expected once. Estimates for initial macroplot establishment, which included pre-clearance of potential field sites and macroplot set-up but *not* travel (see above for travel estimates), ranged from \$96-126 per macroplot for a 2-person crew (Appendix B). Macroplot revisit set-up costs are shown in Table 1.

We considered various crew scenarios for conducting the IU protocol field monitoring, specifically variation in crew number, crew schedule, and traveling vs. local (park-based) crew. Variation in crew number was examined in previous scenarios. Primarily, we considered a base crew of two people for most procedures. An additional one to two volunteer interns can be added to the base crew number, if needed, and procedures, such as the point-intercept and soil measurements, can be conducted simultaneously.

The primary impact of different crew schedule scenarios are the number of days spent traveling from the MOJN I&M office to parks, given the minimum number of field work days needed to collect data. It is expected that under long-term implementation of the IU protocol, all field data collection will take 1 day; thus, a minimum of 35 working field days are needed (or 40 working field days if 15% of monitored macroplots are revisited within the same season to estimate measurement errors). One-way travel time was estimated to be ~1 day for all parks except MOJA and LAKE, which were considered ½ day (Appendix B).

We found that a crew schedule of 10-hour days, working 8 days out of 2 weeks, was the most economical, with 12-14 travel days, and the cost of travel time for a crew of two ranging from \$4,272-4,984 to the more distant parks. Four-day work weeks, with 10-hour work days, were the least economical, with an estimated 36-40 travel days costing \$12,816-14,240. Eight-hour days, working 5 days a week, fell in between the other scenarios, with an estimated 24-26 travel days costing \$6,835-7,405. Per diem costs for two crew members ranged from \$1,840-1,920 for the 10-hour days, working 8 days out of 2 weeks, to \$2,240-2,400 for the 10-hour work days, working 4 days per week (Appendix B).

Field crews could also be either temporarily or permanently based at the monitored parks. In both cases, the amount of time that crews spent in travel to parks was drastically reduced. Crews

that were temporarily based at parks for the field season would require at most 2 travel days, 1 day to and 1 day from the park, which would cost \$576 (\$288 times 2 days). Park-based crews would not require any travel days to the park and would likely have limited travel-related costs (e.g., per diem). However, park-based crews would not be available at every park.

3.2 Office and Support Staff Costs

In addition to costs directly related to field data collection, costs are incurred by MOJN I&M network staff as they are needed to organize and plan the field season, provide logistical and data management support, and produce protocol reports. Network staff consist of the Logistics Technician, Data Management Team (Data Manager, GIS Specialist, and Data Technician), and Ecologist. The Logistics Technician is expected to spend 1/3 of his/her time on the IU protocol on a recurring basis. During the protocol initial establishment years, both the Data Management Team and the Ecologist are expected to spend more time on IU-related activities (e.g., 1/3 of the Ecologist's time). Once the protocol is established and monitoring consists primarily of revisits, it is anticipated that the Data Management Team and Ecologist effort will be reduced on IU-related activities (Table 3).

Table 3. Network staff cost estimates for the integrated upland protocol. Costs are in dollars.

Network Staff	Annual Cost - Initial Establishment	Annual Cost - Recurring
Logistics Technician (GS-7)	12,000	12,000
Data Management Team (GS-11, GS-11, GS-9)	27,000	15,000
Ecologist (GS-11)	31,000	24,000

4 Issues and Implementation Recommendations

We successfully established four macroplots that were within 2 miles of roads during our 2012 pilot season at MOJA. Through the pilot study, we examined the effectiveness of our field procedures in the target community and some of the challenges of monitoring vegetation within parks. Below we highlight some of the issues that were elucidated (through the pilot study or outside discussions or meetings) and our recommendations to address them. Potential field sites may be re-drawn using the GRTS survey design, depending on the recommendations that are adopted.

4.1 Travel and Field Time

During MOJN I&M's start-up review, it was recommended that monitoring of individual macroplots be limited to 1 day, including travel time to sites. The initial set-up of field sites is estimated to take approximately half a day, depending on vegetation type and field crew size (see *Section 2.2 Travel Cost Scenarios*). However, initial macroplot set-up is anticipated to be a one-time occurrence and not expected to affect field time in the long-term. Therefore, we focus on monitoring-related field efforts and recurring travel below.

4.1.1 Field Time

The amount of time needed for monitoring and data collection varies depending on the community type and density of vegetation. In general, denser vegetation will require more time, particularly for the basal/canopy gaps procedure. In years when there is a greater density of annuals, time needed for the point-intercept and invasive species frequency quadrats procedures will likely increase (SOP 9 considers only perennials). During the pilot study, it took ~360 to 480 min for a crew of three, working simultaneously on different procedures, to complete all vegetation, invasive plants, soil, and repeat photograph procedures; transect procedures were the time-limiting procedures.

Recommendations:

- ✓ Increase the monitoring time interval for soil procedures, including basal/canopy gaps, which is a transect procedure. For instance, basal/canopy gaps can be measured every other monitoring period (every 6 years) and procedures at soil sampling points every 5-6 monitoring periods (every 15-18 years). Under the previous scenario, basal/canopy gaps would be monitored in years 1, 6, 12, 18, and soil sampling points in years 1, 15, over a 20-year period. Direct monitoring of soil erosion with the soil erosion pin procedure can occur every monitoring period because the procedure is extremely quick (~15 min) and rates of soil erosion may be fairly rapid, depending on the local conditions.
- ✓ Increase the monitoring interval for repeat photographs to every 3-4 monitoring periods (every 9-12 years), so that repeat photographs would be taken in years 1, 9, and 18, or in years 1 and 12, over a 20-year period.

Cost estimates, including average hiking time, based on a 2-person crew for the **recommended monitoring scenarios**³ at MOJA are shown in Table 4.

The drawback to increasing the monitoring intervals for these procedures is that it will take 30-50 years before enough data are collected to examine trends for quantitative data and an even longer period of time may be needed to detect whether trends exist.

³ See *Section 4.2 Field Procedures* recommendation section below for description of recommendations. The average hiking cost per macroplot at MOJA was the same as used in results (\$63). The cost estimate for the soil measures (\$49-95) and basal/canopy gaps procedure (\$90-108) was based on the modifications recommended under *Section 4.2 Field Procedures*.

Table 4. Cost estimates, including hike times, to conduct different subsets of procedures modified based on the field procedure recommendations (below) of the integrated upland monitoring (IU) protocol at Mojave National Preserve. Cost estimates (in dollars) are provided per macroplot and for 35 macroplots. The IU protocol standard operating procedure number is shown in parentheses.

Point-intercept (8)	Basal/ Canopy Gap (9)	Invasive Species Frequency Quadrats (10)	Soils Measurements (11)	Site Assessment for Invasive Species (12)	Repeat Photos (13)	Cost per Macroplot	Total Cost for 35 Macroplots
X		X		X		170-215	5,950-7,525
X	X	X		X		260-323	9,100-11,305
X		X		X	X	206-251	7,210-8,785
X		X	X	X		219-310	7,665-10,850
X	X	X	X	X	X	345-454	12,075-15,890

4.1.2 Travel Time to Field Sites

Although we focused on field sites that were “close to roads,” or 1-2 miles from a road, hiking times to field sites still ranged from 60-90 min each way. Ideally, field crews will either camp within a short hike to the field site or establish a base camp that is within a short drive of a cluster of field sites. For example, although the estimated hike times to sites 112 and 128 are between 180-240 min each, travel times would be greatly reduced if these sites were monitored together, possibly making those two sites together within the realm of 2-3 days for travel and monitoring. Even with careful planning and efficient travel planning, realistic hiking times may average >60 min each way to sites.

Moreover, our current cost estimates will increase if field sites are to be a minimum distance from roads. Field sites that are close to roads are likely to experience greater disturbance (e.g., backcountry camping, high driving and walking traffic, road disturbances such as dust). Having field sites a minimum distance from roads could move many of the sites in the <30 min hike category into the 30-60 min category or greater, increasing the hike cost estimates by at least \$36 per site for a crew of two.

4.1.3 Field Crews

Recommendations:

- ✓ Employ a minimum crew size of three during initial macroplot establishment for ease of carrying equipment and a minimum crew size of two during macroplot revisits. Use a crew size of 3-4 when soil parameters are measured, so that soil and transect procedures can be conducted simultaneously.
- ✓ Adopt a crew schedule of 10-hour days, working 8 days out of 2 weeks, to maximize the number of field data collection days.
- ✓ Use park field crews or temporarily park-based MOJN I&M field crews to reduce travel costs. However, park crews may not be available at all parks (MANZ, MOJA, or PARA).

4.2 Field Procedures

Through the pilot study, we were able to assess the effectiveness of the field procedures for gathering useful data to address the objectives for the IU protocol. Here, we focus on improving the vegetation and soil-related procedures, as we found the invasive species frequency quadrats procedure to be fairly efficient (Appendix C).

4.2.1 Transect-related Procedures

Point-intercept (SOP 8) – Implementing this procedure was fast, and it was possible to read each transect in <60 min, depending on vegetation density. However, this procedure was not effective at detecting invasive plants, BSC, or Joshua trees (see Appendix C).

Recommendations:

- ✓ Increase the number of points measured along transects. Currently, we read points at every 1 m (total = 50 points). *The number of points read could be increased to 100 per transect, or points read every 0.5 m.* Half-meter intervals should provide a good balance

between detecting more plants and not measuring the same individual plant multiple times.

- ✓ BSC was not detected using this procedure, although non-descript cyanobacterial crust was likely present. *We recommend that detection of BSC either be measured during the invasive species frequency quadrats procedure or be dropped altogether (i.e., the vital sign be dropped from the protocol).* More mature crust can be detected when more surface area is examined.
- ✓ Very few Joshua trees were detected using this procedure, even when Joshua trees were in fairly high density. Although measuring Joshua trees is not a specific objective of the IU protocol, Joshua trees are a good indicator species for climate change. *We recommend that a quick count of Joshua trees by general size classes, as described in Barrow and Murphy-Mariscal (2012), be taken within each macroplot.* During the pilot study, one crew member counted the number of Joshua trees per macroplot and it generally took <30 min (\$7-11).

Basal/canopy gaps (SOP 9) – This procedure was the most time-consuming transect procedure at MOJA. Originally, we had hoped this procedure would enable us to assess the life forms that created gaps on macroplots to understand how changes in vegetation may affect soil processes. However, given time constraints, *we will focus on measuring the potential for soil erosion with the gap data and not identify the species or life forms creating the gap.* This may reduce procedure time by 10-15 min per transect.

- ✓ Cost estimate of modified basal/canopy gaps procedure for a 2-person crew is \$90-108 per macroplot.

4.2.2 Soil Sampling Point Procedure

The primary issue with the soil sampling procedure is the amount of time needed to measure the parameters. In the current procedure, 24 soil samples are analyzed, one vegetated and one barren sample at each of the 12 sampling points of the macroplot. Variation in the quantitative data parameters (i.e., penetration resistance, pH, electrical conductivity) was low both within samples at a point and between soil sampling points at each macroplot at MOJA. While qualitative parameters varied within and between sampling points, macroplot-level assessments were fairly similar.

Recommendations:

- ✓ Analyze one soil sample per sampling point. Take a sample closest to the marked location, regardless of whether it is vegetated or barren.
- ✓ Reduce the number of soil sampling points to eight, two points on each side of the macroplot. Taken together, the total number of soil samples analyzed would be reduced from 24 to eight.
- ✓ Cost estimates for soil measurements would be reduced from \$142-214 to \$49-95.

Literature Cited

- Archer, S. R., and K. I. Predick. 2008. Climate change and ecosystems of the Southwestern United States. *Rangelands* 30:23–28.
- Asher, J. E., and D. W. Harmon. 1995. Invasive exotic plants are destroying the naturalness of U.S. wilderness areas. *International Journal of Wilderness* 1:35–37.
- Barrow, C. W., and M. L. Murphy-Mariscal. 2012. Modeling impacts of climate change on Joshua trees at their southern boundary: How scale impacts predictions. *Biological Conservation* 152:29–36.
- Brooks, M. L., and J. R. Matchett. 2006. Spatial and temporal patterns of wildfires in the Mojave Desert, 1980–2004. *Journal of Arid Environments* 67:148–164.
- Chapin, F. S. III., P. A. Matson, and H. A. Mooney. 2002. Principles of terrestrial ecosystem ecology. Springer-Verlag, New York, New York.
- Chung-MacCoubrey, A. L., R. E. Truitt, C. C. Caudill, T. J. Rodhouse, K. M. Irvine, J. R. Siderius, and V. K. Chang. 2008. Mojave Desert Network vital signs monitoring plan. Natural Resource Report NPS/MOJN/NRR—2008/057. National Park Service, Fort Collins, Colorado.
- Cole, K. L., K. Ironside, J. Eischeid, G. Garfin, P. B. Duffy, and C. Toney. 2011. Past and ongoing shifts in Joshua tree distribution support future modeled range contraction. *Ecological Applications* 21:137–149.
- D’Antonio, C. M., and P. M. Vitousek. 1992. Biological invasions by exotic grasses, the grass/fire cycle, and global change. *Annual Review of Ecology and Systematics* 23:63–87.
- DeFalco, L. A., D. R. Bryla, V. Smith-Longozo, and R. S. Nowak. 2003. Are Mojave Desert annual species equal? Resource acquisition and allocation for the invasive grass *Bromus madritensis subsp. rubens* (Poaceae) and two native species. *American Journal of Botany* 90:1045–1053.
- Groombridge, B., and M. D. Jenkins. 2002. World atlas of biodiversity. University of California Press, Berkeley, California.
- Gurevitch, J., S. M. Scheiner, and G. A. Fox. 2006. The ecology of plants. 2nd edition. Sinauer Associates, Inc., Sunderland, Massachusetts.
- Hereford, R., R. H. Webb, and C. I. Longpre. 2006. Precipitation history and ecosystem response to multidecadal precipitation variability in the Mojave Desert region, 1893–2001. *Journal of Arid Environments* 67:13–34.
- Janssens, F., A. Peeters, J. R. B. Tallowin, J. P. Bakker, R. M. Bekker, F. Fillat, and M. J. M. Oomes. 1998. Relationship between soil chemical factors and grassland diversity. *Plant and Soil* 202:69–78.

- Klironomos, J. N. 2002. Feedback with soil biota contributes to plant rarity and invasiveness in communities. *Nature* 417:67–70.
- National Park Service (NPS). 2002. General management plan for Mojave National Preserve. U. S. Department of Interior, National Park Service, Barstow, California.
- Pan, J. J., D. Craig, D. Robinson, D. A. Soukup, L. A. H. Starceвич, N. Tallent, and R. Truitt. Unpublished Report [a]. Integrated upland protocol of the Mojave Desert Network volume 1: Protocol narrative. Boulder City, Nevada.
- Pan, J. J., D. Craig, D. Robinson, D. A. Soukup, L. A. H. Starceвич, N. Tallent, and R. Truitt. Unpublished Report [b]. Integrated upland protocol of the Mojave Desert Network volume 2: Standard operating procedures. Boulder City, Nevada.
- Seager, R., M. Ting, I. Held, Y. Kushnir, J. Lu, G. Vecchi, H-P. Huang, N. Harnik, A. Leetmaa, N-C. Lau, C. Li, J. Velez, and N. Naik. 2007. Model projections of an imminent transition to a more arid climate in southwestern North America. *Science* 316:1181-1184.
- Sherrill, K. R., B. Frakes, and S. Schupbach. 2010. Travel time cost surface model: standard operating procedure. Natural Resource Report NPS/NRPC/IMD/NRR—2010/238. National Park Service, Fort Collins, Colorado.
- Thomas, K., T. Keeler-Wolf, J. Franklin, and P. Stine. 2004. Mojave Desert Ecosystem Program: Central Mojave vegetation database final report. U.S. Department of the Interior, U.S. Geological Survey, Sacramento, California.
- Vasek, F. C., and L. J. Lund. 1980. Soil characteristics associated with a primary plant succession on a Mojave Desert dry lake. *Ecology* 61:1013–1018.
- Vitousek, P. M., C. M. D’Antonio, L. L. Loope, M. Rejmanek, and R. Westbrooks. 1997. Introduced species: A significant component of human-caused global change. *New Zealand Journal of Ecology* 21:1-16.
- Wilcove, D. S., D. Rothstein, J. Dubow, A. Phillips, and E. Losos. 1998. Quantifying threats to imperiled species in the United States. *Bioscience* 48:607-615.

Appendix A: Travel Time Cost Surface Model

We used the travel time cost surface model (TTCSM) developed by Sherrill et al. (2010) to calculate point-to-point least-cost paths and travel times to potential field sites. Model input included five best-available spatial data sets for the park, including trails, roads, land ownership, vegetation, and Digital Elevation Model (DEM). We estimated Percent of Maximum Travel Speed (PMTS) values for the vegetation and land ownership layers and travel speeds for roads and trails. Our model was estimated under the inverse linear vertical graph type, where it is assumed that it is harder to walk uphill than downhill (speed reduction uphill is greater than speed increase for downhill). Details for model inputs are described below.

Spatial Datasets

The MOJA data used for the travel time cost model were acquired from MOJA before 2009, at which point the data were best available.

Trails Dataset

The data were created in 2000 by Matt Klein (NPS) using Trimble GPS equipment with Pathfinder Office 2.2 software and 1-m Digital Orthophoto Quarter Quads (DOQQs).

Roads Dataset

The original pre-1997 GPSed layer was obtained from San Bernardino County. Data were edited in March, 2001, by Matt Klein. Road names and conditions were verified and corrected.

Boundary and NPS Lands Datasets

The original land ownership layer was downloaded from the NPS Integrated Resource Management Applications (IRMA) Portal (<https://irma.nps.gov/App/Portal/Home>) and was last updated in 2000. Current updates for boundaries and tracts were checked through the NPS Lands Resources Division prior to use in the model.

Vegetation Dataset

The vegetation layer used was the 2001 30-m Multi-Resolution Land Characteristics Consortium (MRLC) National Land Cover Dataset (NLCD) (<http://www.mrlc.gov/>; Figure A1). Accuracy assessment information and metadata for this dataset can be found on the MRLC website.

Digital Elevation Model (DEM)

A 30-m DEM was used in the model. This is a standard USGS product available from: <http://egsc.usgs.gov/isb/pubs/factsheets/fs04000.html>.




Figure A1. Spatial distribution of vegetation types at Mojave National Preserve based on the 30-m Multi-Resolution Land Characteristics Consortium (MRLC) National Land Cover Dataset (NLCD).

PMTS Values

Percent of Maximum Travel Speed (PMTS) is set for each pixel of each layer based on cover type. PMTS ranges from 0 to 100% with 0% representing a cell that is not passable and 100% representing a cell with no impediment to travel. The layers are then overlaid in order of priority. The PMTS settings that we used are indicated below.

Roads and Trails

- Roads = 100%
- Trails = 100%

Slope

- 0 to 10 degree = 90%
- 10-20 degree = 60%
- 20-30 degree = 30%
- 30-35 degree = 10%
- >35 degree = 0%

Land Ownership

- NPS = 100%
- Non_NPS = 0%

Vegetation

- Open Water = 0%
- Developed, Open Space = 90%
- Developed, Low Intensity = 90%
- Developed, Medium Intensity = 90%
- Developed, High Intensity = 95%
- Barren Land = 75%
- Deciduous Forest = 45%
- Evergreen Forest = 45%
- Mixed Forest = 50%
- Shrub/Scrub = 85%
- Herbaceous = 85%
- Woody Wetlands = 25%
- Emergent Herbaceous Wetlands = 25%

Travel Speeds**Driving**

- Freeway = 70 mph
- Paved = 55 mph
- Unpaved maintained = 35 mph
- Unmaintained 4x4 = 10 mph

Walking

- 2 mph
- 2.5 mph
- 3 mph

Layer Priorities:

1. roads
2. trails
3. non-NPS lands
4. landcover (vegetation)

Literature Cited

Sherrill, K. R., B. Frakes, and S. Schupbach. 2010. Travel time cost surface model: standard operating procedure. Natural Resource Report NPS/NRPC/IMD/NRR—2010/238. National Park Service, Fort Collins, Colorado.

Appendix B: Travel Cost Scenarios Tables

The travel time cost surface model generated the least-cost travel paths to the first 35 sites generated from the GRTS draw for MOJA (see *Section 2.1 Sampling Frames* in this report). Least-cost travel paths generally provided the fastest travel path (both driving and hiking) to the target location from a given start point (Figure B1). We ran three models, varying maximum hiking speeds from 2, 2.5, to 3 mph. Distances and travel times to the 35 sites are shown in Table B1.

Travel time and distance estimates from the TTCSM were made for one-way travel. Cost estimates based on hiking time for one-way travel were doubled to estimate round-trip cost estimates (Tables B2-B3). We used an hourly wage estimate of \$22 per hour for the GS-5 position and \$14 per hour for SCA crew members. The hourly wage estimate for a GS-11 GIS specialist is \$39. Wage estimates included benefits, when applicable. Estimates of per diem for NPS employees were not included in the hourly rates or field costs. Cost estimates were generated by multiplying the time to conduct the task by the hourly wage of the crew member. Most cost estimates were generated for a field crew of two; to get an estimate for additional field crew members, we add the appropriate rate for the additional field crew member to the estimate for the crew of two. For example, in Table B4, to estimate the cost for a 3-person crew to conduct field soil measurements, we would add the rate of the additional field crew member (\$54-82) to the estimate for a 2-person field crew (\$142-214) for a total of \$196-296.

Cost estimates were also made for: soil procedures in the field vs. office (Table B4), site reconnaissance and initial macroplot set-up (Table B5), and different crew schedule scenarios (Table B6).




Figure B1. Least cost travel paths to 35 Generalized Random Tessellation Stratified (GRTS) sites from the Cima Road exit off of Interstate 15 generated by the travel time cost surface model. Routes shown include driving and hiking paths.

Table B1. Travel time cost surface model estimates for one-way hiking, driving, and total travel time to 35 potential field sites selected in the Generalized Random Tessellation Stratified (GRTS) draw. The four sites in bold were visited and established with a macroplot during the 2012 pilot field season. The estimated times shown are for a hiking speed of 2.5 mph. Under estimated hiking time, the times in parentheses are for hiking speeds of 2 to 3 mph.

Macroplot ID	Elevation Stratum (m)	Distance From Nearest Road (mi)	Estimated Hiking Time (min)	Drive Time (min; from Cima Rd/ I-15)	Estimated Total One-way Travel Time (min)
MOJA001	800 to 1250	0.238*	7.15 (5.92-8.86)	14.73	21.88
MOJA002	800 to 1250	1.001	35.31 (29.55-44.12)	17.60	52.91
MOJA003	800 to 1250	0.295	9.58 (7.99-15.21)	52.94	61.51
MOJA004	800 to 1250	0.149*	4.29 (3.58-5.34)	72.62	76.55
MOJA005	800 to 1250	0.290	8.28 (6.92-10.37)	3.73	12.01
MOJA006	800 to 1250	0.502	22.73 (18.94-28.40)	54.42	77.14
MOJA007	800 to 1250	0.530	16.54 (13.74-20.65)	64.68	81.22
MOJA008	800 to 1250	0.483	17.13 (14.28-21.39)	73.95	91.07
MOJA009	800 to 1250	1.529	45.24 (37.70-56.55)	3.13	48.38
MOJA010	800 to 1250	0.149*	4.18 (3.46-5.15)	71.88	76.01
MOJA011	800 to 1250	0.205*	7.37 (6.15-8.83)	51.81	59.18
MOJA112	1250 to 1550	4.950	172.73 (143.99-215.96)	38.95	211.68
MOJA113	1250 to 1550	0.429	12.67 (10.57-15.82)	61.06	73.74
MOJA114	1250 to 1550	0.567	18.25 (15.22-22.81)	27.79	46.05
MOJA115	1250 to 1550	1.319	41.48 (35.35-52.02)	41.94	83.42
MOJA116	1250 to 1550	1.373	58.31 (40.69-72.87)	90.69	149.00
MOJA117	1250 to 1550	0.064*	1.83 (1.54-2.26)	48.28	50.11
MOJA118	1250 to 1550	0.047*	1.22 (1.05-1.48)	48.67	49.89
MOJA119	1250 to 1550	1.578	52.22 (43.53-65.26)	29.13	81.35
MOJA120	1250 to 1550	0.691	20.95 (17.47-26.28)	60.11	81.06
MOJA121	1250 to 1550	0.956	29.25 (24.38-36.54)	58.18	87.43
MOJA122	1250 to 1550	0.414	12.17 (2.89-15.17)	49.51	61.68

Table B1. Travel time cost surface model estimates for one-way hiking, driving, and total travel time to 35 potential field sites selected in the GRTS draw. The four sites in bold were visited and established with a macroplot during the 2012 pilot field season. The estimated times shown are for a hiking speed of 2.5 mph. Under estimated hiking time, the times in parentheses are for hiking speeds of 2 to 3 mph (continued).

Macroplot ID	Elevation Stratum (m)	Distance From Nearest Road (mi)	Estimated Hiking Time (min)	Drive Time (min; from Cima Rd/ I-15)	Estimated Total One-way Travel Time (min)
MOJA123	1250 to 1550	1.618	56.23 (46.89-70.24)	49.19	105.42
MOJA124	1250 to 1550	1.031	39.80 (33.18-49.73)	93.93	133.73
MOJA125	1250 to 1550	0.186*	6.36 (5.31-7.93)	35.27	41.63
MOJA126	1250 to 1550	0.475	13.95 (10.41-17.38)	14.08	28.03
MOJA127	1250 to 1550	0.381	11.05 (9.22-13.80)	61.63	72.68
MOJA128	1250 to 1550	4.504	159.76 (133.13-199.68)	49.76	209.52
MOJA129	1250 to 1550	1.353	42.22 (36.33-52.69)	59.04	101.26
MOJA230	1550+	0.497	76.83 (80.83-121.20)	86.89	183.87
MOJA231	1550+	0.686	96.98 (80.83-121.20)	86.89	183.87
MOJA232	1550+	0.758	27.99 (23.34-34.98)	29.13	57.12
MOJA233	1550+	0.903	34.69 (29.04-43.34)	29.77	64.46
MOJA234	1550+	0.045*	2.51 (2.12-3.09)	72.46	74.96
MOJA235	1550+	0.515	59.45 (49.55-73.61)	90.65	150.10

*Sites that are within 0.25 mi of road. An additional eight sites are within 0.5 mi of the road.

Table B2. Estimated round-trip hiking costs for 35 sites from the Mojave National Preserve Generalized Random Tessellation Stratified (GRTS) draw for a 2-person crew. # of sites represents the number of field sites within each hiking time category from the 2.5 mph hiking speed travel time cost surface model (TTCSM). Costs are in dollars.

One-Way Hiking Time (min)	Cost Estimate (GS-5)	Crew Member Cost	Crew Cost per Site	# of Sites
<30	22	14	36	21
30-60	44	27	71	10
60-90	66	41	187	1
90-120	88	54	142	1
120+	121*	77*	198*	2

*Estimates were made based on the approximate hiking times for the two sites in this category, which was ~165 min.

Table B3. Estimated round-trip hiking costs for 35 sites from the Mojave National Preserve Generalized Random Tessellation Stratified (GRTS) draw for a 3-4 person crew, consisting of one GS-5 field technician and 2-3 interns. The first estimate in each range represents the estimate for a crew of three and the second for a crew of four. # of sites represents the number of field sites within each hiking time category from the 2.5 mph hiking speed travel time cost surface model (TTCSM). Costs are in dollars.

One-Way Hiking Time (min)	Cost Estimate (GS-5)	Additional Crew Member Costs	Crew Cost per Site	# of Sites
<30	22	27-41	49-63	21
30-60	44	54-82	98-126	10
60-90	66	82-122	148-188	1
90-120	88	109-163	197-251	1
120+	121*	154-231*	275-352*	2

*Estimates were made based on the approximate hiking times for the two sites in this category, which was ~165 min.

Table B4. Time and cost estimates for conducting the Soil Measurements procedure (SOP 11) in the field vs. in the office. Time estimates for office measurements was based on soil samples collected from Great Basin National Park and Manzanar National Historic Site. Total costs for office measurement of soils are \$246-459. Costs are in dollars.

Procedure	Time Estimate (min)	Cost Estimate (GS-5)	Crew Member Cost	Total Costs
Field	240-360	88-132	54-82	142-214
Office (collect soil)*	100	36	23	59
Office (measurements)	140-240	36-88	23-54	59-142
Office (travel to return soil or disposal procedure)	240-480	88-176	54-109	142-285

*Certain soil measurements still need to be made in the field (e.g., penetrometer).

Table B5. Cost estimates for initial macroplot set-up, including pre-reconnaissance of potential field sites. Office reconnaissance conducted by GIS specialist (GS-11) and field reconnaissance by a field crew of two (GS-5 field technician and intern). SOP 6 is the site characterization procedure and SOP 7 is the macroplot establishment and revisit set-up procedure. Costs are in dollars.

Procedure	Time Estimate (min) per Macroplot	Cost Estimate Per Macroplot	Crew Member Cost	Cost per Macroplot	Total Cost for Macroplots
Office reconnaissance (assume 50 sites)	20-30	13-19	---	13-19	650-950
Field reconnaissance (<i>on-site only</i> ; assume 40 sites plus completion of SOP 6)	20-30	7-11	5-7	12-18	480-720
Cultural clearance	?				
Macroplot set-up (includes SOP 7 for 35 macroplots)	120-150	44-55	27-34	71-89	2485-3115 (3430-4305; 4375-5495)*

*Estimate for 3- and 4-member crews are shown in parentheses. Initial macroplot set-up will likely require a minimum 3-person field crew, given equipment and field weight requirements.

Table B6. Scenarios for crew schedules for a crew of two. Cost estimates are the total for the field season. We assumed that one-way travel to parks would take either 1 day (Death Valley National Park, Great Basin National Park, Joshua Tree National Park, Manzanar National Historic Site, Grand-Canyon Parashant National Monument) or ½ day (Lake Mead National Recreation Area [LAKE], Mojave National Preserve [MOJA]). Costs are in dollars. Per diem costs were estimated by taking the total number of travel days plus 40 field work days and subtracting the number of work weeks or field tours for the season (or ½ the number for LAKE, MOJA).

Procedure	# of Travel Days from LAKE (1/2 travel)	# of Field Work Days*	Cost Estimate for Travel (GS-5)	Crew Member Costs for Travel	Per Diem Costs
8 hour days, 5 days/wk**	24-26 (12-13)	40	4224-4576 (2112-2288)	2611-2829 (1306-1414)	2040-2120 (1840-1880)
10 hour days, 4 days/wk	36-40 (18-20)	40	7920-8800 (3960-4400)	4896-5440 (2448-2720)	2240-2400 (1960-2000)
10 hour days, 8 days/2 wks	12-14 (6-7)	40	2640-3080 (1320-1540)	1632-1904 (816-952)	1840-1920 (1720-1760)

*Travel days were estimated for up to 40 field work days, as up to 15% of the macroplots may be revisited to estimate crew measurement error. With an additional 5 field days, 2 travel days were added to each scenario.

**Time would be tight to finish procedures, QA/QC, and daily travel to the more distant sites.

Appendix C: MOJA Macroplot Data from the Pilot Study

We established macroplots at the first four field sites that were visited at MOJA (Figure C1). We present summaries of the vegetation, invasive plant, and soils data collected on the four macroplots. The data presented in this section pertain only to the monitored macroplots and cannot be extrapolated to the Joshua tree (*Yucca brevifolia* var. *jaegeriana*) wooded scrubland community as a whole.

From the vegetation measurements, we found that community composition of the four monitored macroplots was different, as no shrub species, including Joshua trees (the characteristic species of the community; see Table C5), was found on all macroplots, and most shrub species were found on only one macroplot (Table C1). From the invasive plant procedures, we detected four of the seven target invasive species in the macroplots, but only three of the four target invasive species were found on any one macroplot. *Bromus rubens* (red brome) and *Erodium cicutarium* (redstem filaree) were the only species detected on all four macroplots. For most soil parameters, the range of values detected overlapped across macroplots (Table C4). We examined the potential for soil erosion with the basal/canopy gaps procedure and found that total canopy gap per transect ranged from over 50% to 70% and that total basal gap per transect was even greater, with over 85% of transects being gap.

We initially planned to establish five macroplots at MOJA and were able to establish four macroplots in approximately 12 days (this included travel time to the park from Boulder City, NV). We established one macroplot in the lowest elevation stratum (macroplot 9), two macroplots at the middle elevation stratum (macroplots 115, 121), and one macroplot at the highest elevation stratum (macroplot 233). Three of the sites were located around the Cima Dome area and were all in designated wilderness, and the fourth site (macroplot 121) was on the western edge of the Lanfair Valley area, which was not in wilderness.




Figure C1. Locations of established macroplots within the Joshua tree (*Yucca brevifolia* var. *jaegeriana*) wooded scrubland community at Mojave National Preserve.

Vegetation

Across the four macroplots, we found a total of 24 shrub species. Interestingly, none of the 24 species were found on all macroplots and most were found on only one macroplot. The mean number of shrub species on macroplots ranged from 5-12 (Figure C2), but the mean % cover of those species was fairly low at generally <3% per species (Table C1). The species found on the most macroplots (three macroplots) was *Ephedra nevadensis* (Nevada Mormon tea). The species characteristic of the monitored community, *Yucca brevifolia* var. *jaegeriana* (Joshua tree), was detected on only one of the macroplots, even though it was clearly observed on all macroplots (Table C5).





Figure C2. Mean a) % cover and b) species richness of species for each life form by macroplot. Species richness for all life forms except shrubs could include target invasive species and/or life form categories. For example, species richness for grasses would include target invasive grass species and vegetation recorded as annual grass, perennial grass, etc.

Table C1. Mean % cover per macroplot of shrub and tree species found across four macroplots in 2012.

Shrub Species	Common Name	Live (L) or Dead (D)	No. Plots Where Found	Mean % Cover (range)*
<i>Acamptopappus sphaerocephalus</i> var. <i>hirtellus</i>	Rayless goldenhead	L	1	0.167 (0-0.667)
<i>Ambrosia dumosa</i>	White bursage	L	2	1.5 (0-3.333)
<i>Cylindropuntia acanthocarpa</i> var. <i>coloradensis</i>	Colorado buckhorn cholla	L	2	0.5 (0-1.333)
		D	1	0.167 (0-0.667)
<i>Ephedra aspera</i>	Rough jointfir	L	1	0.333 (0-1.333)
<i>Ephedra nevadensis</i>	Nevada mormon tea	L	3	1.5 (0-4)
<i>Ericameria cooperi</i>	Goldenbush	L	2	0.333 (0-0.667)
<i>Ericameria linearifolia</i>	Narrowleaf goldenbush	L	1	0.167 (0-0.667)
<i>Eriogonum fasciculatum</i> var. <i>polifolium</i>	California buckwheat	L	1	1.667 (0-0.667)
		D	1	0.167 (0-0.667)
<i>Fallugia paradoxa</i>	Apache plume	L	1	0.167 (0-0.667)
<i>Grayia spinosa</i>	Spiny hopsage	L	1	0.667 (0-2.667)
		D	1	0.333 (0-1.333)
<i>Gutierrezia sarothrae</i>	Broom snakeweed	L	2	1.5 (0-4)
<i>Hymenoclea salsola</i>	Burrobrush	L	1	0.167 (0-0.667)
<i>Juniperus osteosperma</i>	Utah juniper	L	1	1.667 (0-6.667)
<i>Krascheninnikovia lanata</i>	Winterfat	L	1	0.333 (0-1.333)
<i>Larrea tridentata</i>	Creosote bush	L	2	4.833 (0-13.333)

Table C1. Mean % cover per macroplot of shrub and tree species found across four macroplots in 2012 (continued).

Shrub Species	Common Name	Live (L) or Dead (D)	No. Plots Where Found	Mean % Cover (range)*
<i>Lycium andersonii</i>	Anderson wolfberry	L	2	1.667 (0-5.333)
		D	2	0.333(0-0.667)
<i>Menodora spinescens</i>	Spiny menodora	L	1	0.5 (0-2)
<i>Opuntia erinacea</i> var. <i>erinacea</i>	Grizzlybear pricklypear	L	1	0.167 (0-0.667))
<i>Prunus fasciculatus</i> var. <i>fasciculatus</i>	Desert almond	L	1	0.333 (0-1.333)
<i>Purshia tridentata</i> var. <i>glandulosa</i>	Mohave antelopebush	L	1	1.333 (0-5.333)
<i>Salvia dorrii</i>	Purple sage	L	1	0.167 (0-0.667)
<i>Salvia dorrii</i> var. <i>pilosa</i>	Purple sage	L	1	0.5 (0-2)
<i>Thamnosma montana</i>	Turpentinebroom	L	1	0.833 (0-3.333)
<i>Yucca baccata</i>	Banana yucca	L	2	1 (0-3.333)
<i>Yucca brevifolia</i>	Joshua tree	L	1	0.667 (0-2.667)

*Mean % cover over the four plots.

Total % cover on macroplots at MOJA, determined by whether any vegetation was detected during the point-intercept procedure, ranged from 47-75% (Figure C3). For each species or functional group that was encountered, we recorded whether it was live or dead (senesced) in order to understand the composition of the vegetation in the community and as a possible early indicator of vegetation mortality. Unidentified or loose senesced vegetation was categorized as either litter or woody debris. Examining the components of cover, we found that the mean % cover for dead species/functional groups was much higher than for live species/functional groups when we included litter/woody debris as a “functional group” (Figure C4). When we excluded litter/woody debris, the mean % cover for live and dead species/functional groups was fairly similar (Figure C4). For mean % cover by life form (forbs, grasses, shrubs, and trees), species within the grass life form had the greatest % cover, while forbs had the lowest % cover (Figure C2a).




Figure C3. Mean (+SE) total % cover by macroplot.




Figure C4. Mean (+SE) % cover of live and dead species/functional group by macroplot. Dead species/functional group cover included or excluded litter/woody debris as a dead species/functional group category.

Status and Trends Invasive Plant Species

Using the point-intercept (SOP 8), invasive species frequency quadrats (SOP 10), and site assessment for invasive species (SOP 12) procedures, we detected four of the seven target invasive species at MOJA in the macroplots. Two target invasive species were detected with the point-intercept procedure (Table C2), *Bromus rubens* and *B. tectorum* (cheatgrass). Two additional species were detected with the invasive species frequency quadrats, *Erodium cicutarium* and *Schismus spp.* (Mediterranean grass). However, *Bromus rubens* was the only species detected on all 4 macroplots and by both procedures (Figure C5). Additional invasive species were detected on macroplots 9 and 121 using the site assessment for invasive species, *Bromus tectorum* and *Erodium cicutarium*, respectively. With this additional procedure, *E. cicutarium* was also found on all four macroplots. We did not detect *Brassica tournefortii* (Sahara mustard), *Salsola spp.* (Russian thistle), or *Sisymbrium irio* (London rocket) on any of the macroplots.




Figure C5. Mean (+SE) proportion of quadrats infested by target invasive species by macroplot. BRRU2 = *Bromus rubens* (red brome), BRTE = *Bromus tectorum* (cheatgrass), ERCI6 = *Erodium cicutarium* (redstem filaree), and SCHIS = *Schismus* spp (Mediterranean grass).

The mean % cover of dead *B. rubens* was five times that of live *B. rubens* (Table C2). In contrast, the mean % cover of live and dead *B. tectorum* was fairly similar. The mean % cover of invasive species (primarily comprised of *B. rubens*) observed on each macroplot was higher than the mean % cover of native species (Figure C6).

Table C2. Mean % cover per macroplot of invasive species found across four macroplots in 2012. Data from point-intercept procedure (SOP 8).

Shrub species	Common name	Live (L) or Dead (D)	No. plots where found	Mean % cover (range)
<i>Bromus rubens</i>	Red brome	L	1	2.167 (0-8.667)
		D	4	11 (0-14)
<i>Bromus tectorum</i>	Cheatgrass	L	1	0.667 (0-2.667)
		D	1	0.5 (0-2)




Figure C6. Mean % cover for invasive and native species by macroplot.

Where *Bromus rubens* was present, it was dead in a majority of the quadrats in which it was found (phenophase 9) and spatially widespread, as it was found in all areas of the community (Table C3). *Schismus* spp. was detected on two macroplots and the proportion of quadrats in which it was present varied greatly between the macroplots, ranging from <5% on macroplot 115 to over 50% on macroplot 9 (Figure C5). It was primarily dead and fairly common across macroplots, although it had a slightly higher frequency in the spaces between plants (i.e., interspaces). *Bromus tectorum* was only found on macroplot 233, using the invasive species frequency quadrats. It was in the interspaces over 50% of the time, primarily alive, and in the mature fruit/seed scatter phenophase. *Erodium cicutarium* was found on all macroplots except the low elevation site (macroplot 9), and it was found on <11% of all quadrats (Figure C5) and primarily in interspaces. It was also alive 25% of the time and usually in the later stages of its phenology, fruit formation/ripening, mature fruit/seed scatter, or senescent/dead (Table C3).

We detected additional invasive species on macroplots 9 and 121 using the site assessment for invasive species. On macroplot 9, we found a single plant of *Bromus tectorum*, which was dead/senescent. On macroplot 121, we found three, dead/senescent plants of *Erodium cicutarium*; with this sighting, *E. cicutarium* was found on all four macroplots.

Out of all of the procedures, the invasive species frequency quadrats was the most effective for detecting invasive species and provided the greatest amount of data on target invasive species. The site assessment for invasive species would be most useful to understand the invasion process, as we would be more likely to detect species in the earlier phases of macroplot invasion (e.g., *Erodium cicutarium*, *Bromus tectorum*). Taken together, the three procedures would provide a more comprehensive understanding of the invasion process and invasive species population growth.

Table C3. Frequency of quadrats for dead vs. live, spatial location, and phenophase of invasive species found across four macroplots in 2012. Ranges of data are in parentheses. Invasive plants in quadrats were categorized into one of nine phenophase stages and only phenophases found in the macroplots are shown here.

Shrub species	Common name	Dead vs. Live		Location*			Phenophase*		
		Dead	Live	C	CI	I	7	8	9
<i>Bromus rubens</i>	Red brome	0.807 (0.328-1)	0.193 (0-0.672)	0.327 (0.234-0.452)	0.266 (0.206-0.371)	0.407 (0.342-0.500)	0.061 (0-0.195)	0.132 (0-0.477)	0.807 (0.328-1)
<i>Bromus tectorum</i> **	Cheatgrass	0.267	0.733	0.166	0.294	0.540	0.139	0.594	0.267
<i>Erodium cicutarium</i>	Redstem filaree	0.754 (0-0.667)	0.246 (0.333-1)	0	0.024 (0-0.071)	0.976 (0.929-1)	0.111 (0-0.333)	0.135 (0-0.333)	0.754 (0.333-1)
<i>Schismus spp.</i> ***	Mediterranean grass	0.996 (0.991-1)	0.004 (0-0.009)	0.256 (0.250-0.263)	0.323 (0.271-0.375)	0.419 (0.375-0.465)	0	0.004 (0-0.009)	0.996 (0.991-1)

*Location: C=canopy, CI=canopy and interspaces, I=interspace; phenophase: 7=fruit/seed formation or ripening, 8=mature fruit/seed scatter, 9=dead/senescent.

**Found on only one macroplot.

****Schismus arabicus* at MOJA.

Soil Measurement Parameters

For most of the soil parameters, the range of values detected overlapped across macroplots, and variation in quantitative soil parameters was low (Table C4). Soil compaction (penetration resistance) was predominantly “extremely low” on all macroplots. pH ranged from ~6.8-7.8 and did not differ greatly between vegetated and barren soil samples, although there seemed to be a trend for vegetated samples to have a slightly higher pH than barren samples. Soil salinity was fairly low on all macroplots, and soils on all macroplots were considered non-saline. The potential for soil erosion varied across macroplots, and total gap lengths varied from >50% to >85%.

We recorded seven soil surface features on macroplots using the point-intercept procedure, with mean % cover per macroplot ranging from <1% to >85% (Figure C7) and bare soil having the greatest % cover.




Figure C7. Mean (+SE) % cover of soil surface features per macroplot.

Soil disturbance features were detected using both the point-intercept and invasive species frequency quadrats procedures. Four disturbance categories were detected with the point-intercept procedure, with washes having the highest % cover (Figure C8a). An additional two disturbance categories were detected with the invasive species frequency quadrats procedure, with wildlife track/trails (which included wildlife scat) found on the most quadrats (Figure C8b).





Figure C8. Mean (+SE) a) % cover and b) proportion of quadrats of soil disturbance features per macroplot from the point-intercept (SOP 8) and invasives species frequency quadrats (SOP 10) procedures, respectively.

Canopy gaps can be used to assess the potential for wind erosion. The total number of canopy gaps ≥ 0.2 m ranged from 22-40 gaps per macroplot (Figure C9). A majority of the canopy gaps on the macroplots were <1 m, although the mean canopy gap size varied from just under 0.7 m to over 1.6 m (Figure C10a). For macroplots 121 and 233, over 2/3 of the gaps were in the two smallest size classes (0.2-0.5 m and 0.51-1 m) and the mean total length of all of the canopy gaps comprised slightly more than half the transect. For macroplots 9 and 115, over 2/3 of transects were canopy gap, as only about 1/2 of their canopy gaps were in the smallest size classes (Figure C9).





Figure C9. Mean number of canopy gaps for a given size category per macroplot. Macroplot 9 had a total of 22 gaps, macroplot 115, 24 gaps, macroplot 121, 40 gaps, and macroplot 233, 32 gaps.

a)



b)




Figure C10. Mean (+SE) gap size and total gap length per transect by macroplot for a) canopy and b) basal gaps.

Basal gaps can be used to assess the potential for water erosion. Similar to what we found for canopy gaps, we found that basal gap data were more similar on macroplots 9 and 115 than to the other macroplots. The total number of basal gaps ≥ 0.2 m ranged from 14-47 gaps per macroplot (Figure C11). Over half of the gaps on macroplots 9 and 115 were in the largest gap category (>2 m), while a majority of gaps on macroplots 121 and 233 were in the smaller size

categories. Mean gap size ranged from <1 m to >4.5 m (Figure C10b). Despite the differences in gap distribution and mean gap size, mean total basal gap length was >40 m per transect for all macroplots (Figure C10b).





Figure C11. Mean number of basal gaps for a given size category per macroplot. Macroplot 9 had a total of 14 gaps, macroplot 115, 19 gaps, macroplot 121, 47 gaps, and macroplot 233, 24 gaps.

Soil compaction (penetration resistance) was predominantly extremely low on all macroplots. All sample points on macroplot 9 exhibited extremely low soil compaction. Soil compaction varied from extremely low to very low on macroplots 115 and 233, and from extremely low to low on macroplot 121.

pH ranged from ~6.8-7.8 and did not vary greatly between vegetated and barren soil samples, although there seemed to be a trend for vegetated samples to have a slightly higher pH than barren samples (Figure C12a). Similar to other soil properties, macroplots 9 and 115 had pH values more similar to each other than to the other two macroplots.

Soil salinity was fairly low on all macroplots, with mean values <0.30 mS/cm on macroplot 115 and <0.15 mS/cm on all other macroplots (Figure C12b). Soils on all macroplots were considered to be non-saline.

a)



b)




Figure C12. Mean (+SE) values for a) pH and b) electrical conductivity (EC) by macroplot.

Qualitative soil parameters are shown in Table C4 for barren and vegetated soil samples for each macroplot. For most of the soil parameters, the range of values detected overlapped across macroplots. For example, soil texture was predominantly a variant of loamy sand, but there were

samples on the macroplots that ranged from sand to clay loam. All macroplots had little to no carbonates, except macroplot 115 where the reaction from the effervescence test indicated moderate amounts of carbonates.

While it is difficult to draw any conclusions for spatial proximity with only four macroplots, spatial proximity may have played a role in the similarity of soil parameters for macroplots 9 and 115. The data for potential soil erosion and soil pH were similar for the two macroplots. The mean gap size, total gap length, total number of gaps, and gap distribution were similar between the two macroplots for both basal and canopy gaps and substantially different from what was seen on macroplots 121 and 233. Mean pH at macroplots 9 and 115 was >7.5 , while pH at the other two macroplots was <7 . Interestingly, EC values for macroplot 115 were nearly double that of all other macroplots, although values at all macroplots are considered non-saline. Considering the EC values and greater amounts of carbonate in the soil, it may be that macroplot 115 receives greater precipitation or has different soil hydrology.

Table C4. Dominant qualitative soil characteristics for four monitored macroplots in 2012. Range of responses are in parentheses.

Macroplot #	Soil From	Carbonates*	Soil Color	Rupture Resistance**	Stickiness***	Plasticity****	Texture
9	Barren	NE	Brown	S/VW (L-SH)	SO	PO	Loamy sand (loamy sand-gravelly loamy sand)
	Vegetated	NE	Brown (pale brown-brown)	S/VW (L-SH)	SO	PO	Loamy sand (loamy sand-gravelly loamy sand)
115	Barren	SL-ST (NE-VE)	Brown (grayish brown-pale brown)	S/VW (S/VW-MS)	SO (SO-MS)	PO (PO-MP)	Gravelly loamy sand (loamy sand-clay loam)
	Vegetated	ST (NE-VE)	Brown (brown-pale brown)	S (L-W)	SO (SO-VS)	PO (PO-MP)	Loamy sand (sand-gravelly sandy clay loam)
121	Barren	NE (NE-SL)	Brown (grayish brown-brown)	S	SO (SO-SS)	PO (PO-SP)	Gravelly loamy sand (gravelly-very gravelly loamy sand)
	Vegetated	NE	Brown (grayish brown-brown)	S	SO	PO	Gravelly loamy sand (loamy sand-very gravelly loamy sand)
233	Barren	NE	Brown (light reddish brown-pale brown)	S/VW (L-S/VW)	SO (SO-SS)	PO (PO-SP)	Gravelly sand-loamy sand (gravelly sand- gravelly sandy loam)
	Vegetated	NE	Brown (very dark grayish brown-grayish brown)	S/VW (S/VW-SH/W)	SO (SO-SS)	PO (PO-SP)	Gravelly loamy sand (gravelly sand- gravelly sandy loam)

*NE=noneffervescent (little/no carbonates), VS=very slightly effervescent, SL=slightly effervescent, ST=strongly effervescent, VE=violently effervescent (high amounts of carbonates).

**L/EW=loose/extremely weak, S/VW=soft/very weak, SH/W=slightly hard/weak, MH/M=moderately hard/moderate, HA/MS=hard/moderately strong.

***SO=non-sticky, SS=slightly sticky, MS=moderately sticky, VS=very sticky.

****PO=non-plastic, SP=slightly plastic, MP=moderately plastic, VP=very plastic.

Joshua Trees Estimates

Although all four macroplots are within what is considered the Joshua tree scrubland community, Joshua trees were recorded on only one macroplot with the point-intercept procedure and two macroplots with the basal/canopy gaps procedure. In both cases, the number of times Joshua trees were recorded was very low (usually only once per transect) compared to the actual density of Joshua trees (Table C5; Appendix D). Data from the two procedures suggest that we would be unlikely to detect substantially more Joshua trees using a belt transect with the current design, unless the belt was fairly wide (>2-3 m).

Table C5. Joshua tree (*Yucca brevifolia* var. *jaegeriana*) count within established macroplots.

Macroplot #	# alive	# dead	# fallen dead	Total
9	6	1	0	7
115	63	5	11	79
121	89	2	3	94
233	148	4	11	163

Appendix D: Macroplot Overview Photographs from the 2012 Pilot Study

Joshua trees were clearly documented on each macroplot through the repeat photos procedure (SOP 13) from the IU protocol.



Figure D1. Macroplot overview photo for macroplot 9.



Figure D2. Macroplot overview photo for macroplot 115.



Figure D3. Macroplot overview photo for macroplot 121.



Figure D4. Macroplot overview photo for macroplot 233.

The Department of the Interior protects and manages the nation's natural resources and cultural heritage; provides scientific and other information about those resources; and honors its special responsibilities to American Indians, Alaska Natives, and affiliated Island Communities.

NPS 170/122931, November 2013

National Park Service
U.S. Department of the Interior



Natural Resource Stewardship and Science

1201 Oakridge Drive, Suite 150
Fort Collins, CO 80525

www.nature.nps.gov

EXPERIENCE YOUR AMERICA™