



Te Rangahau Aroturuki i ngā Rākau Rangatira o
Te Wao Nui ā Tiriwa

2021 Waitākere Ranges Kauri Population Health Monitoring Survey

June 2022, Technical Report 2022/8







2021 Waitākere Ranges Kauri Population Health Monitoring Survey

June 2022

Technical Report 2022/8

Karyn Froud¹, Yue Chin Chew², John Kean³, Jane Meiforth⁴, Sarah Killick²,
Edward Ashby⁵, Robin Taua-Gordon⁵, Alastair Jamieson², Lisa Tolich²

¹Biosecurity Research

²Auckland Council

³AgResearch

⁴Manaaki Whenua – Landcare Research

⁵Te Kawerau ā Maki

Additional authors for specific chapters of this technical report are provided at the start of the relevant chapters.

Auckland Council
Technical Report 2022/8

ISSN 2230-4525 (print)
ISSN 2230-4533 (online)

ISBN 978-1-99-110160-0 (print)
ISBN 978-1-99-110161-7 (PDF)

<p>This report has been peer reviewed by:</p> <p>Professor Ian Dohoo, University of Prince Edward Island, Canada</p> <p>Professor Mark Stevenson, University of Melbourne, Australia (excluding Ch4)</p> <p>Dr. Sarah Green, Forest Research, United Kingdom</p> <p>Dr. Nagendra Singanallur Balasubramian, CSIRO, Australia (Chapter 4)</p>
Review completed on 29 April 2022
<p>Approved for Auckland Council publication by:</p> <p>Name: Rachel Kelleher</p> <p>Position: General Manager, Environmental Services</p>
<p>Name: Phil Brown</p> <p>Position: Head of Natural Environment Delivery, Environmental Services</p>
Date: 29 June 2022

Recommended citation

Froud, K., Y.C. Chew, J. Kean, J. Meiforth, S. Killick, E. Ashby, R. Taua-Gordon, A. Jamieson, L. Tolich, (2022). 2021 Waitākere Ranges kauri population health monitoring survey. Auckland Council technical report, TR2022/8.

Image credits

Cover: Views towards Cornwallis by Andrew Macdonald.

Inside front cover: Aunt Agatha by Gino Demeer.

Inside back cover: Huia emergent kauri by Alastair Jamieson.

Back cover: Karamatura kauri forest by Alastair Jamieson.

© 2022 Auckland Council, New Zealand

Auckland Council disclaims any liability whatsoever in connection with any action taken in reliance of this document for any error, deficiency, flaw or omission contained in it.

This document is licensed for re-use under the [Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International licence](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/).

In summary, you are free to copy, distribute and adapt the material, as long as you attribute it to the Auckland Council and abide by the other licence terms.



Acknowledgements

Ngā mihi

We acknowledge the detailed and ongoing discussion with and sharing of their mātauranga of Te Kawerau ā Maki first and foremost as mana whenua and kaitiaki of Te Wao Nui ā Tiriwa / the Waitākere Ranges. We also acknowledge the sharing of mātauranga from mana whenua representatives of Pou Tāngata Ngāi Tai ki Tāmaki Community Development Trust, Ngāti Paoa Iwi Trust Board, Ngāti Whanaunga Incorporated Society, Ngā Maunga Whakahii o Kaipara Trust, Te Ākitai Waiohau Waka Taua Inc, Ngāti Maru Rūnanga Trust and Environs Te Uri o Hau.

Thank you to Professor Ian Dohoo (University of Prince Edward Island) and Dr Sarah Green (Forest Research UK) who provided external review of all aspects of our research methodology prior to the start of the survey and expert review of our results and manuscript. We also thank Professor Mark Stevenson (University of Melbourne) for expert review of the sample size change and spatial analyses methods and expert review of our results and manuscript. Thank you to Dr. Nagendrakumar Singanallur Balasubramanian (Australian Centre for Disease Preparedness, CSIRO and OIE Centre for Diagnostic Test Validation Science in the Asia-Pacific Region) for expert review of the diagnostic test performance evaluation results and manuscript.

We thank everyone who shared their expertise with us in different workshops and hui as we developed our survey methods and identified potential risk factors for inclusion in the study. We would also like to thank Nari Williams, Ian Horner, Bruce Burns, Luitgard Schwendenmann, Lee Hill and Fredrik Hjelm who helped build and refine the monitoring form.

Many thanks to Ben Yorke, Callum McCosh, David Jacobi, Fayas Mohamed, Genavee Rhodes, George Wilson, Hunter Chrisp, Jarden Howard, Hayley Roos, James Farrimond Kelly, Leo Casey Waby, Olivia Hossin, Sandy Huang, Sacchi Shin-Clayton, Taine Williams, Toby Elliott, the Biosense Ltd. field team members who spent many long days in the bush collecting our field data.

Thank you to Jan Schindler, Alexander Aimes, Ben Jolly, and David Pairman from Manaaki Whenua Landcare Research who contributed to the remote sensing host detection research.

We also thank Matthew Arnet, Jayne Wilton, Sarah Nicoll, Terrence Makea, Ellena Hough and Mary Horner, the Plant & Food Research Ltd Havelock North pathology team who processed the soil samples.

Thank you also to the Waitākere Ranges Monitoring Survey steering committee members for excellent advice throughout the design, delivery, analysis and reporting of the survey.

Thanks also to Ian Horner, Richard Winkworth, Lindi Eloff, Kim Morgan, Nari Williams, Chris Green, Kim Parker, Peter Scott, Andrew McDonald, Adrian Peachey, Murray Fea, Lee Hill, Randy Lacey, Stanley Bellgard and Bronwyn Mullions, who contributed to the NKDP workshop (May 2019)

for the development of the case definition and estimation of sensitivity and specificity priors for soil and aerial testing with Mark Stevenson, Emilie Vallee and Travis Ashcroft. Also, to those who were unable to attend and provided additional feedback during consultation, including members of the National Kauri Dieback Programme Tangata Whenua Roopu and Strategic Science Advisory Group.

We also thank Tiakina Kauri for contributing funding towards the diagnostic test performance evaluation.

Finally, we gratefully acknowledge the ratepayers of Auckland who provided funding for this study via the Natural Environment Targeted Rate, without which this work would not have been possible.

Table of contents

Te ripanga ihirangi

Acknowledgements.....	v
Table of contents.....	vii
Table of figures	xi
Table of tables.....	xvii
Glossary of Te Reo Māori words.....	xix
Terminology	xx
Chapter 1 Long-term kauri health monitoring framework and objectives of the 2021 Waitākere Ranges Monitoring Survey.....	1
1.1 Introduction	2
1.2 The Waitākere Ranges.....	2
1.3 Kauri dieback and <i>Phytophthora agathidicida</i>	3
1.4 Auckland Council kauri dieback surveillance.....	4
1.5 Epidemiological approach to kauri dieback	5
1.6 Design of the long-term kauri health monitoring framework.....	7
1.7 2021 Waitākere Ranges monitoring survey	10
Chapter 2 Baseline prevalence study of <i>Phytophthora agathidicida</i> and kauri dieback in the Waitākere Ranges and frequency of potential risk factors using a cross-sectional study.....	12
2.1 Abstract.....	13
2.2 Introduction	14
2.3 Methods	15
2.4 Results.....	35
2.5 Discussion.....	50
2.6 Conclusion.....	57
Chapter 3 Multivariable analysis of risk factors associated with symptomatic kauri and detection of <i>P. agathidicida</i> in the Waitākere Ranges	58
3.1 Abstract.....	59
3.2 Introduction	60
3.3 Methods	61
3.4 Results.....	65

3.5	Discussion.....	76
3.6	Conclusion.....	84
Chapter 4	Estimation of the diagnostic sensitivity and specificity of kauri dieback visual assessment and <i>Phytophthora agathidicida</i> soil baiting, culturing and morphological identification using Bayesian latent class analysis	85
4.1	Abstract.....	86
4.2	Introduction	87
4.3	Objectives	89
4.4	Methods	89
4.5	Results and discussion	95
4.6	Conclusions and recommendations	111
Chapter 5	Key findings of the 2021 Waitākere Ranges survey.....	112
5.1	Key findings from the prevalence study.....	113
5.2	Key findings from the risk factor multi-variable analysis study.....	114
5.3	Key findings from the diagnostic test performance evaluation study	116
5.4	Conclusions from the 2021 Waitākere Ranges Monitoring Survey	116
5.5	Te Ao Māori	118
Chapter 6	Future steps for the long-term strategy for monitoring kauri health in the Auckland region	119
6.1	Strategy for implementation of the long-term kauri health monitoring framework	120
References	133
Appendix A	Monitoring form and detailed methods for study variables.....	141
A1	Use of monitoring form.....	141
A2	Survey information	144
A3	Site information.....	146
A4	Sampled tree information	146
A5	Replacement tree information.....	151
A6	Kauri host-related variables	153
A7	Disease-related variables.....	158
A8	Disturbance-related variables	166
A9	Ecological variables.....	168
A10	Photos.....	175
A11	Variables calculated using existing data sources	178

A12	Updated summary of the Stevenson and Froud (2020) draft kauri dieback case definition	180
A13	Common species method development.....	180
Appendix B	Supplementary results from the prevalence study – descriptive summary of host, environment and anthropogenic risk factors and ecological impact factors from Chapter 2.....	183
B1	Host detection.....	183
B2	Basal lesions.....	184
B3	Canopy health.....	186
B4	Approved observer kauri dieback field status	186
B5	Host factors.....	188
B6	Environmental factors	192
B7	Anthropogenic factors.....	199
B8	Ecological impact factors.....	204
Appendix C	Results of univariable screening tests from Chapter 3.....	212
Appendix D	Results of multivariable screening tests from Chapter 3.....	217
Appendix E	OpenBUGS code for the BLCA model from Chapter 4.....	219
Appendix F	Supplementary information from Chapter 4.....	221
F1	Gelman-Rubin-Brooks plot.....	221
F2	Gelman and Rubin’s potential scale reduction factor where a result of 1 means no issues were encountered	222
Appendix G	Supplementary information risk maps from GIS derived variables	223
G1	Archaeological features risk map.....	224
G2	Aspect risk map.....	225
G3	Canopy height risk map.....	226
G4	Confirmed all <i>P. agathidicida</i> sites risk map (including historical detections)	227
G5	Confirmed all <i>P. cinnamomi</i> sites risk map (including historical detections)	228
G6	Current extent vegetation risk map.....	229
G7	Depth to water model risk map.....	230
G8	Elevation risk map	231
G9	Historic timber sites risk map.....	232
G10	Landcover database risk map.....	233
G11	Mean high water risk map (coast boundary)	234
G12	Natural drainage risk map	235
G13	Stream sub-catchments risk map.....	236

G14	Park boundary and forested extent risk map.....	237
G15	Road and track network risk map	238
G16	Slope risk map	239
G17	Overland flow path risk map	240

Table of figures

He ripanga mō ngā tau

Figure 1-1. The epidemiological approach adopted for this study, showing the steps taken to investigate and manage a disease outbreak, adapted from Stevenson and Froud (2020).	6
Figure 1-2. Disease triangle showing that disease only occurs when sufficient factors relating to a host, pathogen and environment (including management) intersect (Bhopal, 2016, p 136).	7
Figure 1-3. Proposed long-term kauri health monitoring framework.....	9
Figure 2-1. Geographical boundary for the study area (coloured in light blue) of the Waitākere Ranges Regional Park and adjacent local parks where this survey was undertaken.	16
Figure 2-2. Random sample (yellow crosses) of 1300 kauri trees > 15 m tall in the Waitākere Ranges. Dark green is forest >15 m tall. Light green is forest 8-15 m in height. Grey is shrubland less than 8 m in height.	17
Figure 2-3. Example of large trees >20 m tall, identified by remote sensing in a map of the Cascades area of the Waitākere Ranges. The map has 3 classes: GREEN = kauri with healthy crowns or thinning canopy or thinning with some branch dieback (canopy score 1-3), RED = trees with severe dieback or dead trees (canopy score 4 & 5) and YELLOW = other tree species (canopy score 1-3).....	18
Figure 2-4. Total random samples required to detect a risk factor for kauri dieback disease with 80% power and 95% confidence, depending on the prevalence ratio (strength of the risk effect) and disease prevalence (different lines). In (a) half of all samples are exposed to the risk; in (b) only 15% of samples are exposed. The dotted line shows a proposed sample size of 2000 trees. .	21
Figure 2-5. Sampling frame diagram showing how trees from the full population of interest were reduced to a sample frame for random selection of trees. It also shows the steps to reduce the sample size halfway through the survey and the final group of trees in the study. Where WRRP is Waitākere Ranges Regional Park.....	23
Figure 2-6. Tree tags used for permanent marking of monitored trees.	26
Figure 2-7. Canopy symptom class and severity rating: 1) healthy crown with no visible signs of dieback; 2) canopy thinning; 3) thinning and some branch dieback; 4) severe dieback; 5) dead. (Dick & Bellgard 2012) versus the modified half-point scale.	29
Figure 2-8. Spatial point map showing the location of kauri trees in the study area that had soil samples taken for diagnostic testing (n = 761) with red circles indicating the detection of <i>P. agathidicida</i> (n = 76) and blue circles indicating that <i>P. agathidicida</i> was not detected (n = 685).36	
Figure 2-9. A symmetric adaptive bandwidth spatial log-relative risk surfaces map of <i>P. agathidicida</i> detection, estimated using kauri trees that had soil samples taken for diagnostic testing (n = 761). The relative risk is estimated on the natural log scale, such that values > 0 depict areas of elevated risk (log(0) = 1, and therefore log relative risk values > 0 equate to relative risks > 1, that is, increased risk). Where detected, tolerance contours delineating statistically significant risk elevations are drawn at significance levels of 0.1 (dashed line) and	

0.05 (solid line). White inland spaces indicate areas outside the study area (e.g., Piha village in the central west of the map).	37
Figure 2-10. Choropleth map showing <i>P. agathidicida</i> prevalence (left) and a Bayesian smoothed <i>P. agathidicida</i> prevalence (right) calculated using 761 monitored kauri trees in stream sub-catchments. Cells with NA did not have any randomly selected kauri trees within the stream sub-catchment.	38
Figure 2-11. Spatial point map showing the location of surveyed kauri trees (n = 2140) with red circles indicating symptomatic kauri (n = 413) and blue circles indicating non-symptomatic kauri (n = 1727) based on the case definition.	39
Figure 2-12. Symmetric adaptive relative risk surfaces (Davies et al., 2016) estimated using all the kauri trees included in the study (n = 2140; symptomatic = 413; non-symptomatic = 1727) within the study area. The relative risk is estimated on the natural log scale, such that values > 0 depict areas of elevated risk (log(0) = 1, and therefore log relative risk values > 0 equate to relative risks > 1, that is, increased risk). Where detected, tolerance contours delineating statistically significant risk elevations are drawn at significance levels of 0.05 and 0.1. White inland spaces indicate areas outside the study area (e.g., Piha village in the central west of the map).	40
Figure 2-13. Choropleth map showing the spatial distribution of symptomatic kauri prevalence (left) and Bayesian smoothed symptomatic kauri prevalence (right) within discrete stream sub-catchments in the Waitakere Ranges Regional Park. Cells with NA did not have any randomly selected kauri trees within the stream sub-catchment. Note that stream sub-catchment areas include urban areas outside the study boundary e.g., Piha which were not surveyed and may have higher prevalence.	41
Figure 2-14. Spatial point pattern plot showing the location of kauri trees in the study area that had soil samples taken for diagnostic testing (n = 761) with orange circles indicating the detection of <i>P. cinnamomi</i> (n = 401) and blue circles indicating that <i>P. cinnamomi</i> was not detected (n = 360).	43
Figure 2-15. Bar chart showing the number of monitored trees within each canopy score class with a score of 1 being healthy and 4 significant dieback, stratified by canopy colour. Dead trees (canopy score of 5) were reported separately.	46
Figure 2-16. Frequency histogram showing the distribution of distance to the closest confirmed <i>P. agathidicida</i> site for 2140 monitored trees with a bin width set at 100 m.	48
Figure 2-17. Box and whisker plots of mean forest floor depth (cm) per tree where <i>P. agathidicida</i> was detected or not detected, stratified by kauri tree size class from 759 monitored trees that were soil sampled and where the size class value was recorded (2 observations missing). Showing the median value (horizontal line), interquartile range (within box), maximum and minimum values (excluding outliers, vertical bars) and outliers (dots) for the population.	49
Figure 3-1. A mesh generated for a stochastic partial differential equation via integrated nested Laplace approximations for spatial multivariable models. Blue line indicates the boundary of Waitākere Ranges Regional Park and green dots are the location where kauri were sampled. Red line indicates a disjunct area of Waitākere Ranges Regional Park where no kauri were sampled. The black line denotes areas outside the study area.	65

- Figure 3-2.** A path diagram of potential risk factors for the presence of symptomatic kauri in the Waitākere Ranges Regional Park, Auckland. The variables are grouped in three categories: (1) individual tree factors (blue square), (2) environmental factors (yellow square), and (3) anthropogenic factors (red square). Please note that not all the correlations between variables are shown to enhance readability. 66
- Figure 3-3.** A path diagram of potential risk factors for the detection of *Phytophthora agathidicida* in kauri of Waitākere Ranges Regional Park, Auckland. The variables are grouped in three categories: (1) individual tree factors (blue square), (2) environmental factor (yellow square), and (3) anthropogenic factor (red square). Please note not all the correlations between variables are shown to enhance readability. Where *P. crassifolius* is lancewood (*Pseudopanax crassifolius*) and *P. trichomanoides* is tanekaha (*Phyllocladus trichomanoides*)..... 67
- Figure 3-4.** A variogram of standardised residuals of a non-spatial multivariable logistic regression model for the presence of symptomatic kauri in the Waitākere Ranges parkland, Auckland (blue points). Any blue points outside of the grey area indicate a spatial correlation, where the grey area was computed by permutation of the standardised residual 500 times. 70
- Figure 3-5.** A variogram of standardised residuals of a non-spatial multivariable logistic regression model for the detection of *Phytophthora agathidicida* in kauri of the Waitākere Ranges parkland, Auckland (blue points). Any blue point outside of the grey area indicates a spatial correlation, where the grey area was computed by permutation of the standardised residual 500 times. However, this variogram has a low sample size so it could be an impractical indicator of spatial correlation. 71
- Figure 3-6.** A forest plot depicting the prevalence odds ratio (PR) of potential risk factors for the presence of symptomatic kauri in the Waitākere Ranges parkland, Auckland. The black dot and horizontal bars respectively indicate the PR and its 95% credible interval (CI). Risk factors with their PR and 95% credible intervals fully to the left or right of the red dashed vertical line are associated with the outcome, where most of the PR and 95% credible intervals are to the left or right of the red line the association is protective or increases the prevalence odds of symptomatic kauri respectively, and where the black dot and credible intervals are centred on the red dashed line, the strength of the association is low (e.g., distance to coast).75
- Figure 3-7.** A forest plot depicting the prevalence odds ratio (PR) of potential risk factors for the detection of *Phytophthora agathidicida* in kauri in the Waitākere Ranges Regional Park, Auckland. The black dot and horizontal bars respectively indicate the PR and its 95% credible interval. Risk factors with their PR and 95% credible intervals fully to the left or right of the red dashed vertical line are associated with the outcome, where most of the PR and 95% credible intervals are to the left or right of the red line the association is protective or increases the prevalence odds of *P. agathidicida* respectively, and where the black dot and credible intervals are centred on the red dashed line, the strength of the association is low (e.g., diameter at breast height). Note that the x axis is illustrated in a log scale and has a wider range than the symptomatic kauri plot..... 76
- Figure 3-8.** Historic images of i) a kauri log on a cutting table inside the Piha timber mill (photographer A.P. Godber, Auckland Libraries Heritage Collections JTD-04L-00124) and ii) a felled kauri crown showing surrounding forest devastation after the sawn log has been removed (photographer A.P Godber, Auckland Libraries Heritage Collections JTD-04D-03327)..... 79

Figure 4-1. Locations of trees sampled in the Waitākere Ranges, North Island, New Zealand, for the evaluation of 2 kauri dieback diagnostic tests. Dots of tree locations from estimated low prevalence areas are in blue and dots for tree locations in estimated high prevalence areas are in yellow.....	90
Figure 4-2. Point maps of the 2021 Waitākere Ranges survey showing the prior expected high prevalence areas (yellow-coloured polygons) and A) where <i>P. agathidicida</i> was predicted based on the visual assessment test and B) where <i>P. agathidicida</i> was detected based on the soil sampling bioassay.	96
Figure 4-3. Prior (grey) and posterior (red) distributions of the sensitivity (A) and specificity (B) of the visual assessment test for <i>P. agathidicida</i>	99
Figure 4-4. Relationship between the apparent prevalence of <i>P. agathidicida</i> using visual assessment of disease symptoms, and the true prevalence of <i>P. agathidicida</i>	100
Figure 4-5. Prior (grey) and posterior (red) distributions of the sensitivity (A) and specificity (B) of the soil sampling bioassay test for <i>P. agathidicida</i>	101
Figure 4-6. Relationship between the apparent prevalence using the soil sampling bioassay, and the calculated true prevalence of <i>P. agathidicida</i>	101
Figure 4-7. Prior (grey) and posterior (red) distributions of the true prevalence of <i>P. agathidicida</i> in the high prevalence area (A) and low prevalence area (B).	103
Figure 4-8. Posterior distributions for the sensitivity analysis of the visual assessment sensitivity (A), specificity (B), soil sampling bioassay sensitivity (C), specificity (D), true prevalence in the high prevalence area (E) and low prevalence area (F). The black line was the posterior distribution for the main result using the original priors, the red line for model 1, the forest green line for model 2, the dark blue line for model 3. See Table 4-2 for details on the change in priors for the different sensitivity analysis models.....	107
Figure 6-1. Map showing point locations of 125 soil samples collected from an area (inside the polygon) of the Waitākere Ranges Regional Park containing an estimated 12,680 kauri trees where <i>P. agathidicida</i> was not detected during the 2021 Waitākere Ranges survey.	130
Figure 6-2. Predicted probability of symptomatic kauri presence for a representative kauri across the Waitākere Ranges study area.....	131
Figure 6-3. Predicted probability of <i>P. agathidicida</i> detection for a representative kauri across the Waitākere Ranges study area.....	131
Figure B-1. Frequency histogram showing the number of trees in each 20 cm increment of basal bleed heights from 453 trees with basal bleeds present.....	185
Figure B-2. Percent of the tree base affected by a basal lesion (bleed) from 453 monitored trees with basal lesions.....	185
Figure B-3. Bar chart showing frequencies of kauri dieback field status assessment by presence or absence of basal bleeds.	187
Figure B-4. Bar chart showing frequencies of kauri dieback field status assessment by canopy health scores.....	187
Figure B-5. Canopy images showing the range in size from one of the smallest trees in the study (DBH of 13 cm) and one of the largest trees with a DBH of 317 cm.....	188

Figure B-6. Frequency histogram showing diameter at breast height (DBH) of monitored kauri trees (with a bin width of 10 cm).....	189
Figure B-7. Spatial distribution of monitored kauri trees in green with those showing epicormic growth in orange.	190
Figure B-8. Difference in the proportion of trees with active growth flush over time.	191
Figure B-9. Proportion of trees with female seed cones visible over time of monitoring (n=87). .	192
Figure B-10. Frequency histogram showing the number of trees at increasing distance (metres) from the high tide water mark of the coast (or harbour) of 2140 monitored kauri trees with a bin width of 250 m.	193
Figure B-11. Frequency histogram showing the elevation distribution in metres of 2140 kauri trees monitored in the Waitākere Ranges Regional Park.	194
Figure B-12. Frequency histogram showing the distribution of slope in degrees of 2140 monitored kauri sites.....	195
Figure B-13. Frequency histogram showing the number of trees at different depths to water using a depth to water index in metres with a bin width of 10 m.....	196
Figure B-14. Frequency histogram showing the number of trees at different distances to the closest overland flow path in metres with a bin width of 5 m.	197
Figure B-15. Frequency histogram showing the number of trees at different distances to the closest historic timber mill in metres with a bin width of 250 m.	198
Figure B-16. Frequency histogram showing the distribution of distance to the closest track for 2140 monitored trees with a bin width set at 25 m.	201
Figure B-17. Frequency histogram showing the distribution of the distance to the closest uphill track for 1895 monitored trees with a bin width set at 25 m.	202
Figure B-18. Frequency histogram showing the number of trees at different distances to the closest Waitākere Ranges Regional Park boundary in metres with a bin width of 250 m.....	203
Figure B-19. Bar plot of the number of archaeological features within 500 m of each of our 2140 monitored trees.	204
Figure B-20. Box and whisker plot showing the distance (m) between the monitored kauri tree and its closest neighbouring tree (>10 cm DBH) stratified by whether the kauri tree is the dominant or subordinate tree. Showing the median value (horizontal line), interquartile range (within box), maximum and minimum values (excluding outliers, vertical bars) and outliers (dots) for the population.....	205
Figure B-21. Box and whisker plots showing diameter at breast height for A] monitored kauri trees where they were the dominant or subdominant tree and for B] the DBH of the closest neighbour tree where the monitored kauri tree was dominant vs subdominant. Showing the median value (horizontal line), interquartile range (within box), maximum and minimum values (excluding outliers, vertical bars) and outliers (dots) for the population.....	206
Figure B-22. Scatter plot showing average forest floor depth (cm) per tree as a function of tree size measured as DBH (cm). Superimposed on this plot is a loess smoothed linear regression line (blue) with 95% confidence intervals (grey shading).	208
Figure B-23. Box and whisker plots showing the mean forest floor depth (cm) per tree, stratified by kauri tree size class from 2127 monitored trees where the size class value was recorded.	

Showing the median value (horizontal line), interquartile range (within box), maximum and minimum values (excluding outliers, vertical bars) and outliers (dots) for the population. 209

Figure B-24. Boxplot showing the median diameter (cm) at breast height (DBH) of kauri trees with crown epiphytes present, absent and where they were not visible from the ground. Showing the median value (horizontal line), interquartile range (within box), maximum and minimum values (excluding outliers, vertical bars) and outliers (dots) for the population. 210

Figure B-25. Box and whisker plots of kauri tree diameter at breast height (DBH) differences between trees with climbing plants present or absent. Showing the median value (horizontal line), interquartile range (within box), maximum and minimum values (excluding outliers, vertical bars) and outliers (dots) for the population. 210

Table of tables

He ripanga mō ngā ripanga hoki

Table 2-1. Decision algorithm for calculating if the symptomatic criteria were met for the symptomatic kauri trees kauri dieback case definition.....	31
Table 2-2. Common kauri forest-associated plant species (scientific and common names) selected for observation during the 2021 Waitākere Ranges survey.....	32
Table 2-3. Number of trees that meet the kauri dieback case definition stratified by the different classes within symptomatic kauri and non-symptomatic kauri. Where confirmed is on a <i>P. agathidicida</i> site, probable is within 50 m and suspect is >50 m of a <i>P. agathidicida</i> site. Note this is the total prevalence of symptomatic kauri which is higher than the survey adjusted prevalence.	42
Table 2-4. Detection of <i>P. agathidicida</i> , <i>P. cinnamomi</i> and <i>P. spp.</i> alone or in combination in the culture bioassay tests from 761 sites where soil samples were collected.....	42
Table 2-5. Detection status of <i>P. agathidicida</i> within soil samples taken from 761 trees stratified by whether the trees were symptomatic or non-symptomatic under the case definition for kauri dieback.....	44
Table 2-6. Counts and percent of sites where kauri seedlings and saplings were present or absent stratified by <i>Phytophthora</i> species detection status from 761 soil sampled sites.	47
Table 3-1. A comparison of final non-spatial multivariable logistic regression models incorporating either the distance to the closest track, distance to the closest road, or distance to the closest uphill track. Values are the Akaike information criteria or the area under the ROC curve for each model. The model with its value underlined indicates the model that best explained the data....	70
Table 3-2. A result of spatial multivariable logistic regression model for the presence of symptomatic kauri, consistent with kauri dieback in the Waitākere Ranges Regional Park, Auckland. The median (95% credible interval (CI)) of the coefficients and prevalence odds ratio of the potential risk factors are presented, in order of the strength of association.	72
Table 3-3. A result of spatial multivariable logistic regression model for the detection of <i>Phytophthora agathidicida</i> in kauri soil samples in the Waitākere Ranges Regional Park, Auckland. The median (95% credible interval (CI)) of the coefficients and prevalence odds ratio of the potential risk factors are presented, in order of the strength of association.	74
Table 4-1. Prior belief and corresponding beta distributions for the different parameters needed to estimate the sensitivity and specificity of 2 tests for kauri dieback using BLCA.....	91
Table 4-2. Changes in prior distributions used for the 3 different models run for the sensitivity analysis (min = minimum, ML = most likely, max = maximum).	94
Table 4-3. Number of trees testing positive or negative for <i>P. agathidicida</i> by visual assessment (cases) and by soil baiting, culture and morphological identification (<i>P. agathidicida</i> detected vs not detected), stratified by population.....	95

Table 4-4. Summary statistics and Monte Carlo error for the six diagnostic test performance and prevalence parameters estimated using Bayesian latent class analysis.	97
Table A-1. Survey forms in use during the Waitākere Ranges baseline monitoring survey.	141
Table A-2. Kauri dieback field status wording compared between the first 6 weeks of monitoring and the remaining 10 weeks of monitoring.	165
Table A-3. GIS derived variable names, units and a description of how they were derived.	178
Table B-1. Tree species that were misclassified as kauri trees using remote sensing for host detection.	183
Table B-2. Numbers and proportion of monitored kauri trees (n=2140) with basal or lateral root bleeds present, stratified by kauri dieback field status.	184
Table B-3. Number and percent of monitored trees (n=2140) with different canopy health scores. Note that fully dead trees were reported separately.	186
Table B-4. Number and percent of 2140 kauri trees assessed by surveyors to have different kauri dieback field status scores.	186
Table B-5. Number and percent of monitored kauri trees in each size class (Ricker <150 cm; Intermediate 150-450 cm and mature >450 cm circumference), stratified by host origin forest type from 2133 observations.	189
Table B-6. Number of kauri tree monitoring sites where saplings were observed within 5 m of the trunk of the kauri tree, stratified by the range of counts of saplings per site from 1452 sites.	190
Table B-7. Non-kauri plant species showing signs of decline at 89 kauri tree monitoring sites. ..	192
Table B-8. Frequency of trees in each aspect group.	194
Table B-9. Total and proportion of trees by ecosystem type for 2140 monitored kauri trees.	198
Table B-10. Ecological origin of the kauri trees surveyed in the Waitakere Ranges n=2140.	199
Table B-11. Number of trees with evidence of disturbance nearby.	199
Table B-12. Prevalence of symptomatic kauri trees for different types of road classes closest to each of 2140 monitored kauri trees.	200
Table B-13. Eight most common dominant closest neighbour species out of 117 sites where kauri were subdominant from 2080 monitored kauri tree sites where species was recorded.	206
Table B-14. Twelve most common subdominant closest neighbour species out of 1903 sites where kauri were subdominant from 2080 monitored kauri tree sites where species was recorded.	207
Table B-15. Number and percent of kauri tree monitoring sites out of 1406 sites surveyed, where each of 16 common plants were observed.	207

Glossary of Te Reo Māori words

Te rārangi kupu Māori

The list below defines Māori terms and concepts used within the text.

Te Ao Māori	The Māori world view
Hapū	Subtribe, the primary political unit in traditional Māori society
Hui	Meeting
Iwi	Tribe comprising a number of hapū (sub-tribes) related through a common ancestor and associated with a distinct territory
Kaitiaki	Guardians
Kaitiakitanga	Guardianship. The practice of looking after the environment, rooted in tradition
Mahaki	Blight; disease
Mātauranga Māori	The body of Māori knowledge; referring to all things physical, emotional and spiritual in a Māori context
Moana	Sea
Mana whenua	Territorial rights, power over the land / by extension: Māori who have customary authority over land through ancestral links
Ngahere	Forest
Rāhui	A temporary ritual prohibition to restrict access and separate people from things that are tapu; in this context, placed by Te Kawerau ā Maki on Te Wao Nui ā Tiriwa as a measure to protect and restore balance to the forest
Rākau rangatira	Chiefly trees
Rongoā	Traditional Māori medicines; cultural health measures
Tapu	Sacred or prohibited
Tohu	Indicator
Tikanga	Cultural values, customs and practices
Te Wao Nui ā Tiriwa	The Great Forest of Tiriwa, known as the Waitākere Ranges
Whakataukī	Māori proverb
Whānau	Family

Terminology

Ngā kupu whāiti

The definitions below are specified in accordance with standard epidemiological usage. Where the same word is defined differently between different disciplines, the definition used for this study and the alternative definition are provided for context.

Baseline	The first comprehensive measurement of symptomatic tree prevalence, pathogen prevalence and impact variables in a population. A baseline is set so that future measurements can be compared against it to detect a change over time.
Case definition	The consistent criteria by which the health condition of an individual tree is included as a 'case' in a disease outbreak or study.
Confounding	Refers to the distortion of the true association between an exposure and an outcome, because of the influence of a third factor. A key difference of confounding from correlation is that the exposure variable and confounder should have a separate causal relationship or association mechanism from the outcome variable.
Cross-sectional study	Cross-sectional studies are a type of observational study, rather than an experimental study. They provide a snapshot in time. Individuals in the study are examined for the presence of an outcome of interest, such as a pathogen or cases of disease. At the same time data is collected about the presence or absence of factors that may increase or protect from the risk of disease. These are called risk factors.
Delimiting surveillance	Surveys designed to determine the extent and distribution of a new biosecurity risk outbreak or incursion.
Disease	A dynamic development of abnormal life processes due to a <u>pathogen</u> or <u>abiotic</u> disorder, lasting long enough to cause vital disturbances in the life of the host, possibly leading to its death (Tronsmo et al., 2020).
Ill-thrift	Ill-thrift describes plants that fail to thrive. For the purposes of this study, ill-thrift refers to kauri trees that are not healthy, but their poor health is caused either by other biotic or abiotic causes, or very early kauri dieback, where conclusive symptoms are not yet apparent.

Incidence	The number of new cases of disease (i.e. trees that meet the case definition) in a defined population over a defined period of time. <i>NOTE: This should not be confused with incidence as defined in plant pathology, as the number of diseased/symptomatic individuals within a defined population at a point in time. This is much closer to the epidemiological definition of prevalence (Madden et al., 2007).</i>
Incubation period	The time between an individual (tree) being infected by a pathogen and when symptoms become visible (also referred to as the asymptomatic period).
Interaction	Interaction is said to be present when the association between an explanatory variable and an outcome variable differs between, or depends in some way on, the level of a third variable.
Latency / Latent period	The time period between an individual (tree) being infected by a pathogen and when the pathogen has completed its lifecycle and becomes infectious, in that it releases reproductive structures (e.g. zoospores) and can infect other trees. Note that the pathogen can spread prior to the host tree becoming symptomatic (during the incubation period).
Misclassification bias	A type of measurement error where a study unit (e.g., kauri tree) is classified into the wrong group e.g., being classified as diseased when healthy. Or when an imperfect test is used to detect a pathogen and the pathogen is classified as absent when it is present. Misclassification can bias estimates of disease or pathogen prevalence or measures of association between variables (Haine et al., 2018).
Monitoring	Repeated surveys to determine changes in the frequency and distribution of a disease over time.
Pathogen	An infectious agent that causes disease in a host. In plants, this includes oomycetes, fungi, viruses, virus-like organisms, bacteria, and nematodes.
Positive predictive value	The probability that an individual (tree) with a positive test is actually positive; e.g., the proportion of trees identified as kauri through remote sensing that are actually kauri.
Precision	A description of random error, a measure of statistical variability.

Prevalence	<p>The number of individuals in a defined population having a specified outcome at a given point in time. Where the outcome may be presence of a pathogen (pathogen prevalence) or meeting the case definition for diseased (disease prevalence).</p> <p><i>NOTE: This should not be confused with prevalence as defined in plant pathology, as the count of geographical sampling units where disease is present (e.g., fields, plots, regions, countries) divided by the number assessed.</i></p>									
Prevalence ratio (PR)	<p>The ratio of the proportion of trees with the outcome (e.g., disease or pathogen detection) to the proportion of trees exposed to the risk factor.</p> <p>Using a 2 x 2 table and disease as an example:</p> <table><tr><td></td><td>Disease +ve</td><td>Disease -ve</td></tr><tr><td>Risk factor -Yes (exposed)</td><td>a</td><td>b</td></tr><tr><td>Risk factor -No (unexposed)</td><td>c</td><td>d</td></tr></table> <p>Prevalence ratio: $PR = \frac{a/(a+b)}{c/(c+d)}$</p> <p>Where:</p> <p>a/(a+b) is the prevalence of disease among those exposed to the risk factor</p> <p>c/(c+d) is the prevalence of disease among those that are not exposed to the risk factor</p> <p>Where the prevalence is the same between the exposed and the unexposed PR equals 1.0</p>		Disease +ve	Disease -ve	Risk factor -Yes (exposed)	a	b	Risk factor -No (unexposed)	c	d
	Disease +ve	Disease -ve								
Risk factor -Yes (exposed)	a	b								
Risk factor -No (unexposed)	c	d								
Risk factors	<p>Any factor or variable that is associated with either an increase or decrease in disease prevalence or pathogen prevalence.</p>									
Sensitivity (Se)	<p>This is the diagnostic sensitivity of a test.</p> <p>Proportion of trees with the disease that will test positive.</p> $\frac{\text{True positives}}{\text{True positives} + \text{false negatives}}$ <p>Where false negatives are trees that test negative but do have disease. Highly sensitive tests can be used to rule out disease because they will have few or no false negatives. Less sensitive tests such as the soil bioassay may fail to detect <i>P. agathidicida</i> even when it is present. Typically, if a test has high sensitivity, it</p>									

	<p>will have lower specificity (i.e., you will find almost all cases of disease (high Se), but you will also call lots of things diseased that are not (low Sp).</p> <p><i>NOTE: Diagnostic sensitivity should not be confused with analytical sensitivity which is the lowest level of target agent that can be measured accurately by the test (Cardwell et al., 2018).</i></p>
Specificity (Sp)	<p>This is the diagnostic specificity of a test.</p> <p>Proportion of healthy trees that will test negative</p> $\frac{\text{True negatives}}{\text{True negatives} + \text{false positives}}$ <p>Where false positives are trees that test positive but do not have disease. Highly specific tests will have very few or no false positives e.g., if we detect <i>P. agathidicida</i> in a soil sample using culture and sequencing it is almost certain that <i>P. agathidicida</i> is present. Typically, if a test has high specificity, it will have lower sensitivity (i.e., the cases you find are truly diseased, but you will miss quite a few cases of disease).</p> <p><i>NOTE: Diagnostic specificity should not be confused with analytical specificity, which is similar, but is concerned with performance around excluding non-target species and cross-reactions (false positives) in laboratory testing (Cardwell et al., 2018).</i></p>
Surveillance	<p>Surveillance is the systematic ongoing collection, collation and analysis of information related to health (plant health in this case) and the timely dissemination of that information to those who need to know so that action can be taken.</p>
Symptoms/ symptomatic	<p>Physiological or structural changes in a plant that indicate the presence of disease by reaction of the host, e.g., canker, leaf spot, wilt, lesion, dieback.</p>