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SUMMARY

The role of mycorrhizal networks in forest dynamics is poorly understood because of the elusiveness of their spatial structure. We mapped the underground distribution of the fungi *Rhizopologon vesiculosus* and *Rhizopogon vinicolor* and Douglas-fir trees to determine the architecture of a mycorrhizal network in a multi-aged old growth forest. We collected the mycorrhizas within a 30 x 30-meter plot. We identified them by DNA analysis and then matched them to above ground satellite image trees. We considered them linked if they shared the same fungus. The fungal network colonized approximately 19 trees in a plot. Multiple trees were linked with young saplings within the mycorrhizal network of Douglas-firs. We feel that if we represent trees as nodes and the Mychorrhizal Network as the connections, then a mathematical network model is appropriate. We found a strong relationship between tree size and connectivity, creating a robust network.

DESCRIPTION

This study was conducted in the cool, dry, interior Douglas-fir forest near Kamloops, Canada (51°51°’7’’N Lattitude, 120°31’46’’W Longitude). The plot was 1035 m above sea level, with a 10-40% slope. The plot we studied had 67 live trees. We grouped them into four age groups. We based their age on the stem diameter and the diameter of the whole group of trees. We sampled the below ground mychorrigal layer from four different sides of every tree in the plot where the canopy cover was sparse. We sampled fresh needles or bark from trees to gather the DNA samples.

Mathematically we modeled the location of the forest trees within the plot. We compared tree age, trees connected by the MNs. We modeled older trees connected to saplings, how close the clusters were, how many trees were connected together, …

Our Model was coded in NetLogo. We used a Network Small World Model as we viewed the Mychorrizal layer as a network. Agents were trees called nodes, the size of the node indicated tree age and the distance between trees was the Mychorrhizal network verified with forest data. We….

RESULTS

We found that up to 19 trees were linked together by the MNs. Of the 338 fungal tubercles collected, 338 were matched to both a tree and fungal type. See table 2.

55 of the 56 tree genotypes identified connected to a MN were linked to one or more trees. The maximum distance between any two trees within a network was 3 fungal links whether they were located farther from each other or closer or the size of the tree. ……………..

CONCLUSIONS

The architecture of our network suggests that MNs are a robust system where it would be protected from random changes, but would be affected if the hub trees (mature) were removed from the network. This poses a problem for forest management and clear cutting for logging. It appears that it is important to conserve large trees or groups of trees and the MNs. ……………………….
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