

# A MULTI-ATTRIBUTE-ASSESSMENT OF SITE PREPARATION EFFECTS ON THE SOCIOECONOMICAL AND ECOLOGICAL ATTRIBUTES OF LOBLOLLY PINE (*Pinus taeda*) STANDS

**James H. Miller\***<sup>1</sup>, Jianbang **Gan**<sup>2</sup>, Stephen H. **Kolison**<sup>2</sup>, Robert S. **Boyd**<sup>3</sup>,  
Kenneth L. **McNabb**<sup>4</sup>, B. Graeme **Lockaby**<sup>4</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Southern Research Station, USDA Forest Service, **DeVall** Drive, Auburn University, AL 36849  
Tel: **334-826-8700**, Fax: **334-821-0037**, Email: **miller@forestry.auburn.edu**

<sup>2</sup>Department of Agricultural Sciences, Tuskegee University

<sup>3</sup>Department of Botany and Plant Pathology, Auburn University

<sup>4</sup>School of Forestry, Auburn **University**

## Introduction

The public demands both commodity and non-commodity goods and **services from** our forests. This requires management options that not only provide fiber, clean water, wildlife habitat, and **recreation**, but do so in a biologically **sustainable** manner, resulting in healthy productive forests into perpetuity. A common forest management activity used to enhance fiber production is site preparation. Little is known how site **preparation** affects recreational quality, soil sustainability, biodiversity, primary productivity, and other indicators **of non-commodity** productivity and forest **sustainability**. Management techniques must strike a prudent balance among these diverse and vital multi-attributes. A multidisciplinary team was **formed** to assess a wide **spectrum** of site preparation alternatives for the Southeastern U.S. as to their **influence** on commodity and non-commodity forest values and biological sustainability. Prime indicators for socioeconomic and ecologic attributes were assessed in an integrated approach in an attempt to optimize desirable features.

## Materials and Methods

**Two sets** of experimental plots were established 12 and 15 years earlier on harvested sites having similar soils in eastern Alabama, U.S.A. Four different site preparation treatments were used at each location, ranging **from** intensive to extensive. These nearby **separate** studies were both randomized complete block designs, each with four replications. At the Tuskegee National Forest site, only pines **>10** cm dbh had been harvested. Site preparation treatments applied 15 years earlier were: (1) none, (2) chainsaw felling of all woody plants **>60** cm tall, (3) herbicide tree injection of hardwoods and pines **>5cm** dbh using picloram plus 2,4-D, and (4) spot-grid applications of the soil-active herbicide (**SAH**) hexazinone at 1.7 kg **ai** ha<sup>-1</sup>. Loblolly pine seedlings (*Pinus taeda* L.) were then planted at a 2.4 m square spacing. At the Tallasse industrial forestry site, harvesting of both pines and hardwoods **>10** cm dbh was followed by roller drum chopping and burning. Loblolly seedlings were planted at a 2.7 m square spacing. Plot treatments at Tallasse were (1) none, (2) complete woody competition control for the first 4 years, (3) complete herbaceous plant control for 4 years, and (4) complete control of all competition for 4 years. Treatment plots at Tuskegee were 0.48 ha with net plots for sampling of 0.24 ha. Treatment plots at Tallasse were **0.1** ha with net plots of 0.037 **ha**.

**At** Tuskegee in **Year 15**, 20 sampling **points** were established within each net plot using random assignments to a grid. At each point, all plants **<1** m tall **were** identified to species on 9 **m**<sup>2</sup> plots and

their covers estimated in spring, summer, and late-summer visits. At 10 points, 50 m<sup>2</sup> plots were used to sample hardwood and shrub species >1 m tall, with heights and dbh recorded for each stem.

Also measured was standing and down coarse woody debris. At a specified distance from each point, soils were sampled to a 60 cm depth and samples combined by plot. On three blocks, at a specified distance from 8 points, 0.5 m<sup>2</sup> traps were used to sample litter fall monthly for 2 years.

At Tallassee after 11 growing seasons, all trees within net plots were measured for height and dbh by species. Shrub numbers and their heights by species were measured on 3 each 27 m<sup>2</sup> plots per net plot. In Year 12, 10 cells (3 m x 3 m, bound by pines on plot corners) were randomly selected for sampling. All 10 cells were used to sample understory plant species by seasons as with the other site. Seven cells were randomly selected and 3 soil samples per cell (21 total per plot) were collected to 60 cm depth and combined by plot. In Years 10 and 11, litter fall was sampled monthly using 6 traps per plot in two blocks. All soil samples were air dried, milled, and C, N, P, K, Ca, Mg, and pH determined. Litter was dried at 70° C, ground, and analyzed for N, P, and C.

Timber yields for the unevenaged and evenaged stands at Tuskegee were projected using the SE TWIGS model (Bolton and Meldahl 1990a; 1990b). Timber yields for the evenaged plantations at Tallassee were projected using the North Carolina State University Managed Pine Plantation Growth and Yield Simulator (Hafley and Smith 1991); height-age curves were from Burkhardt et al. (1987); and methods for translating these curves for vegetation management treatments followed Lauer et al. (1993). Timber values were calculated using the predicted yields, average monthly wood prices, and a 4 percent discount rate. These values along with published or estimated current treatment costs were used to calculate net present value.

Recreation benefits were evaluated using the Contingent Valuation Method (Cummings et al. 1986; Mitchell and Carson 1989). Recreation was measured using the weighted average of the index values of aesthetics, picnicking, hiking/cycling, camping, hunting, and bird watching. These index values along with their weights were derived from surveys of 400 randomly-selected residents from counties surrounding the study sites. Interviewees were shown enlarged color photographs (25 cm x 20 cm) of the stands to obtain these values, and were not told what treatments were used as site preparation. Site preparation methods were ranked using the multi-attribute assessment approach based on a weighted-additive utility function (Keeney and Raiffa 1976). The original measurements of all indicators were converted to index values ranging from 0 to 10 to overcome the unit differences. All the attributes in this presentation were considered to be equally important.

## Results and Discussion

The four site preparation methods used on the Tuskegee site yielded differences in values for diversity, user preferences, soil sustainability, and biological and economic productivity, 15 years post treatment (Table 1). Results derived from the Tuskegee site will be the focus of this summary. Floristic richness was greatest on the Chainsaw Felling plots and least on plots treated with SAH ( $\alpha=0.07$ ). A total of 138 taxa were identified. SAH plots had significantly ( $\alpha=0.05$ ) higher proportion of pine to hardwood basal area compared to the other treatments. SAH plots had significantly lower levels of selected oak species in the overstory (*Quercus marilandica* Muenchh. and *Q. margaretta* Ashe). Under-story diversity, according to the Shannon-Wiener Index, was

significantly **greater** with Chainsaw Felling (3.0) compared to Check and **SAH** (both **2.6**), while **Tree Injection** (2.9) was intermediate.

**Table 1. Measurements of Prime Attributes for Stands yielded by the Four Site Preparation Methods used 15 Years Earlier on the Tuskegee National Forest.**

Attribute	Check	chainsaw Felling	Tree Injection	Soil-Active Herbicide	ANOVA p-values
Total plant species	64	65	63	58	0.0683
Recreation index	6.42	5.70	5.94	5.60	0.8357
Soil C:N ratio	25	22	20	20	0.3632
Annual litterfall (g m <sup>-2</sup> )	409	391	383	436	0.6968
Net present value for timber:					
40-year rotation (US\$ ha <sup>-1</sup> )	810	514	561	978	0.1323
70-year rotation (US\$ ha <sup>-1</sup> )	442	321	306	437	0.0699

An integrated value for recreation **indicated** that customer preference (**from** highest to lowest) was Check > Tree Injection > Chainsaw Felling > **SAH**. Results of this survey are presented more fully in another paper at this conference. Soil C:N ratio was lowest with the **SAH** (more conducive for N mineralization) and highest with the Check, although not **significant** at  $\alpha=0.05$ . Litterfall levels were highest on the **SAH**, indicating more leaf area for gross primary productivity. Plots treated with **SAH** had the highest projected timber value at a **40-year** rotation. At a **70-year** rotation, the Check yielded slightly **higher values** than the SAH. The economic optimal rotation age is about 40 **years**, while the current rotation age used in this National Forest is about 70 years.

**Table 2. Index Values (and Rankings) of the Four Site Preparation Methods.**

Rotation Length	Check	Chainsaw Felling	Tree Injection	Soil-Active Herbicide
40 years	9.10 (2)	8.44 (4)	8.70 (3)	9.53 (1)
70 years	9.45 (2)	<b>8.84</b> (4)	8.94 (3)	9.51 (1)

Rankings of the four site preparation methods presented in Table 2, **reveal SAH** as the best method for both **40-year** and a **70-year** rotations, followed by the Check and **Tree Injection**. However, the index values for **SAH** and Check were almost the same for the **70-year** rotation. Chainsaw felling was ranked lowest. Multi-attribute assessments can provide **valuable** insights into balancing diverse demands and essential **attributes**. This is only one **analysis** of a complex matrix of so&economical and ecological data that can **be** used to assist in optimizing management. Other attributes, and methods for weighting attribute importance, can and will be explored.

#### References

- Bolton, R.K.**, and **Meldahl, R.S.** 1990a. Alabama Ag. Exp. **Sta. Bull** 603.  
**Bolton, R.K.**, and **Meldahl, R.S.** 1990b. Alabama Ag. Exp. **Sta. Bull** 604.  
 Burkhardt, H.E., et al. 1987. **Virginia Polytechnic** Institute and State Univ. Pub FWS-1-87.  
 Cummings, R.G., et al. 1986. **Rowman** and Littlefield Press, Totowa, New Jersey.  
 Hafley, W.L., and Smith, W.D. 1991. North Carolina State Univ., version 3.2  
 Keeney, **R.L.**, and Raiff' H. 1976. John Wiley and Sons, New York City.  
 Lauer; **D.K.**, et al. 1993. Canadian J. For. Res. **23:2116-2125**.  
 Mitchell, **R.C.**, and Carson, **R.T.** 1989. Resources for the Future, Washington, **D.C.**

Poster

Miller, J.H.; Miller, K.V. Forest Plants and Shrubs of the Southeast and Their Wildlife Uses. Southern Weed Science Annual Meeting, Theme: A glance to the past, a vision for the Future, 25-27 January 1999, Greensboro, North Carolina..