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Abstract - This paper describes an unmanaged 1930s-era pine-hardwood stand on a minor stream terrace in Ashley County, AR. Probably inventoried as a part of an early growth and yield study, the sample plot was approximately 3.2 ha in size and contained at least 21 tree species. Loblolly pine comprised 39.1% of all stems, followed by willow oak (12.7%), winged elm (9.6%), sweetgum (7.8%), water oak (6.7%), white oak (6.2%), red oak (4.9%), and hickory (4.6%). Pine, sweetgum, and oak dominated the midcanopy and overstory, with few late successional species. Stand basal area averaged 32 m²/ha, with 409 live trees/ha. The dominance of shade intolerant species, the lack of very big trees, and a scarcity of snags suggested that this stand was second-growth and likely arose from a disturbance in the mid-19th Century. Because this forest was sampled in the 1930s, its composition and structure should better reflect mature presettlement pine-hardwoods on minor stream terrace sites than modern examples.

Introduction

Restoration ecology has traditionally focused on the reproduction and maintenance of a desired environmental state and developmental trajectory (SER 2002). In the highly modified landscapes of eastern North America, much of the emphasis has been placed on creating communities visually similar to those of presettlement times. This is especially true on public lands, where some degree of restoration has become general policy and practice (e.g., Tyrrell 1996). Reliable reference conditions must therefore be acquired if the effort is to be successful.

Centuries of human intervention, including logging, agriculture, urbanization, fire control, and the introduction of exotic species have impacted the southeastern United States. This makes it almost certain that any contemporary examples of old forests are significantly different than presettlement conditions (Kennedy and Nowacki 1997) and, hence, poor models for restoration. Very few technical assessments of ecosystem condition date back to before 1900. Qualitative descriptions of virgin landscapes can be developed from the narratives of early explorers (e.g., Grimmett 1989, Hammett 1992) or historical photographs (Fig. 1), but these typically lack sufficient detail to gauge restoration

*USDA Forest Service, Southern Research Station, PO Box 3516 UAM, Monticello, AR 71656; dbragg@fs.fed.us
effectiveness. Public land survey records have limited quantitative elements in them, including tree diameter, taxonomic abundance, and stem location. Even though survey notes have been extensively studied (e.g., Bourdo 1956, Delcourt and Delcourt 1974, Jackson et al. 2000, Lutz 1930), there are some problems with their interpretation and use in ecological research (e.g., Bragg 2003, Manies et al. 2001, Mladenoff et al. 2002, Noss 1985).

It is highly improbable that most presettlement natural communities will ever be thoroughly described. However, some records from early studies conducted by the USDA Forest Service (USFS) date back to the early 20th Century and thus are decades closer to presettlement conditions. One such data set from a mature pine-hardwood forest along a minor stream terrace was recently discovered in the files of the USFS’s Crossett Experimental Forest and will be detailed in this paper.

Field Site Location and Sample Period

The rectangular sample plot was located in Ashley County, AR, most likely within the Chemin-A-Haut Creek drainage (Fig. 2). The stand seems to have been inventoried between 1933 and 1935, probably by foresters Russ Reynolds and/or A.E. Wackerman for a joint project between the Crossett Lumber Company and the USFS Southern Forest Experiment Station. Unfortunately, the exact location of this plot has been lost, so the area defined in Figure 2 is as precise as currently available. The following lines of evidence support the aforementioned sampling location and time frame.

The data were recovered from a large mailing envelope simply marked “Sample Plot #1 East Block” in a study file originally denoted as “Industrial Forestry Arkansas #4” and later renumbered “CR-2.3.” Presumably, this envelope was placed with this study file because it was part of this project. Study CR-2.3 was an investigation of the growth and reproduction in forest cover types common to a holding called the “Crossett East Block” (CEB), which at that time was owned by the Crossett Lumber Company (Anonymous 1940). The 10,500-ha CEB

Figure 1. Virgin overcup oak-dominated bottomlands in the Ouachita River drainage of southern Arkansas and northern Louisiana. Photograph by Russ Reynolds (USFS# FS350894).
was located approximately 24 km east of the city of Crossett, AR, and consisted of a mixture of old fields, cut-over stands, second-growth forest, and virgin timber, including pine-hardwood stands on minor stream terraces (Reynolds 1934, 1980). Numerous streams bisect this portion of Ashley County, but few have extensive floodplains. Chemin-A-Haut Creek drains much of central Ashley County and has a sufficiently broad floodplain to accommodate a multi-hectare stand.

This file also included a letter reviewing the timber marking protocols for the CEB from Burt Kirkland, an economist with the USFS Southern Forest Experiment Station (Kirkland 1934). In his correspondence, Kirkland suggested that Reynolds (the study’s principal investigator) continue the 100% inventory of the Crossett Lumber Company because of its low cost (about 5 cents per thousand board feet). Kirkland also advised the extension of the inventory to trees less than 33 cm in diameter at breast height (DBH), even to stems as small as 5 cm in DBH.

Figure 2. Probable location of the 1930s-era pine-hardwood sample plot in the Chemin-A-Haut Creek bottoms (cross-hatched), including the locations of the Reynolds Research Natural Area (RRNA) and the Levi Wilcoxon Demonstration Forest (LWDF).
This sample plot may have been a pilot study on the efficiency of Kirkland’s suggestions. Work on the CR-2.3 inventory and timber marking of the CEB began in 1933 and was completed later that year (Reynolds 1934). One final line of evidence suggested that this plot was sampled before 1935. Study CR-2.3 was one of a very few USFS studies established in the area that included minor terrace forests. As early as 1935, research and demonstration projects had started on the newly established Crockett Experimental Forest 10 km south of Crockett (Reynolds 1980), which lacks blocks of mature terrace pine-hardwood timber large enough to encompass a 3.2 ha sample plot. Over the next few years, USFS research in southern Arkansas focused on the upland pine forests of the Crockett Experimental Forest.

Methods

Original sampling design

The study plot measured 220 m by 146 m. All living and standing dead trees greater than 3.5 cm DBH had their species and DBH (to the nearest 0.25 cm) recorded. Live trees also received a relative crown class (dominant, codominant, intermediate, and suppressed) and status (live, cull, or dead) rating. Trees that were at least 33 cm DBH had their merchantable height (to the nearest 0.3 m) and number of graded sawlogs recorded. Measurements of bark thickness and 20 yr radial growth (in 5 yr increments) were collected from loblolly (Pinus taeda L.) and shortleaf (Pinus echinata Mill.) pines. The file contained no information on non-arboreal species or site conditions.

Data analysis

For diameter and crown position distributions, I condensed species into the following groups to reduce the number of sparsely populated taxa: pines (loblolly + shortleaf); hickories (Carya spp.); sweetgum (Liquidambar styraciflua L.); white oak (Quercus alba L.); red oaks (Quercus falcata Michx. and probably Quercus pagoda Raf.); water oak (Quercus nigra L.); willow oak (Quercus phellos L.); post oak (Quercus stellata Wang.); elms (Ulmus sp. + Ulmus alata Michx.); and other hardwoods (Acer spp. + Cornus florida L. + Fagus grandifolia Ehrh. + Fraxinus sp. + Ilex opaca Ait. + Nyssa sylvatica Marsh. + Ostrya virginiana (Mill.) K. Koch. + Oxydendrum arboreum (L.) DC + Prunus serotina Ehrh. + Quercus velutina Lam.). Diameter distributions follow 5 cm DBH classes, starting at 0–5 cm DBH.

Radial increment and bark thickness equations were developed for the pines using ordinary least squares regression. For all pines ≥ 14 cm DBH, tree- and stand-level sawtimber volumes were calculated
using equations for “average” sites in Ashley County (Farrar et al. 1984). No comparable hardwood sawtimber equations with DBH as the sole independent variable were available, so a polynomial equation based on a local hardwood stand table (Table 25 in Reynolds (1959)) was used to predict volume. Sawtimber volume was calculated using the Doyle log scale to permit comparison with historical growth and yield information. To convert board feet Doyle per acre to cubic meters per hectare, I assumed 5.5 board feet Doyle = 1 cubic foot = 0.02832 cubic meters and 1 acre = 0.4047 ha, thus 1 m$^3$/ha = 79 board feet Doyle/acre.

**Results**

**Species composition and stocking**

At least 21 taxa were found in the 3.2 ha study plot (Table 1), although only 17 were identified definitively enough to assign species.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Species</th>
<th>Live trees per ha</th>
<th>Live basal area (m$^2$/ha)</th>
<th>Dead trees per ha</th>
<th>Dead basal area (m$^2$/ha)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Maple (Acer spp.)</td>
<td>4.983</td>
<td>0.067</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hickory (Carya spp.)</td>
<td>18.997</td>
<td>0.349</td>
<td>0.311</td>
<td>0.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>flowering dogwood (Cornus florida L.)</td>
<td>5.606</td>
<td>0.054</td>
<td>0.311</td>
<td>0.013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American beech (Fagus grandifolia Ehrhr.)</td>
<td>0.311</td>
<td>0.020</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ash (Fraxinus sp.)</td>
<td>0.311</td>
<td>0.009</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American holly (Ilex opaca Ait.)</td>
<td>0.311</td>
<td>0.006</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweetgum (Liquidambar styraeflora L.)</td>
<td>32.389</td>
<td>1.211</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blackgum (Nyssa sylvatica Marsh.)</td>
<td>3.426</td>
<td>0.150</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern hop hornbeam (Ostrya virginiana (Mill.) Koch.)</td>
<td>0.311</td>
<td>0.003</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sourwood (Oxydendrum arboreum (L.) DC.)</td>
<td>0.623</td>
<td>0.004</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shortleaf pine (Pinus echinata Mill.)</td>
<td>1.869</td>
<td>0.148</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loblolly pine (Pinus taeda L.)</td>
<td>158.829</td>
<td>22.244</td>
<td>3.737</td>
<td>0.136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black cherry (Prunus serotina Ehrhr.)</td>
<td>0.311</td>
<td>0.007</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White oak (Quercus alba L.)</td>
<td>25.849</td>
<td>1.159</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Red oak ($^b$ Quercus falcata Michx.)</td>
<td>19.309</td>
<td>1.362</td>
<td>0.934</td>
<td>0.040</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water oak (Quercus nigra L.)</td>
<td>27.094</td>
<td>1.656</td>
<td>0.934</td>
<td>0.081</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willow oak ($^c$ Quercus phellos L.)</td>
<td>52.632</td>
<td>2.233</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post oak (Quercus stellata Wang.)</td>
<td>15.883</td>
<td>0.890</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black oak (Quercus velutina Lam.)</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.311</td>
<td>0.071</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elm (Ulmus sp.)</td>
<td>0.311</td>
<td>0.045</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winged elm (Ulmus alata Michx.)</td>
<td>39.552</td>
<td>0.528</td>
<td>0.311</td>
<td>0.005</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Totals:* 
408.907 32.145 6.849 0.348

$^a$ Nomenclature from Smith (1988) and Moore (1999).

$^b$ Probably also includes cherrybark oak (Quercus pagoda Raf.).

$^c$ Labeled “pin oak,” but was almost certainly Quercus phellos rather than southern pin oak (Quercus palustris Muenchh.) since Quercus palustris is not native to this part of Arkansas (Smith 1988).
The diversity of individuals in the 1930s-era pine-hardwood stand was not even, with nine species accounting for > 95% of all stems. Loblolly pine was the most frequently measured of the 1,335 trees sampled, encompassing 39.1% of all living and dead stems (Table 1). Oaks were common, especially willow oak, water oak, white oak, red oak, and post oak. Winged elm, sweetgum, and hickory were also relatively abundant. The remaining 12 taxa accounted for only 4.57% of the live and dead stems. For example, shortleaf pine was represented by only six individuals (0.45%). Basal area from the 409 live trees per hectare exceeded 32 m²/ha (Table 1). Loblolly pine also dominated stocking, contributing 158.8 live trees/ha and almost 70% of live basal area. Willow oak produced the next highest proportion of living basal area (6.9%), and no other single species exceeded 6%.

Less than 7 standing dead trees per hectare were tallied (≈ 1% of total basal area) (Table 1). Loblolly pine dominated the snag population, comprising almost 55% of the standing dead individuals and 39% of total snag basal area. Other species with snags included hickory, flowering dogwood, red oak, water oak, black oak, and winged elm, but none contributed more than a single standing dead tree per hectare. The only black oak reported in this plot was a large snag.

**Diameter and canopy position distributions**

The 1930s-era sample plot had a distinctly stratified size class distribution (Fig. 3), with pines comprising the majority of the large diameter individuals and hardwoods dominating the smallest classes. Over three
dozen loblolly pines surpassed 60 cm DBH, including a 74.7 cm DBH specimen that was the largest tree on the plot. Only one individual (a 65 cm DBH willow oak) of the other taxa exceeded 60 cm (Table 2, Figure 4). The oaks were found in all size classes, but rarely had more than 5 individuals in the largest classes. Black oak (53.8 cm DBH) and Ulmus sp. (42.7 cm DBH) had the largest mean diameters, but were represented by a single individual each (Table 2). Most other hardwoods averaged 25 cm DBH or less, with maple, hickory, flowering dogwood, sourwood, and elm averaging < 15 cm. Both loblolly and shortleaf pine had mean DBH > 30 cm.

Canopy position data by species group for the 1930s-era sample plot followed patterns consistent with the presumed developmental stage of this stand (Fig. 5). Every species group occurred in each canopy position, although some were better represented than others. For example, the pines largely occupied dominant (45.0%) and codominant (22.2%) canopy positions, with fewer individuals classified as intermediate (13.3%) or suppressed (19.5%). Water oak and red oak also had their greatest presence in the dominant and codominant classes. Hickory, sweetgum, white oak, willow oak, post oak, elm, and the other hardwoods group were most prominent in suppressed and intermediate positions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Species</th>
<th>Number of live and dead</th>
<th>Minimum DBH (cm)</th>
<th>Maximum DBH (cm)</th>
<th>Mean DBH (cm)</th>
<th>Standard deviation (cm)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Maple spp.</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>20.3</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>3.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hickory spp.</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>37.1</td>
<td>14.1</td>
<td>5.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flowering dogwood</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>22.9</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>3.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American beech</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>28.7</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ash sp.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>19.3</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American holly</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweetgum</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>42.2</td>
<td>20.4</td>
<td>7.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blackgum</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>43.9</td>
<td>22.0</td>
<td>9.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern hophornbeam</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sourwood</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>0.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shortleaf pine</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>17.8</td>
<td>37.3</td>
<td>30.9</td>
<td>8.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loblolly pine</td>
<td>522</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>74.7</td>
<td>39.4</td>
<td>14.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black cherry</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>17.0</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White oak</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>53.1</td>
<td>22.0</td>
<td>9.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Red oak</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>57.9</td>
<td>26.6</td>
<td>13.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water oak</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>49.5</td>
<td>26.0</td>
<td>10.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willow oak</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>65.0</td>
<td>20.6</td>
<td>10.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post oak</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>53.3</td>
<td>24.7</td>
<td>10.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black oak</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>53.8</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elm sp.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>42.7</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winged elm</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>33.5</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>4.49</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2. Diameter attributes of all live and dead trees in the 1930s-era pine-hardwood plot.
Pine growth and yield

Twenty year pine increment was highly variable (Fig. 6). Of the 479 pines with radial measurements, annual growth ranged from 0.04 to 0.30 cm, with a slightly increasing trend related to diameter. Most pines averaged 0.05 to 0.15 cm of growth annually, or 2 to 6 cm of DBH increment in 20 yr. The linear regression fit to the data had a very low coefficient of determination ($R^2 = 0.03$) because of considerable variation in the radial increment of the sample (Fig. 6).

Stand-level pine sawtimber yield in the 1930s-era pine-hardwood stand was calculated to be 149.9 m$^3$/ha. Using the increment data to back-calculate pine diameter of 20 years earlier (merchantable pines that died and fell during this period were not tallied), the stand appar-

![Diagram showing diameter class distributions by species groups for the 1930s-era pine-hardwood sample plot.](image-url)

Figure 4. Diameter class distributions by species groups for the 1930s-era pine-hardwood sample plot.
ently increased from 116.9 m³ of pine per hectare, or an average stand-
level sawtimber growth of 1.65 m³/ha/yr.

Similar growth calculations were not possible for the hardwoods
since they lacked increment information. Hardwoods contributed 54.6
m³/ha in merchantable sawtimber at the time the plot was measured,
making the total yield of this pine-hardwood stand in the 1930s of
approximately 204 m³/ha.

Figure 5. Crown position frequency by species groups for the 1930s-era pine-
hardwood sample plot.

Figure 6. Plot of 1930s pine DBH against average annual increment over the
previous 20 yr period for the 1930s-era pine-hardwood sample plot.
Bark thickness

Bark thickness data was also collected for 473 of the loblolly and shortleaf pines sampled in the 1930s-era pine-hardwood stand. Pine bark thickness ranged from 0.4 to 5.6 cm, although most trees averaged 1 to 3 cm. Bark thickness was positively correlated to tree DBH, and a regression equation explained almost 56% of the variance in the data (Fig. 7).

Discussion

Compositional patterns

The composition and relative abundance of pine and hardwoods reported in this file suggests that the 1930s-era pine-hardwood stand occurred along a minor stream terrace (Hodges 1997). Pine-oak terrace flats are frequent in this part of Arkansas (Record 1910, Vanatta et al. 1916), and mature stands of this type were common during the 1930s (Reynolds 1980). Vanatta et al. (1916, p. 1201) described a poorly drained phase of the abundant loessal soils found in Ashley County as “... forested with pin [willow] oak, black gum, water oak, and pine ...”. This soil type dominated the Chemin-A-Haut Creek drainage (Vanatta et al. 1916), further corroborating the location of the 1930s-era pine-hardwood stand.

Loblolly pine was often a prominent component of stands on terrace soils following severe disturbances like windthrow, fire, logging,

![Figure 7. Plot of 1930s pine DBH against bark thickness for the 1930s-era pine-hardwood sample plot.](image-url)
and failed agriculture, but shortleaf pine occurred only sparingly (Record 1910, Turner 1937). Shortleaf pine does not tolerate saturated soils as well as loblolly, but can sprout following top-killing fires when young (Mattoon 1915). Hence, loblolly pine was more frequent in sheltered bottoms, while shortleaf pine dominated fire-prone upland sites (Bragg 2002, Mattoon 1915, Record 1910, Turner 1937). These autecological attributes help differentiate pine species between landforms in presettlement forests of the Upper Gulf Coastal Plain.

The arboreal richness found in this sample plot is considerable but not unusual for streamside forests of the southeastern United States (e.g., Fountain 1980, Harcombe et al. 2002, Jones et al. 1981, Pederson et al. 1997, White and Skojac 2002). Fountain (1980) described similar diversity patterns in unmanaged terrace hardwoods in southern Arkansas. In his plots in the Chemin-A-Haut Creek bottom, sweetgum was most abundant, followed by American hornbeam (Carpinus caroliniana Walt.), mockernut hickory (Carya tomentosa Nutt.), white oak, and blackgum. An abundance of shade tolerant, fire intolerant understory hardwoods like American holly and winged elm were also found. Fountain (1980) did not report any pine in his sample, but his plots were chosen to reflect hardwood-dominated stands, not pine-hardwood mixtures.

Notable for their absence in this stand are species commonly found in wetter Arkansas bottomlands like sycamore (Platanus occidentalis L.), river birch (Betula nigra L.), baldcypress (Taxodium distichum (L.) Rich.), water tupelo (Nyssa aquatica L.), swamp privet (Forestiera acuminata (Michx.) Poir.), overcup oak (Quercus lyrata Walt.), waterlocust (Gleditsia aquatica Marsh.), black willow (Salix nigra Marsh.), sugarberry (Celtis laevigata Willd.), and planertree (Planera aquatica (Walk.) Gmelin). Coupled with the presence of other taxa not known for their success on wet terraces (e.g., shortleaf pine, American beech), the sample plot likely received only periodic inundation.

An unexpected species appeared in the 1930s-era plot inventory. Sourwood, a common understory tree in other parts of the southeastern US, is relatively rare west of the Mississippi River (Overton 1990). Sourwood can be found in northeastern Louisiana and apparently extends into southeastern Arkansas, although no herbarium collections have been made in the state (Smith 1988).

**Stand origin from tree size, age, and species inferences**

Two nearby contemporary examples of pine-hardwood stands with similar landforms, stand structures, and species composition have larger pines and hardwoods. The proposed Reynolds Research Natural Area (RRNA) on the Crossett Experimental Forest (Fig. 2) was reserved as an
uncut control in 1935 after the USFS acquired the property (Shelton and Cain 1999). When sampled in the winter of 1992–93, loblolly and shortleaf pine in the RRNA had reached maximum diameters of 95 and 74 cm, respectively, and the largest hardwoods ranged from 75 to 112 cm DBH (Cain and Shelton 1994). By 1990, the maximum age of the overstory in the RRNA exceeded 140 yr, although most pines were recruited in the early 20th Century (and, hence, were 70 to 80 yr old). The oldest trees survived the initial high-grading around 1915, when only pines > 30 cm DBH were logged (Reynolds 1980). The Levi Wilcoxon Demonstration Forest (LWDF), a nearby industrially-owned old forest remnant (Fig. 2), has been periodically salvaged since being established in 1939. The largest pines and hardwoods in this stand are > 200 yr old and many have diameters from 80 to 120 cm (D.C. Bragg, unpubl. data).

With the dimensions and ages of the dominants in these stands, it appears that the oldest trees in the 1930s-era sample plot are probably 70 to 80 yr old, suggesting the overstory initiated between 1855 and 1865. Another stand of similar dimensions was briefly described in the CR-2.3 study file. A 1940 letter from Ike W. Rawls (superintendent of the Crossett Experimental Forest) reported a trip to the CEB to visit Professor H.H. Chapman of Yale University. Chapman was measuring an old field pine stand that was “...75 to 77 years old and had an average d.b.h. of 20" [51 cm] and was from 100 to 125 feet [30.5 to 38.1 m] high ... [t]he diameter ran as high as 28" [71 cm]. These figures do not include small suppressed trees.” (Rawls 1940). This would place the old field stand’s origin in 1863–65, possibly following Civil War-era agricultural abandonment, logging, or natural disturbance (Garver and Miller 1933, Vanatta et al. 1916). Jones et al. (1981) and Pederson et al. (1997) postulated similar origins for “old-growth” loblolly pine-hardwood stands in some South Carolina floodplains.

Given the vertical distribution of the stand and the overstory dominance of shade intolerant species like loblolly and shortleaf pine, willow oak, and sweetgum, similar events may have produced the 1930s-era stand. When initially settled, the minor stream pine-hardwood flats in Ashley County were considered good farmland (Vanatta et al. 1916, Turner 1937) and hence attracted many early farmers. However, these terrace soils often suffered from hardpan-related impeded drainage, leading to flooding in wet periods and drought and salt accumulation in the dry season (Vanatta et al. 1916). Such harsh growing conditions usually triggered their abandonment for cultivation. In addition to reclaiming old fields, pines, sweetgum, and some oak species also rapidly invade openings created by catastrophic disturbances on the coastal plain of Arkansas (Turner 1937).
Snag abundance

Some of the best evidence suggesting that this pine-hardwood stand was a mature, second-growth forest is the relative rarity of snags (< 7 per ha) and low average snag basal area (0.34 m²/ha). Though the abundance of standing dead trees varies considerably from one stand to the next, these numbers correspond best with unmanaged second-growth forests (Harcombe et al. 2002, Spetich et al. 1999, Zhang 2000). Comparable old-growth forests typically have higher amounts of snags (Battaglia et al. 1999, Harcombe et al. 2002, Kennedy and Nowacki 1997). Old, dense, pine-dominated stands usually have many snags from southern pine beetle (*Dendroctonus frontalis* Zimm.) mortality (Belanger and Malac 1980, Ku et al. 1981, Turchin et al. 1999). For example, Cain and Shelton (1996) found an average of 32 snags/ha in the RRNA (23.5 pine snags/ha and 8.5 hardwood snags/ha).

Size class and basal area distributions

Further indication that this stand was second-growth can be seen from the size of the trees reported. The biggest individuals ranged from 60 to 75 cm DBH (Table 2), which is not particularly large, given the productivity of similar terrace sites in southern Arkansas. For instance, Bragg (2003) reported many oaks, gums, hickories, and pines greater than 100 cm DBH in Ashley County stream bottoms, including a 183 cm diameter pine in the flatwoods along the Ouachita River. Other sources have touted the impressive dimensions of the primeval forests of this region (e.g., Anonymous 1890, Record 1910, Turner 1937).

The relatively high live tree density reported for the 1930s-era pine-hardwood sample is also consistent with mature, unmanaged forests (e.g., Batista and Platt 1997, Cain and Shelton 1996, Harcombe et al. 2002, Meier et al. 1999, Pederson et al. 1997, White and Skojac 2002). Upland virgin forests in the southeastern United States were often open, with sparse understories primarily maintained by frequent fire (e.g., Bragg 2002, Stanturf et al. 2002). However, terrace flats commonly supported many more trees in their moister, more protected environment.

Growth and yield

Mlodziansky (1896) and Mohr (1897) reported diameter growth of 0.3 to 0.4 cm annually in 70 to 90 yr old loblolly pines growing under relatively open conditions. This is somewhat higher than the 0.04 to 0.3 cm increment of the pines in the well-stocked 1930s-era pine-hardwood stand. Stand-level growth of the sawtimber-sized pine in this 1930s-era sample plot (1.65 m³/ha/yr) is consistent with other pine-dominated stands on good quality sites from this period. Bond (1939) reported growth of 1.4 m³/ha/yr in the virgin pine forests of
the Upper West Gulf Coastal Plain. Turner (1937) placed 60 to 80 yr old second-growth loblolly pine sawtimber increment on good Ashley County sites at 0.86 to 1.24 m³/ha/yr. Chapman (1912, 1913) reported peak pine sawtimber growth of 0.71 to 0.73 m³/ha/yr in unmanaged 80 to 100 yr old loblolly and shortleaf pine stands in Ashley County. However, Chapman’s growth data came from stands much more poorly stocked than the one reported in this study. Second-growth stands under uneven-aged silviculture are capable of 2 to 3 m³/ha/yr in this region, depending on their initial stocking (Baker and Murphy 1982, Williston 1978).

Chapman (1912, 1913) also determined that instantaneous yield peaked at 100 to 103 m³/ha in 150 to 180 yr old understocked upland pine stands. Turner (1937) reported yields of 60 to 82 m³/ha of loblolly pine in good quality, second-growth pine-hardwood sites similar to this study. A set of photograph point images from a “branch bottom type” was taken on the Crossett Experimental Forest in 1936. These second-growth pine-hardwoods are similar in composition and overall structure to the 1930s-era stand (Fig. 8), but sawtimber volume reported in the photograph caption was appreciably lower (50 to 60 m³/ha versus 150 m³/ha). The 1930s-era pine-hardwood stand is much higher than any of these values, suggesting a high amount of stocking and low disturbance rates.

Figure 8. A 1936 photograph of a “branch bottom” (a minor stream terrace) taken on the Crossett Experimental Forest, with approximately 1/3 of the sawtimber stocking of the 1930s-era stand. Photograph by Russ Reynolds (USFS# FS394375).
Conclusions

Even with uncertainty in the exact location and sample date of the 1930s-era pine-hardwood stand, considerable information was extracted from this data file. The information suggests that unmanaged second-growth forests along minor stream terraces in southern Arkansas early in the 20th Century often had a prominent if passing loblolly pine component. Unless impacted by catastrophic disturbance, this stand would have gradually developed an oak-gum-hickory overstory with only scattered pines and a midstory of dogwood, holly, and winged elm. This successional pattern is being witnessed in a number of old forest reserves in the area (e.g., Cain and Shelton 1995, Heitzman et al. in press).

Restoration is challenging in part because of how difficult it is to describe the community under consideration (Stanturf et al. 2001). Even for relatively abundant upland forests, we have only rudimentary descriptions of historical composition, structure, and dynamics. Thus, perhaps the greatest benefit from this information is the quantitative description of an unmanaged, mature stand of timber from a period much closer to presettlement (pre-1900) times. The data contained in this recently discovered file should assist restoration efforts in similar terrace pine-hardwood ecosystems in the Upper West Gulf Coastal Plain.
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