

Stephen F. Austin State University  
**SFA ScholarWorks**

---

Faculty Publications

Forestry

---

5-2010

# Aboveground Biomass Estimation for Three Common Woody Species in the Post Oak Savannah of Texas

Brian P. Oswald

*Arthur Temple College of Forestry and Agriculture, Stephen F. Austin State University, Nacogdoches, Texas 75962*

R.R. Botting

Dean W. Coble

*Arthur Temple College of Forestry, Stephen F. Austin State University, Nacogdoches, TX 75962-6109*

Ken W. Farrish

*Arthur Temple College of Forestry, Stephen F. Austin State University, Nacogdoches, TX 75962-6109*

Follow this and additional works at: <http://scholarworks.sfasu.edu/forestry>



Part of the [Forest Sciences Commons](#)

Tell us how this article helped you.

---

## Recommended Citation

Oswald, Brian P.; Botting, R.R.; Coble, Dean W.; and Farrish, Ken W., "Aboveground Biomass Estimation for Three Common Woody Species in the Post Oak Savannah of Texas" (2010). *Faculty Publications*. Paper 13.

<http://scholarworks.sfasu.edu/forestry/13>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Forestry at SFA ScholarWorks. It has been accepted for inclusion in Faculty Publications by an authorized administrator of SFA ScholarWorks. For more information, please contact [cdsscholarworks@sfasu.edu](mailto:cdsscholarworks@sfasu.edu).

1

2 **Keywords:** Regression, Eastern redcedar, gum bumelia, fuel loads, post oak

3

4

5         The Post Oak Savannah occupies about 3.4 million hectares of gently  
6 rolling to hilly lands in east central Texas. Large post oak (*Quercus stellata*  
7 Wangenh.) blackjack oak (*Quercus marilandica* Munchh.), Eastern redcedar  
8 (*Juniperus virginiana* L.) and honey mesquite (*Juniperus virginiana* L.) usually  
9 form the overstory, often above thickets of yaupon (*Ilex vomitoria*), winged elm  
10 (*Ulmus alata*), gum bumelia (*Sideroxylon lanuginosum* Michx. Subsp.  
11 *Oblongifolium* (Nutt) T.D. Penn.), and live oak (*Quercus virginiana* Mill.).  
12 Historically limited to rocky hillsides and draws (Owens and Ansley 1997), these  
13 species have migrated over the last several hundred years into bottomlands where  
14 grasses once dominated, and the increase in abundance and range has fluctuated  
15 due to both the modification of the historic fire regime and overgrazing (Smeins  
16 and Fuhlendorf 1997).

17         The primary focus of previous fire studies in the Post Oak Savannah have  
18 been ignition time, mortality rate and the effect of burning to the understory  
19 vegetation, not standing shrub biomass estimation. Biomass estimation equations  
20 developed in different regions may not be applicable to the Post Oak Savannah  
21 since these substitutions may result in substantial error (Grier and Milne 1981,  
22 Gottfried and Severson 1994). With better prediction equations for this region

1 with an increasing Urban-Wildfire Interface, managers can more accurately  
2 estimate the potential severity of wildfires or the effects of prescribed burns  
3 (Martin *et al.* 1978).

4 Biomass estimation methods that involve juniper species have focused on  
5 Pinyon-Juniper (*Pinus edulis* and *Juniperus spp.*) and overstory-understory  
6 interactions in the western states. Schnell (1976) developed biomass prediction  
7 equations tables for eastern redcedar in Georgia, Alabama Tennessee and  
8 Virginia, that required diameters at breast height (DBH) > 12.7 cm. Clark *et al.*  
9 (1986) and Phillips (1981) developed equations for estimating post oak biomass  
10 in North Carolina, South Carolina and Georgia, using DBH and total height;  
11 Phillips (1981) also age, but neither included foliage. Common in both studies  
12 was a DBH > 15.2 cm and total height as independent variables. There is little  
13 biomass estimation information available for gum bumelia, although Bryant and  
14 Kothmann (1979) suggested a quadratic equation might work best.

15 The objective of this study was to develop regression models to predict the  
16 total above-ground biomass for three species commonly found in Post Oak  
17 Savannah plant communities.

18

## 19 **Methods**

20 Camp Swift Military Reservation is located in south central Texas, 45 km  
21 east of Austin and 11 km north of Bastrop, with an elevation of 122-183 m MSL.  
22 Established in 1942, 4,735 hectares were retained as a military reservation after

1 World War II (Leatherwood 2002). The climate is humid with a mean January  
2 temperature of 4 C°, a mean July temperature of 36 C° and mean rainfall of 94 cm  
3 (Odintz 2006). The terrain is characterized by rolling uplands and broken hills  
4 with primarily sandy and loamy surface soils. The Axtell-Tabor soil association  
5 was found where sampling was performed on nearly level to strongly sloping  
6 terrain with a loamy surface layer and very slowly permeable lower profiles on  
7 streams terraces and uplands (USDA 1979).

8           The study area included four sites adjacent to urbanized development.  
9 Each site contained 12 plots, 50m X 20m in size, with six plots placed randomly  
10 on opposing aspects. All plots ran lengthwise parallel to the slope. The location  
11 for each plot was determined using GPS coordinates and a random numbers table,  
12 with the GPS coordinate considered the starting corner of the plot.

13           Each plot contained five 20m transects perpendicular to the length of the  
14 plot. The first transect was no less than 3m from the starting corner, and all  
15 transects were placed 5-10m from each other. Each transect contained one  
16 randomly placed sample point. The nearest representative to the sampling point  
17 of any of the three species was labeled and recorded. If the plant was a species  
18 whose target quota (30) was filled, the nearest plant of another species was  
19 sampled until the quota was reached.

20           Mean basal diameters (cm) were measured using a caliper above the root  
21 crown or above the swelling of the root crown, usually within 2.5- 5.0 cm above  
22 the top of the litter, with perpendicular readings taken for each plant and basal

1 area (cm<sup>2</sup>) calculated. The heights of each plant (m) and crown area (m<sup>2</sup>) were  
2 also recorded. Crown area was measured by taking two readings from the center  
3 of each plant; one taken at the longest dimension and the second perpendicular to  
4 the first. Each plant was cut and segmented into fuel size classes (Brown 1976,  
5 Frandsen 1983), had all foliage removed, and placed in separate bags. The  
6 samples were oven-dried at 60°C for 48 hours (longer for heavier fuel samples)  
7 and dry weights (g) recorded.

8 Five models (Full Model, Full Log Model, Combined Variable Model,  
9 Logarithmic Model, and a Combined Variable Model with Crown Area (Clutter *et*  
10 *al.*, 1983)) were fitted to the data for each species and evaluated for the best fit.  
11 Best fit was determined by a high R<sup>2</sup>, low root mean square error (RMSE), and  
12 Furnival's Index of Fit (FI, Furnival 1961). FI reflects the size of the residuals  
13 and possible departures from normality and non-constant variance, so it is a useful  
14 fit index to evaluate these five models. Regression parameter estimates were  
15 evaluated at the  $\alpha=0.05$  level. The models were:

16

17 Full Model:  $Y = \beta_0 + \beta_1D + \beta_2H + \beta_3C + \beta_4B + \epsilon$

18 Full Log Model:  $\ln Y = \beta_0 + \beta_1\ln D + \beta_2\ln H + \beta_3\ln C + \beta_4\ln B + \epsilon$

19 Combined Variable model:  $Y = \beta_0 + \beta_1D^2H + \epsilon$

20 Logarithmic Model:  $\ln Y = \beta_0 + \beta_1\ln D + \beta_2\ln H + \ln \epsilon$

21 Combined variable model with crown area:  $Y = \beta_0 + \beta_1D^2H + \beta_2C + \epsilon$

1 Where  $Y$ =total above-ground biomass or total above-ground dry-weight (g);  $D$ =  
2 basal diameter (cm);  $H$ =height (m);  $C$ = crown area ( $m^2$ );  $B$ =Basal area ( $cm^2$ );  $\beta_0$   
3  $\beta_1$   $\beta_2$   $\beta_3$   $\beta_4$  regression parameters to be estimated;  $\epsilon$  = error or residual.

4  
5 SAS ver. 8 (SAS Institute Inc., 1999) was used to estimate the regression  
6 parameters. Due to redundancy in this model since basal diameter was used to  
7 find the basal area and only some of the variables were significant at the 0.05  
8 level, models were consolidated to use basal diameter, height and crown area.

## 10 **Results and Discussion**

11 Mean total above-ground weight (g) per plant, and height (m), basal  
12 diameter ( $cm^2$ ) and crown area ( $m^2$ ) per species are presented in Table 1. For all  
13 species  $R^2$  values exceeded 64% for the full regression model, and 25% for the  
14 full log model, although a majority of the variables were not significant. The  
15 logarithmic and combined variable with crown area models had  $R^2$  values  $\geq 72\%$   
16 for all species. The combined variable model results had  $R^2$  values  $\geq 17\%$ , non-  
17 constant variance was present and the variables were significant. The logarithmic  
18 model had the best fit for all three species based on the values for  $R^2$ , RMSE, and  
19 FI (Tables 2 and 3). The logarithmic model with regression parameter estimates  
20 was back-transformed to original units for ease of use (Table 4). These equations  
21 include a correction for log-normal bias (correction factor =  $CF = e^{MSE/2}$ , where

1 MSE = Mean Square Error =  $RMSE^2$ , Baskerville 1972) since the dependent  
2 variables were transformed to logarithmic units for fitting.

3 The larger individual foliage of post oak and gum bumelia compensated  
4 for smaller, more numerous Eastern redcedar foliage. Natural variation in the size  
5 of the individual plants contributed to different diameter and height results. Post  
6 oak and eastern redcedar had large basal diameters that contributed to the heavier  
7 weights in comparison to gum bumelia.

8 The equation by Schnell (1976) for eastern redcedar requires a DBH >  
9 12.7cm. For this study basal diameter was used because DBH was not found on  
10 small plants. Since his tables leave a size class gap, the prediction equations  
11 provided here can fill a portion of the size class gap. The post oak collected here  
12 were smaller in height and diameter than those used by Clark *et al.* (1986) and  
13 Phillips (1981) and did not have a measureable DBH. Therefore, their prediction  
14 equations are impractical for this size plants, even if basal diameter was converted  
15 to DBH. Bryant and Kothmann (1979) suggest a quadratic model for gum  
16 bumelia, but they fail to provide regression coefficients for the model. Here, a  
17 logarithmic model for gum bumelia is provided with regression coefficients  
18 instead of the suggested quadratic model.

19

## 20 **Conclusions**

21 Biomass prediction equations using the logarithmic model with  
22 corrections for log-normal bias for total above-ground biomass were found for

1 eastern redcedar, post oak and gum bumelia. To calculate the potential energy  
2 (heat) release, total above-ground biomass (g) estimation can now be made for  
3 three of the most common species in the Hill Country of Texas. Additionally, the  
4 prediction equations found for post oak foliage can have implications in wildlife  
5 management areas if managers want to determine available foliage in small trees  
6 < 10.2 cm in basal diameter or < 3.0m in height.

7

## 8 **Literature Cited**

9

10 Baskerville, G.L. 1972. Use of logarithmic regression in the estimation of plant  
11 biomass. *Can. Journal. For. Res.* 2:49–53.

12 Brown, J. K. 1976. Estimating shrub biomass from basal stem diameters. *Can.*  
13 *Journal. For. Res.* 6: 153-158.

14 Bryant, F.C., and M.M. Kothmann 1979. Variability in predicting edible browse  
15 from crown volume. *J. Range Management* 32(2):144-146.

16 Clark, A.I.; D.R. Phillips, D.J. Frederick, 1986. *Weight, volume, and physical*  
17 *properties of major hardwood species in the Upland South.* Res. Pap. SE-  
18 257. Asheville, NC: U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service,  
19 Southeastern Forest Experiment Station. 55p.

20 Clutter, J.L., J.C. Fortson, L.V. Pienaar, G.H. Brister and R.L. Bailey. 1983.  
21 *Timber Management: A Quantitative Approach.* New York, NY: John  
22 Wiley and Sons. 333p.



- 1 Frandsen, W.H. 1983. Modeling Big Sagebrush as a Fuel. *J. Range*  
2 *Management* 36(5): 596-600.
- 3 Furnival, G.M. 1961. An index for comparing equations used in constructing  
4 volume tables. *For. Sci.* 7:337-341.
- 5 Gottfried, G.J. and K.E. Severson. 1994. Managing Pinyon-Juniper Woodlands.  
6 *Rangelands* 16(6): 234-236.
- 7 Grier, C.C., and W. A. Milne. 1981. Regression equations for calculating  
8 Component biomass of young *Abies amabilis* (Dougl.) Forbes. *Can.*  
9 *Journal. For. Res.* 11: 184-187.
- 10 Grier, C.C., K.J. Elliot and D.G. McCullough. 1992. Biomass distribution and  
11 productivity of *Pinus edulis-Juniperus monosperma* woodlands of north-  
12 central Arizona. *Forest Ecology and Management*, 50: 331-350.
- 13 Leatherwood, A. 2002. *Camp Swift*. Retrieved Feb. 20, 2006, from The Handbook  
14 of Texas Online Web site:  
15 [http://www.tsha.utexas.edu/handbook/online/articl](http://www.tsha.utexas.edu/handbook/online/articles/CC/qbc27.html)  
16 [es/CC/qbc27.html](http://www.tsha.utexas.edu/handbook/online/articles/CC/qbc27.html).
- 17 Martin, R.E., H.E Anderson, W.D. Boyer, J.H. Dieterich, S.N. Hirsch, V.J.  
18 Johnson and W.H. McNab 1978. *Effects of Fire on Fuels. A State of*  
19 *Knowledge Review* National Fire Effects Workshop Denver, Co. USDA.  
20 For. Serv. Gen. Tech. Report WO-13, 64p.
- 21 Odintz, M.F. 2006. *Brazos County*. Retrieved Feb. 20, 2006, from the Handbook

1 of Texas Online Web site:  
2 <http://www.tsha.utexas.edu/handbook/online/articles/BB/hcb13.html>.

3 Owens, K. and J. Ansley. 1997. *Ecophysiology and Growth of Ashe and*  
4 *Redberry Juniper*. <http://texnat.tamu.edu/symposia/juniper/KEITH.htm>.

5 Phillips, D. 1981. *Predicted total-tree biomass of understory hardwoods*. Res.  
6 Pap. SE-223. Asheville, NC: U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest  
7 Service, Southeastern Forest Experiment Station.

8 SAS Institute Inc., *SAS/STAT Users Guide, Version 8*, Cary, NC: SAS Institute  
9 Inc., 1999. 3884 p.

10 Schnell, R. 1976. *Biomass estimates of eastern redcedar tree components*. Tech.  
11 Note B15. Norris, TN: Tennessee Valley Authority, Division of Forestry,  
12 Fisheries and Wildlife Development. 15p.

13 Smeins, F.E., and S.D Fuhlendorf. 1997. *Biology and Ecology of Ashe*  
14 *(Blueberry) Juniper*. <http://texnat.tamu.edu/symposia/juniper/FRED2.htm>

15 U. S. Department of Agriculture (USDA), Soil Conservation Service (SCS). 1979.  
16 *Soil Survey of Bastrop County, Texas*. U.S. Government Printing Office,  
17 Washington, D.C.

18