

Reprinted from

# Forest Ecology and Management

---

Forest Ecology and Management 114 (1999) 199-213

## Vegetation dynamics after a prescribed fire in the southern Appalachians

Katherine J. Elliott<sup>a,\*</sup>, Ronald L. Hendrick<sup>b</sup>, Amy E. Major<sup>b</sup>,  
James M. Vose<sup>a</sup>, Wayne T. Swank<sup>a</sup>

<sup>a</sup> *Coweeta Hydrologic Laboratory, Southern Research Station, USDA Forest Service, Otto, NC 28763, USA*

<sup>b</sup> *University of Georgia, Athens, GA 30602, USA*



# Forest Ecology and Management

**Aims and scope.** *Forest Ecology and Management* publishes scientific articles concerned with forest management and conservation, and in particular the application of biological, ecological and social knowledge to the management of man-made and natural forests. The scope of the journal includes all forest ecosystems of the world. A refereeing process ensures the quality and international interest of the manuscripts accepted for publication. The journal aims to encourage communication between scientists in disparate fields who share a common interest in ecology and natural-resource management, and to bridge the gap between research workers and forest managers in the field to the benefit of both. The journal should be of interest to research workers, managers and policy makers in forestry, natural resources, ecological conservation and related fields.

## FOUNDING EDITOR

Laurence L. Roche, Murroe, Ireland

## EDITORS-IN-CHIEF

For the Americas, Australia, New Zealand and the Pacific:  
RF. Fisher  
Department of Forest Science  
Texas A&M University  
College Station, TX 77843-2135. USA

For the rest of the world:  
G.M.J. Mohren  
Forest Production Ecology Group  
Department of Vegetation Ecology  
DLO-Institute for Forestry and Nature Research  
PO. Box 23  
6700 AA Wageningen, The Netherlands

## BOOK REVIEWS EDITOR

Margaret R. Gale  
School of Forestry and Wood Products  
Michigan Technological University  
1400 Townsend Drive  
Houghton, MI 49931, USA

## EDITORIAL ADVISORY BOARD

G. Abrahamsen, Agricultural University of Norway, As, Norway

R. Alfaro, Canadian Forestry Service, Victoria, B.C., Canada  
F. Andersson, Swedish University of Agricultural Sciences, Uppsala, Sweden

P.M.S. Ashton, Yale University, New Haven, USA  
P. Attiwill, University of Melbourne, Parkville, Vic., Australia  
J. Boyle, Oregon State University, Corvallis, USA  
S. Brown, US Environmental Protection Agency, Corvallis, USA

I. Burke, Colorado State University, Fort Collins, CO, USA  
J.C. Calvo, Institute of Technology, Cartago, Costa Rica  
R.-J. Chen, University of Hong Kong, Pokfulam Road, Hong Kong

J.D. Deans, Institute of Terrestrial Ecology, Penicuik, Midlothian, UK

R.M. DeGraaf, USDA Forest Service, University of Massachusetts, Amherst, MA, USA

S. Diamandis, Forest Research Institute, Thessaloniki, Greece

D.P. Dykstra, CIFOR, Jakarta, Indonesia

E.P. Farrell, University College Dublin, Dublin, Ireland

PM. Fearnside, Instituto Nacional de Pesquisas da Amazonia-INPA, Manaus-Amazonas, Brazil

PH. Freer-Smith, Forestry Commission, Farnham, UK

O. Garcia, ENGREF, Nancy, France

D. Gilmore, Canadian Forest Product Ltd., Alberta, Canada

R.A. Goyer, Louisiana State University, Baton Rouge, LA, USA

J.B. Hall, University College of North Wales, Bangor, UK

F. Houllier, Campus International de Baillarguet, Laboratoire Associe de Modelisation des Plantes (AMAP), Montpellier, France

B.M. Kumar, Kerala Agricultural University, Kerala, India  
J.P. Lassoie, Cornell University, Ithaca, NY, USA

J.N. Long, Utah State University, Logan, UT, USA

A.E. Lugo, International Institute of Tropical Forestry, Rio Piedras, PR, USA

J.A. Maghembe, SADCC / ICRAF Agroforestry Project, Zomba, Malawi

F. Makeschin, Institut für Bodenkunde und Standortslehre, Tharandt, Germany

D.C. Malcolm, University of Edinburgh, Edinburgh, UK

E. Mälkönen, Finnish Forest Research Institute, Vantaa, Finland

M.A.R. Nahuz, Instituto de Pesquisas Tecnologicas, São Paulo, SP, Brazil

R. Päivinen, European Forestry Institute, Joensuu, Finland  
S.G. Pallardy, University of Missouri, Columbia, MO, USA

R.F. Powers, Pacific Southwest Research Station, Redding, CA, USA

T. Pukkala, University of Joensuu, Joensuu, Finland

F.E. Putz, University of Florida, Gainesville, FL, USA

L. Rasmussen, RISO, Roskilde, Denmark

D.D. Reed, Michigan Technological University, Houghton, MI, USA

R. Sands, University of Canterbury, Christchurch, NZ

J.A. Stanturf, Stoneville, MS, USA

O. Sziklai, University of British Columbia, Vancouver, B.C., Canada

J.R. Toliver, USDA Forest Service, Washington, DC, USA

K. von Weissenberg, University of Helsinki, Helsinki, Finland

D. Whitehead, Manaaki Whenua Landcare Research, Lincoln, New Zealand

Publication information: *Forest Ecology and Management* (ISSN 0378-1127). For 1999 volumes 111-122 are scheduled for publication. Subscription prices are available upon request from the Publisher. Subscriptions are accepted on a prepaid basis only and are entered on a calendar year basis. Issues are sent by surface mail except to the following countries where air delivery via SAL mail is ensured: Argentina, Australia, Brazil, Canada, Hong Kong, India, Israel, Japan, Malaysia, Mexico, New Zealand, Pakistan, PR China, Singapore, South Africa, South Korea, Taiwan, Thailand, USA. For all other countries airmail rates are available on request. Claims for missing issues should be made within six months of our publication (mailing) date.

Orders, claims, and product enquiries: please contact the Customer Support Department at the Regional Sales Office nearest you:  
New York: Elsevier Science, PO Box 945, New York, NY 10159-0945, USA; Tel. (+1) (212) 633 3730, [toll free number for North American customers: 1-888-4ES-INFO (437-4636)]; fax: (+1) (212) 633 3680; e-mail usinfo-f@elsevier.com

Amsterdam: Elsevier Science, PO Box 211, 1000 AE Amsterdam, The Netherlands; Tel.: (+31) 20 4853757; fax: (+31) 20 485 3432; e-mail nlinfo-f@elsevier.nl

Tokyo: Elsevier Science, 9-15, Higashi-Azabu 1-chome, Minato-ku, Tokyo 106, Japan; Tel. (+81) (3) 5561 5033; fax (+81) (3) 5561 5047; e-mail: info@elsevier.co.jp

Singapore: Elsevier Science, No. 1 Temasek Avenue, #17-01 Millenia Tower, Singapore 039192; Tel. (+65) 434 3727; fax: (+65) 337 2230; e-mail: asiainfo@elsevier.com.sg

Rio de Janeiro: Elsevier Science, Rua Sete de Setembro 11116 Andar, 20050-002 Centro, Rio de Janeiro - RJ, Brazil; phone: (+55) (21) 509 5340; fax: (+55) (21) 507 1991; e-mail: elsevier@campus.com.br [Note (Latin America): for orders, claims and help desk information, please contact the Regional Sales Office in New York as listed above]

## Vegetation dynamics after a prescribed fire in the southern Appalachians

Katherine J. Elliott<sup>a,\*</sup>, Ronald L. Hendrick<sup>b</sup>, Amy E. Major<sup>b</sup>,  
James M. Vose<sup>a</sup>, Wayne T. Swank<sup>a</sup>

<sup>a</sup>Coweeta Hydrologic Laboratory, Southern Research Station, USDA Forest Service, Otto, NC 28763, USA

<sup>b</sup>University of Georgia, Athens, GA 30602, USA

---

### Abstract

In April 1995, the USDA Forest Service conducted a prescribed burn along with a south-facing slope of southern Appalachian watershed, Nantahala National Forest, western NC. Fire had been excluded for over 70 years and the purpose of the burn was to create a mosaic of fire intensities to restore a degraded pine/hardwood community and to stimulate forage production and promote oak regeneration along a hillslope gradient. Permanent plots were sampled at three locations along a gradient from 1500 to 1700 m. Plot locations corresponded to three community types: mesic, near-riparian cove (low slope); dry, mixed-oak (mid slope); and xeric, pine/hardwood (ridge). Before burning (1994-1995) and post-burn (summer, 1995 and summer, 1996) vegetation measurements were used to determine the effects of fire on the mortality and regeneration of overstory trees, understory shrubs, and herbaceous species. After the burn, mortality was highest (31%) at the ridge location, substantially reducing overstory (from 26.84 pre-burn to 19.05 m<sup>2</sup> ha<sup>-1</sup> post-burn) and understory shrub (from 6.52 pre-burn to 0.37 m<sup>2</sup> ha<sup>-1</sup> post-burn) basal area. At the mid-slope position, mortality was only 3%, and no mortality occurred at the low slope. Not surprisingly, percent mortality corresponded to the level of fire intensity. Basal area of *Kalmia latifolia*, *Gaylussacia baccata*, and *Vaccinium* spp. were substantially reduced after the fire, but density increased due to prolific sprouting. The prescribed fire had varying effects on species richness and diversity across the hillslope gradient. On the ridge, diversity was significantly increased in the understory and herb-layer, but decreased in the overstory. On the mid slope, no change was observed in the overstory, but diversity significantly decreased in the understory. On the low slope, no change was observed in the overstory or understory. © 1999 Elsevier Science B.V. All rights reserved.

**Keywords:** Pine-oak heath; Restoration; Mortality: *Kalmia latifolia*; *Pinus rigida*; *Quercus* spp.; Herbaceous flora; Diversity: Species nomenclature follows Radford et al. (1968)

---

### 1. Introduction

Historically, fire was an integral part of the disturbance regime of southern Appalachian forests and defined their natural structure and composition (Barden and Woods, 1976; Harmon, 1982; Buckner, 1989;

van Lear and Waldrop, 1989; DeVivo, 1991; van Lear, 1991). The pre-colonial forests were disturbed by windstorms, floods, landslides, insect and disease epidemics, and American Indian- and lightning-caused fires. In particular, mixed pine/hardwood forest-types occupying dry ridge sites (primarily composed of *Pinus rigida* and *Quercus prinus* in the overstory and *Kalmia latifolia* in the understory) are

---

\*Corresponding author.

thought to be highly dependent on high intensity fires for their maintenance (Barden and Woods, 1976). Fire suppression and the limited occurrence of intense natural fires in xeric pine/hardwood forests have promoted the dominance of hardwoods, and the pine component has been in a state of decline for about two decades (Smith, 1991; Vose et al., 1994). In addition, substantial drought-related insect infestations (primarily southern pine beetle (*Dendroctonus frontalis* Zimmermann)) (Hoffman and Anderson, 1945; Smith, 1991) and previous land practices, such as selective removal of high quality trees, have contributed to further degradation of these forests. The result is a significant increase in acreage of dense stands of *K. latifolia* on upper, drier slopes which provide competition to reproduction and growth of both woody and herbaceous vegetation.

The mixed-oak (*Quercus* spp.) stands that occupy mesic to dry-mesic forests at middle elevations are also undergoing considerable change. Oaks were a dominant feature of the southern Appalachians long before European settlement (Clark and Robinson, 1993), and throughout the entire region various species of oak remain major components of many forest-types (Nowacki and Abrams, 1992; Stephenson et al., 1993). These oak forests were established and historically maintained by a combination of natural and human-induced fires (Lorimer, 1984; Abrams and Nowacki, 1992). In the absence of fire, shade-tolerant species that were formerly confined to the understory, such as *Acer rubrum*, have become established and are recruiting into the overstory (Lorimer, 1985; Crow, 1988).

Fire has been prescribed as a silvicultural treatment in pine/hardwood forests in the southern Appalachians to restore diversity and productivity (Swift et al., 1993) and to promote regeneration of native pines (Vose et al., 1994; Vose et al., 1997). Fire reduces the abundance of *Kalmia latifolia* and delays its growth, encourages tree species such as oak to sprout (van Lear and Waldrop, 1989), and provides a seedbed for native pines to germinate and become established (Vose et al., 1994).

In April 1995, the USDA Forest Service conducted a prescribed burn along a south-facing slope in the Nantahala National Forest, western NC where fire had been excluded for over 70 years. The purpose of the burn was to create a mosaic of fire intensities to restore

a degraded pine/hardwood community, to stimulate forage production, and to reduce the understory biomass of *Kalmia latifolia* and shade-tolerant hardwood tree species to promote pine and oak regeneration along the hillslope gradient. We hypothesized that (1) a high intensity burn along the ridge would simulate a wildfire that would produce seedbed conditions for pine seed germination and reduce *K. latifolia* to allow for seedling establishment (Vose et al., 1997); (2) a moderate intensity burn at mid slope would reduce *K. latifolia* density and promote forage production and oak regeneration; and (3) a low intensity, surface burn along the near-riparian low-slope position would promote regeneration of herb-layer species to increase diversity. The objectives of our research were to determine the effects of this fire on the mortality and regrowth of the overstory, understory, and herbaceous layer vegetation across a hillslope gradient from the mesic, near-riparian community to the xeric, ridge community.

## 2. Methods

### 2.1. Site description

The study area is located in the Nantahala National Forest of the southern Appalachian Mountains, western North Carolina (35°N latitude, 83°W longitude) and is part of the Wine Spring Creek Ecosystem Management Project (Swank et al., 1994). The wine Spring Creek watershed is within the Blue Ridge Mountain District of the Blue Ridge physiographic province. Three tributaries (Wine Spring Creek, Bearpen Creek, and Indian Camp Branch) converge to Wine Spring Creek which drains into Nantahala Lake at the western edge of the watershed boundary. The area has a southern aspect and elevations range from 1500 to 1700 m with slopes ranging from 35 to 60%. The soil-types along with the upper slope and ridge are fine-loamy, mixed, mesic Typic Hapludults (Edneyville Series) and loamy, mixed, mesic Lithic Dystrochrepts (Cleveland Series); and the soils along with the middle and lower slope positions are coarse-loamy to a loamy-skeletal, mixed, mesic Typic Haplumbrepts (Cullasaja Series) (Thomas, 1996). Mean annual temperature is 10.4°C and mean annual precipitation is 1900 mm (Swift, unpublished data).

The Wayah Ranger District, Nantahala National Forest, North Carolina prescribed burned the approximately 300 ha study area in April 1995. The fire was ignited by helicopter at the bottom of the south-facing slope near the stream and created a mosaic of fire intensities, ranging from lightly burned ( $<80^{\circ}\text{C}$ ) at the low slope to heavily burned ( $>800^{\circ}\text{C}$ ) along upper slopes and ridges (Vose et al., in review). On the ridge, the stand-replacing fire consumed understory vegetation and ignited the crowns in areas of highest fire intensity.

## 2.2. Experimental design

In July 1994, twelve 15 m x 15 m plots were established along three parallel transects from the top of the ridge to the stream. Along each transect, three plots were located at about 80 m from the stream (low slope), three plots were located at about 140 m from the low-slope plots (mid slope), and six plots were located along the upper slope to ridge top at about 140 m from the mid-slope plots (ridge). Plot locations corresponded to three community-types: mesic, near-riparian cove (low slope); dry, mixed-oak (mid slope); and xeric, pine/hardwood (ridge). In March 1995, an additional twenty 10 m x 10 m plots (six low slope, six mid slope, and eight ridge) were established along four parallel transects from the ridge to the stream. The 20 added plots and the 12 original plots were analyzed together as one population because plots were added to increase sample size and increase spatial coverage of the burned area.

## 2.3. Overstory and understory sampling

All plots were sampled at the time of plot establishment (i.e. July 1994 for the original plots and March 1995 for the additional plots) before the prescribed burn, and in July 1995 and July 1996 after the burn. Vegetation was measured by layer: the overstory layer included all trees  $\geq 5.0$  cm diameter at breast height (dbh, 1.37 m above ground); the understory layer included all woody stems  $< 5.0$  cm dbh and  $\geq 1.0$  cm basal diameter; the herb-layer included woody stems  $< 1.0$  cm basal diameter and all herbaceous species. Woody stems with  $< 1.0$  cm basal diameter were counted as seedlings regardless of the mode of reproduction (i.e. seedling or sprout origin).

Diameter of all overstory trees was measured to the nearest 0.1 cm and recorded by species in every plot. In the original plots, the understory layer was measured in the entire 15 m x 15 m plot, with the exception of clonal shrubs (e.g. *Kalmialatifolia* and *Rhododendron calendulaceum*) which were measured in a 3.75 m x 3.75 m subplot in the southwest corner of each 15 m x 15 m plot. In the added plots, the understory layer (including *K. latifolia*, *Rhododendron maximum*, and *R. calendulaceum*) was measured in a 3.0 m x 3.0 m subplot located in the southwest corner of each 10 m x 10 m plot. In the understory layer, basal diameter of trees and shrubs was measured to the nearest 0.1 cm and recorded by species.

## 2.4. Herb-layer sampling

Only the original six ridge plots were used in the analyses to compare pre-burn 1994 to post-burn 1995 and 1996. Although all original plots were sampled for herb-layer species in pre-burn 1994 and resampled in 1995, only the six ridge plots were resampled in 1996. Since the herb-layer quadrats of the additional plots were only measured in 1995 and 1996, they were not used to compare pre-burn and post-burn herb-layer response. Percent cover of herb-layer species was estimated visually by cover classes in six 1.0 m<sup>2</sup> quadrats placed in the corners and at the midpoint of the eastern and western sides of each 15 m x 15 m plot. The seven cover classes used were: R (0–0.5%), 1 (0.5–1%), 2 (1–3%), 3 (3–15%), 4 (15–33%), 5 (34–66%), and 6 ( $>66\%$ ). Midpoint values of each cover class were used in the analyses to compare pre-burn and post-burn effects.

Tree seedling abundance was estimated for all the original and additional plots. Tree seedlings were counted in each 1.0 m<sup>2</sup> quadrat of the original plots and in the 3.0 m x 3.0 m subplots of the additional plots. All species nomenclature follows Radford et al. (1968).

## 2.5. Data analysis

We used several indices – species richness (S), Shannon-Weiner's index of diversity ( $H'$ ), and Pielou (1966) evenness index ( $J'$ ) – to evaluate the change in vegetation diversity pre-burn 1994 to post-burn 1995 and 1996. Shannon-Weiner's index is a simple quan-

titative expression that incorporates both species richness and the evenness of species abundance. Since the calculated value of  $H'$  alone fails to show the degree that each factor contributes to diversity, we calculated a separate measure of species evenness ( $J'$ ). Species diversity was calculated as:  $H' = -\sum p_i \ln(p_i)$ , where  $p_i$  = proportion of total abundance of species  $i$ , with abundance of woody species = stem density (stems  $\text{ha}^{-1}$ ) or basal area ( $\text{m}^2 \text{ha}^{-1}$ ); and abundance of herbaceous species = percent cover. Species evenness was calculated as:  $J' = H' / H'_{\max}$ , where  $H'_{\max}$  = maximum level of diversity possible within a given population =  $\ln(S)$ . We used pairwise  $t$ -tests (Magurran, 1988) to examine the differences in  $H'$  between sampling years 1994–1996.

### 3. Results

#### 3.1. Overstory

On the ridge, *Pinus rigida*, *Quercus prinus*, and *Quercus coccinea* were the most abundant species in the overstory, comprising 64% of the density and 74% of the basal area in 1994 (Table 1). After burning, these three species continued to dominate the overstory stratum with 70% of the density and 61% of the basal area. Mortality ranged between 18.5% and 30.6% (Table 2). High mortality significantly reduced overall overstory density and basal area after the fire. Species richness ( $S$ ), density-based  $H'$ , and basal area-based  $H'$  significantly decreased after the fire.

On the mid slope and low slope, no significant differences in overall average overstory density or basal area were found between pre- and post-burn sampling dates (Table 1). In addition, no differences in species richness ( $S$ ), density-based  $H'$ , or basal area-based  $H'$  were detected on the mid-slope or low-slope positions after burning. The fire had little effect on the mid-slope overstory with only 3% mortality and no overstory mortality occurred on the low slope in 1995. No additional mortality occurred on either slope or the ridge between 1995 and 1996.

#### 3.2. Understory

The fire affected the understory layer on the ridge and mid slope much more than on the low slope. On

the ridge, density and basal area significantly decreased after burning (Table 3). In post-burn 1996, density and basal area were significantly higher than post-burn 1995, but remained significantly lower than before burning. In contrast, density-based  $H'$  and basal area-based  $H'$  increased significantly every year.

Density and basal area of *Kalmia latifolia* were dramatically reduced after burning on the ridge and mid-slope positions. However, high clonal densities in 1995 and 1996 show that *K. latifolia* is sprouting prolifically (Table 4). By 1996, *Robinia pseudoacacia*, *Quercus prinus*, and *Quercus coccinea* density had increased on the ridge, while *Quercus rubra* and *Quercus velutina* had not returned to the understory.

On the mid slope, density and basal area were significantly reduced after burning (Table 3). In addition, species richness ( $S$ ) and diversity were significantly lower. *Rhododendron maximum* was the dominant species before burning and had an even greater dominance after the burn because it occurred in plots that were not burned by the fire. *Quercus alba* and *Quercus rubra* were no longer present in the understory layer, and *Quercus prinus* had decreased in abundance.

#### 3.3. Herb layer

On the ridge,  $S$  and  $H'$  increased, while percent cover decreased the first summer after the burn (Table 4). *Kalmia latifolia* percent cover in the herb layer decreased after burning in 1995 and although it increased in 1996, percent cover had not reached before burning levels. Deciduous shrubs, such as *Vaccinium* spp., *Gaylussacia baccata*, *Rhododendron calendulaceum*, and *Clethra acuminata*, increased after the burn. Grasses, *Andropogon scoparius* and *Panicum* spp., which were not present before the burn were relatively abundant after the burn.

The relative percent cover of growth forms changed after the burn. *Kalmia latifolia*, an evergreen shrub, was substantially reduced after burning, while deciduous shrubs and trees increased in relative percent cover (Fig. 1). Non-woody species (herbs, grasses, and vines) also increased. Before burning, non-woody species accounted for only 6% of the relative cover; by 1996, non-woody species accounted for 22% of the relative cover.

Table 1  
 Frequency (%), density (stems ha<sup>-1</sup>), basal area (m<sup>2</sup> ha<sup>-1</sup>) and importance value (IV, (relative density+relative basal area)/2) of overstorey trees for the three communities in the Wine Spring Creek prescribed burn area; pre-burn 1994 and post-burn 1995

| Species                     | Ridge (n=14)     |                   |                  |                   |                  |                   |                  |                   |
|-----------------------------|------------------|-------------------|------------------|-------------------|------------------|-------------------|------------------|-------------------|
|                             | Frequency        |                   | Density          |                   | Basal area       |                   | IV               |                   |
|                             | Pre-burn<br>1994 | Post-burn<br>1995 | Pre-burn<br>1994 | Post-burn<br>1995 | Pre-burn<br>1994 | Post-burn<br>1995 | Pre-burn<br>1994 | Post-burn<br>1995 |
| <i>Acer rubrum</i>          | 50               | 21                | 108              | 41                | 2.14             | 1.21              | 7.48             | 6.28              |
| <i>Amelanchier arborea</i>  | 43               | 21                | 109              | 70                | 0.97             | 0.67              | 5.33             | 5.55              |
| <i>Carya</i> spp.           | 36               | 21                | 128              | 50                | 1.38             | 0.80              | 6.72             | 4.79              |
| <i>Castanea dentata</i>     | 21               | –                 | 29               | –                 | 0.11             | –                 | 1.14             | 0                 |
| <i>Halesia carolina</i>     | 7                | 7                 | 7                | 7                 | 0.15             | 0.15              | 0.50             | 0.77              |
| <i>Nyssa sylvatica</i>      | 14               | –                 | 29               | –                 | 0.17             | –                 | 1.25             | 0                 |
| <i>Oxydendrum arboreum</i>  | 50               | 50                | 96               | 77                | 1.60             | 1.40              | 6.09             | 7.82              |
| <i>Pinus rigida</i>         | 93               | 78                | 637              | 441               | 12.45            | 9.67              | 43.81            | 49.27             |
| <i>Quercus alba</i>         | 7                | 7                 | 7                | 7                 | 0.02             | 0.02              | 0.27             | 0.43              |
| <i>Quercus coccinea</i>     | 57               | 36                | 121              | 60                | 2.26             | 1.55              | 8.14             | 7.35              |
| <i>Quercus prinus</i>       | 93               | 64                | 239              | 146               | 5.22             | 3.33              | 17.45            | 16.70             |
| <i>Quercus rubra</i>        | 21               | 14                | 17               | 14                | 0.07             | 0.07              | 0.70             | 0.95              |
| <i>Robinia pseudoacacia</i> | 7                | –                 | 7                | –                 | 0.01             | –                 | 0.26             | 0                 |
| <i>Sassafras albidum</i>    | 7                | –                 | 3                | –                 | 0.01             | –                 | 0.12             | 0                 |
| <i>Tsuga canadensis</i>     | 7                | –                 | 7                | –                 | 0.26             | –                 | 0.72             | 0                 |
| <b>Total</b>                |                  |                   | 1545a            | 913b              | 26.84a           | 18.86b            |                  |                   |
| (SE)                        |                  |                   | (137)            | (163)             | (1.99)           | (3.00)            |                  |                   |
| <i>H'</i>                   |                  |                   | 1.92a            | 1.73b             | 1.68a            | 1.55b             |                  |                   |
| <i>J'</i>                   |                  |                   | 0.71             | 0.75              | 0.62             | 0.67              |                  |                   |
| <i>S</i>                    |                  |                   | 15               | 10                |                  |                   |                  |                   |
|                             | Mid slope (n=9)  |                   |                  |                   |                  |                   |                  |                   |
| <i>Acer rubrum</i>          | 200              | 100               | 626              | 606               | 9.01             | 9.02              | 37.32            | 38.07             |
| <i>Amelanchier arborea</i>  | 33               | 33                | 38               | 38                | 0.27             | 0.27              | 1.79             | 1.88              |
| <i>Betula lenta</i>         | 22               | 22                | 5                | 5                 | 0.03             | 0.03              | 0.22             | 0.24              |
| <i>Carya</i> spp.           | 67               | 67                | 173              | 178               | 2.84             | 2.89              | 10.92            | 11.60             |
| <i>Halesia carolina</i>     | 11               | 11                | 44               | 33                | 0.26             | 0.23              | 1.99             | 1.63              |
| <i>Magnolia acuminata</i>   | 11               | 11                | 5                | 5                 | 0.04             | 0.04              | 0.24             | 0.26              |
| <i>Nyssa sylvatica</i>      | 22               | 22                | 156              | 156               | 0.99             | 0.99              | 7.10             | 7.45              |
| <i>Oxydendrum arboreum</i>  | 67               | 67                | 153              | 137               | 3.16             | 3.11              | 10.80            | 10.50             |
| <i>Quercus coccinea</i>     | 22               | 22                | 38               | 27                | 4.00             | 3.91              | 8.30             | 7.88              |
| <i>Quercus prinus</i>       | 56               | 44                | 99               | 94                | 6.47             | 6.44              | 14.68            | 14.78             |
| <i>Robinia pseudoacacia</i> | 56               | 44                | 89               | 64                | 0.66             | 0.53              | 4.22             | 3.28              |
| <i>Tsuga canadensis</i>     | 22               | 22                | 22               | 22                | 0.94             | 0.94              | 2.41             | 2.47              |
| <b>Total</b>                |                  |                   | 1448a            | 1365a             | 28.69a           | 28.42             |                  |                   |
| (SE)                        |                  |                   | (204)            | (208)             | (4.80)           | (4.85)            |                  |                   |
| <i>H'</i>                   |                  |                   | 1.85a            | 1.81a             | 1.86a            | 1.85a             |                  |                   |
| <i>J'</i>                   |                  |                   | 0.74             | 0.73              | 0.75             | 0.74              |                  |                   |
| <i>S</i>                    |                  |                   | 12               | 12                |                  |                   |                  |                   |
|                             | Low slope (n=9)  |                   |                  |                   |                  |                   |                  |                   |
| <i>Acer pensylvanicum</i>   | 44               | 44                | 64               | 64                | 0.49             | 0.50              | 3.64             | 3.77              |
| <i>Acer rubrum</i>          | 89               | 89                | 333              | 328               | 6.54             | 6.59              | 26.09            | 26.55             |
| <i>Acer saccharum</i>       | 11               | 11                | 5                | 5                 | 0.04             | 0.04              | 0.28             | 0.30              |
| <i>Amelanchier arborea</i>  | 44               | 33                | 47               | 37                | 0.28             | 0.24              | 2.52             | 2.10              |
| <i>Carya</i> spp.           | 78               | 78                | 186              | 167               | 6.64             | 6.62              | 19.97            | 19.35             |
| <i>Castanea dentata</i>     | 11               | 11                | 11               | 11                | 0.001            | 0.001             | 0.48             | 0.50              |
| <i>Halesia Carolina</i>     | 22               | 11                | 44               | 15                | 0.13             | 0.05              | 2.14             | 0.76              |

Table 1 (Continued)

| Species                        | Ridge (n=14) |          |         |          |            |          |         |          |
|--------------------------------|--------------|----------|---------|----------|------------|----------|---------|----------|
|                                | Frequency    |          | Density |          | Basal area |          | IV      |          |
|                                | Pm-bum       | Post-bum | Pm-bum  | Post-bum | Pm-bum     | Post-bum | Pre-bum | Post-bum |
|                                | 1994         | 1995     | 1994    | 1995     | 1994       | 1995     | 1994    | 1995     |
| <i>Hamamelis virginiana</i>    | 11           | 11       | 11      | 11       | 0.02       | 0.02     | 0.52    | 0.54     |
| <i>Liriodendron tulipifera</i> | 22           | 22       | 15      | 15       | 0.48       | 0.51     | 1.49    | 1.58     |
| <i>Magnolia acuminata</i>      | 11           | 11       | 30      | 39       | 0.16       | 0.18     | 1.57    | 2.09     |
| <i>Nyssa sylvatica</i>         | 11           | 11       | 22      | 22       | 0.07       | 0.07     | 1.08    | 1.12     |
| <i>Oxydendrum arboreum</i>     | 11           | 11       | 22      | 22       | 0.78       | 0.78     | 2.37    | 2.41     |
| <i>Quercus alba</i>            | 22           | 22       | 36      | 36       | 2.88       | 2.90     | 6.73    | 6.82     |
| <i>Quercus coccinea</i>        | 33           | 33       | 21      | 21       | 3.12       | 3.16     | 6.54    | 6.62     |
| <i>Quercus prinus</i>          | 33           | 33       | 32      | 32       | 0.63       | 0.62     | 2.51    | 2.56     |
| <i>Quercus rubra</i>           | 33           | 33       | 21      | 21       | 0.61       | 0.63     | 2.01    | 2.07     |
| <i>Robinia pseudoacacia</i>    | 22           | 22       | 22      | 22       | 0.94       | 0.94     | 2.65    | 2.68     |
| <i>Sassafras albidum</i>       | 11           | 11       | 5       | 5        | 0.07       | 0.07     | 0.34    | 0.35     |
| <i>Tsuga canadensis</i>        | 89           | 89       | 238     | 243      | 3.80       | 3.87     | 17.08   | 17.85    |
| Total                          |              |          | 1167a   | 1117a    | 27.72a     | 27.82a   |         |          |
| (SE)                           |              |          | (104)   | (113)    | (4.25)     | (4.24)   |         |          |
| H'                             |              |          | 2.25a   | 2.26a    | 2.11a      | 2.13a    |         |          |
| J'                             |              |          | 0.76    | 0.77     | 0.72       | 0.72     |         |          |
| S                              |              |          | 19      | 19       |            |          |         |          |

Values in rows followed by different letters are significantly different between years.

(SE)=standard error.

H'=Shannon's index of diversity.

J'=Pielou's evenness index.

S=species richness.

Table 2

Average percent mortality, standard error (SE), and coefficient of variation (CV) of overstory species for the ridge, pine/hardwood community in the Wine Spring Creek prescribed bum area; post-bum 1995

| Species                    | n <sup>a</sup> | Mortality (%) | SE   | cv (%) |
|----------------------------|----------------|---------------|------|--------|
| <i>Pinus rigida</i>        | 12             | 18.5          | 8.6  | 161    |
| <i>Quercus prinus</i>      | 12             | 30.6          | 13.3 | 150    |
| <i>Quercus coccinea</i>    | 8              | 29.2          | 16.0 | 155    |
| <i>Amelanchier arborea</i> | 4              | 25.0          | 25.0 | 200    |
| <i>Carya</i> spp.          | 5              | 57.5          | 17.5 | 68     |
| <i>Castanea dentata</i>    | 3              | 100.0         | 0.0  | 0      |
| <i>Acer rubrum</i>         | 7              | 42.8          | 20.2 | 125    |
| Total                      | 14             | 31.2          | 10.3 | 124    |

<sup>a</sup>n=number of plots; percent mortality of individual species was calculated based on number of plots where that species occurred before the bum.

### 3.4. Tree seedling regeneration

Total number of tree seedlings increased after the bum at all slope positions (Fig. 2). By summer 1996, the number of seedlings had declined from the previous year at all slope positions because new germi-

nants died or fast-growing sprouts entered the understorey stratum. The response of individual tree species to fire was variable. For example, on the ridge, *Quercus coccinea* was the only species to significantly increase (p=0.023) in number every year from pre-bum through post-bum 1995 and 1996. *Pinus rigida* seed-



Table 3  
Frequency (%), density (stems ha<sup>-1</sup>), and average basal area (m<sup>2</sup> ha<sup>-1</sup>) of understory species ( $\geq 1.0$  cm basal diameter,  $<5.0$  cm dbh) for the three communities in the Wine Spring Creek prescribed burn area; pre-burn 1994 and post-burn 1995, 1996.

| Species                           | Ridge (n=14)    |           |           |           |            |           |            |           |           |
|-----------------------------------|-----------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|------------|-----------|------------|-----------|-----------|
|                                   | Frequency       |           |           | Density   |            |           | Basal area |           |           |
|                                   | Pre-burn        | Post-burn | Post-burn | Pre-burn  | Post-burn  | Post-burn | Pre-burn   | Post-burn | Post-burn |
|                                   | 1994            | 1995      | 1996      | 1994      | 1995       | 1996      | 1994       | 1995      | 1996      |
| <i>Acer rubrum</i>                | 43              | 14        | 14        | 168       | 13         | 82        | 0.045      | 0.010     | 0.011     |
| <i>Amelanchier arborea</i>        | 36              | 7         | 7         | 76a       | 6b         | 3b        | 0.027      | 0.008     | 0.001     |
| <i>Betula lenta</i>               | –               | –         | 7         | –         | –          | 79        | –          | –         | 0.006     |
| <i>Carya</i> spp.                 | 14              | –         | 14        | 82        | –          | 161       | 0.022      | –         | 0.025     |
| <i>Castanea dentata</i>           | 21              | –         | 21        | 952       | –          | 413       | 0.536      | –         | 0.184     |
| <i>Kalmia latifolia</i>           | 100             | 21        | 14        | 8651a     | 248b       | 168b      | 4.974a     | 0.127b    | 0.403b    |
| <i>Oxydendrum arboreum</i>        | 1               | –         | 14        | 10        | 10         | 29        | 0.001      | 0.001     | 0.004     |
| <i>Pinus rigida</i>               | 21              | –         | 7         | 165       | –          | 317       | 0.212      | –         | 0.035     |
| <i>Quercus alba</i>               | 28              | –         | –         | 397       | –          | –         | 0.096      | –         | –         |
| <i>Quercus coccinea</i>           | 50              | 7         | 50        | 295b      | 6c         | 1997a     | 0.078b     | 0.008b    | 0.222a    |
| <i>Quercus prinus</i>             | 50              | 14        | 21        | 505b      | 25c        | 720a      | 0.244      | 0.024     | 0.097     |
| <i>Quercus rubra</i>              | 36              | –         | –         | 368a      | 19b        | –         | 0.187      | 0.002     | –         |
| <i>Quercus velutina</i>           | 36              | –         | –         | 19        | –          | –         | 0.010      | –         | –         |
| <i>Rhododendron calendulaceum</i> | 7               | –         | 7         | 159a      | –          | 19b       | 0.038      | –         | 0.002     |
| <i>Robinia pseudoacacia</i>       | 14              | –         | 28        | 10b       | –          | 813a      | 0.002      | –         | 0.119     |
| <i>Sassafras albidum</i>          | 36              | 7         | 36        | 321b      | 82c        | 571a      | 0.050      | 0.191     | 0.102     |
| <i>Vaccinium stamineum</i>        | –               | –         | 7         | –         | –          | 317       | –          | –         | 0.025     |
| Total                             |                 |           |           | 12,178a   | 409c       | 5692b     | 6522a      | 0.371c    | 1.236b    |
| (SE)                              |                 |           |           | (3198)    | (189)      | (2205)    | (2.20)     | (0.199)   | (0.482)   |
| H'                                |                 |           |           | 1.24b     | 1.27b      | 2.03a     | 1.02c      | 1.19b     | 1.95a     |
| J'                                |                 |           |           | 0.46      | 0.61       | 0.77      | 0.38       | 0.57      | 0.74      |
| S                                 |                 |           |           | 15        | 8          | 14        |            |           |           |
|                                   | Mid slope (n=9) |           |           |           |            |           |            |           |           |
|                                   | Frequency       |           | Density   |           | Basal area |           |            |           |           |
|                                   | Pre-burn        | Post-burn | Pre-burn  | Post-burn | Pre-burn   | Post-burn |            |           |           |
|                                   | 1994            | 1995      | 1994      | 1995      | 1994       | 1995      |            |           |           |
| <i>Acer rubrum</i>                | 56              | 22        | 326a      | 15b       | 0.494a     | 0.019b    |            |           |           |
| <i>Carya</i> spp.                 | 11              | –         | 5         | –         | 0.006      | –         |            |           |           |
| <i>Castanea dentata</i>           | 44              | 11        | 573a      | 20b       | 0.127a     | 0.002b    |            |           |           |
| <i>Halesia Carolina</i>           | 22              | –         | 494       | –         | 0.064      | –         |            |           |           |
| <i>Kalmia latifolia</i>           | 67              | 11        | 4691a     | 123b      | 4.497a     | 0.422b    |            |           |           |
| <i>Magnolia acuminata</i>         | 11              | –         | 123       | –         | 0.019      | –         |            |           |           |
| <i>Nyssa sylvatica</i>            | 11              | 11        | 123a      | 10b       | 0.012a     | 0.012a    |            |           |           |
| <i>Oxydendrum arboreum</i>        | 22              | 11        | 138a      | 25b       | 0.015a     | 0.002b    |            |           |           |
| <i>Pyrularia pubera</i>           | 11              | –         | 123       | –         | 0.047      | –         |            |           |           |
| <i>Quercus alba</i>               | 22              | –         | 247       | –         | 0.020      | –         |            |           |           |
| <i>Quercus prinus</i>             | 11              | 11        | 25        | 5         | 0.012      | <0.001    |            |           |           |
| <i>Quercus rubra</i>              | 22              | –         | 20        | –         | 0.010      | –         |            |           |           |
| <i>Rhododendron maximum</i>       | 22              | 11        | 1605a     | 1358a     | 7.231a     | 7.789a    |            |           |           |
| <i>Robinia pseudoacacia</i>       | 11              | –         | 15        | –         | 0.008      | –         |            |           |           |
| <i>Tsuga canadensis</i>           | 11              | –         | 10        | –         | 0.002      | –         |            |           |           |
| Total                             |                 |           | 851a      | 1556b     | 12.56a     | 8.25b     |            |           |           |
| (SE)                              |                 |           | (2929)    | (1473)    | (7.79)     | (8.21)    |            |           |           |
| H'                                |                 |           | 1.52a     | 0.54b     | 0.96a      | 0.23b     |            |           |           |
| J'                                |                 |           | 0.56      | 0.39      | 0.35       | 0.17      |            |           |           |
| S                                 |                 |           | 15        | 7         |            |           |            |           |           |

Table 3 (Continued)

| Species                           | Ridge (n=14)      |                   |                   |                  |                   |                   |                  |                   |                   |
|-----------------------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|------------------|-------------------|-------------------|------------------|-------------------|-------------------|
|                                   | Frequency         |                   |                   | Density          |                   |                   | Basal area       |                   |                   |
|                                   | Pre-burn<br>1994  | Post-burn<br>1995 | Post-burn<br>1996 | Pre-burn<br>1994 | Post-burn<br>1995 | Post-burn<br>1996 | Pre-burn<br>1994 | Post-burn<br>1995 | Post-burn<br>1996 |
|                                   | Low slope (n=9)   |                   |                   |                  |                   |                   |                  |                   |                   |
| Frequency                         |                   |                   | Density           |                  |                   | Basal area        |                  |                   |                   |
| Pre-burn<br>1994                  | Post-burn<br>1995 | Pre-burn<br>1994  | Post-burn<br>1995 | Pre-burn<br>1994 | Post-burn<br>1995 |                   |                  |                   |                   |
| <i>Acer pensylvanicum</i>         | 22                | 22                | 133               | 153              | 0.018             | 0.026             |                  |                   |                   |
| <i>Acer rubrum</i>                | 22                | 22                | 30                | 44               | 0.010             | 0.021             |                  |                   |                   |
| <i>Acer saccharum</i>             | 33                | 33                | 138               | 158              | 0.026             | 0.032             |                  |                   |                   |
| <i>Amelanchier arborea</i>        | 33                | 22                | 30                | 54               | 0.016             | 0.037             |                  |                   |                   |
| <i>Betula lenta</i>               | 11                | 11                | 5                 | 10               | <0.001            | <0.001            |                  |                   |                   |
| <i>Carya</i> spp.                 | 11                | 11                | 40                | 10               | 0.006             | 0.007             |                  |                   |                   |
| <i>Castanea dentata</i>           | 33                | 44                | 138               | 592              | 0.044             | 0.115             |                  |                   |                   |
| <i>Crataegus</i> spp.             | –                 | 11                | –                 | 123              | –                 | 0.014             |                  |                   |                   |
| <i>Fraxinus americana</i>         | 11                | 22                | 15                | 79               | 0.005             | 0.017             |                  |                   |                   |
| <i>Halesia carolina</i>           | 33                | 33                | 59                | 138              | 0.022             | 0.031             |                  |                   |                   |
| <i>Liriodendron tulipifera</i>    | 22                | 33                | 69                | 118              | 0.011             | 0.020             |                  |                   |                   |
| <i>Magnolia acuminata</i>         | 33                | 44                | 207               | 301              | 0.056             | 0.074             |                  |                   |                   |
| <i>Magnolia fraseri</i>           | 11                | –                 | 5                 | –                | <0.001            | –                 |                  |                   |                   |
| <i>Oxydendrum arboreum</i>        | 11                | 11                | 5                 | 10               | 0.002             | <0.001            |                  |                   |                   |
| <i>Pyrolaria pubera</i>           | 11                | 33                | 123               | 370              | 0.051             | 0.135             |                  |                   |                   |
| <i>Quercus alba</i>               | 22                | 11                | 10                | 34               | 0.001             | 0.003             |                  |                   |                   |
| <i>Quercus prinus</i>             | 11                | –                 | 5                 | –                | <0.001            | –                 |                  |                   |                   |
| <i>Quercus rubra</i>              | 22                | 22                | 133               | 64               | 0.026             | 0.005             |                  |                   |                   |
| <i>Rhododendron calendulaceum</i> | 11                | 11                | 864               | 370              | 0.320             | 0.200             |                  |                   |                   |
| <i>Tsuga canadensis</i>           | 22                | 22                | 143               | 20               | 0.400             | 0.019             |                  |                   |                   |
| Total                             |                   |                   | 2153a             | 2652a            | 1.015a            | 0.758a            |                  |                   |                   |
| (SE)                              |                   |                   | (899)             | (694)            | (0.470)           | (0.262)           |                  |                   |                   |
| H'                                |                   |                   | 2.15a             | 2.40a            | 1.76a             | 2.26a             |                  |                   |                   |
| J'                                |                   |                   | 0.73              | 0.83             | 0.60              | 0.78              |                  |                   |                   |
| S                                 |                   |                   | 19                | 18               |                   |                   |                  |                   |                   |

Values in rows followed by different letters are significantly different ( $p \leq 0.05$ ) between years.

(SE)=standard error.

H'=Shannon's index of diversity.

J'=Pielou's evenness index.

S=species richness.

In 1996, only six plots from the mid slope and six plots from the low-slope position were sampled, thus, diversity indices (H' and J') were not calculated for 1996.

ling numbers increased by 358% the first summer after the bum, then decreased to 35% of the pre-bum number by 1996. *Amelanchier arborea* seedling numbers decreased by 290% the first summer after the bum and an additional 350% the second summer (1996).

On the mid slope, only a small or temporary increase in *Quercus* seedlings was noted after burning

(Fig. 2). *Acer rubrum*, *Halesia Carolina* and *Robinia pseudoacacia* seedlings, not present before the bum, were abundant after the bum. On the low slope, *Quercus prinus*, *Acer rubrum*, and *Quercus rubra* seedlings, not present before the bum, were abundant, and *Acer saccharum* and *Magnolia acuminata* numbers increased (Fig. 2).

Table 4

Percent cover (%) and relative percent cover (%) of herb-layer species for the ridge, pine/hardwood community in the Wine Spring Creek prescribed burn area; pre-burn 1994 and post-burn 1995, 1996

| Growth form                                   | 1994          |                | 1995          |                | 1996          |                |
|---|---------------|----------------|---------------|----------------|---------------|----------------|
|   | Cover         | Relative cover | Cover         | Relative cover | Cover         | Relative cover |
| <i>Deciduous trees</i>                        |               |                |               |                |               |                |
| <i>Acer rubrum</i>                            | 0.25          | 0.7            | 0.08          | 0.8            | 1.17          | 3.1            |
| <i>Quercus prinus</i>                         | 0.25          | 0.7            | 0.10          | 0.9            | 1.29          | 3.4            |
| <i>Sassafras albidum</i>                      | 0.10          | 0.3            | 0.25          | 2.4            | 2.88          | 7.6            |
| <i>Quercus coccinea</i>                       | 0.08          | 0.2            | 0.03          | 0.3            | 0.21          | 0.6            |
| <i>Quercus rubra</i>                          | 0.08          | 0.2            | 0.08          | 0.8            | 0.25          | 0.7            |
| <i>Amelanchier arborea</i>                    | 0.06          | 0.2            | 0.08          | 0.8            | 0.08          | 0.2            |
| <i>Quercus velutina</i>                       | 0.06          | 0.2            | 0.08          | 0.8            | –             | –              |
| <i>Quercus alba</i>                           | 0.03          | 0.2            | –             | –              | –             | –              |
| <i>Oxydendron arboreum</i>                    | 0.02          | 0.05           | 0.05          | 0.5            | –             | –              |
| <i>Robinia pseudoacacia</i>                   | 0.02          | 0.05           | 0.05          | 0.5            | –             | –              |
| <i>Castanea dentata</i>                       | –             | –              | 0.07          | 0.6            | –             | –              |
| <i>Evergreen trees</i>                        |               |                |               |                |               |                |
| <i>Pinus rigida</i>                           | 0.10          | 0.3            | 0.08          | 0.8            | –             | –              |
| <i>Deciduous shrubs</i>                       |               |                |               |                |               |                |
| <i>Vaccinium</i> spp.                         | 2.28          | 6.4            | 2.28          | 21.6           | 5.17          | 13.7           |
| <i>Gaylussacia baccata</i>                    | 1.03          | 2.9            | 1.88          | 17.8           | 0.96          | 2.5            |
| <i>Rubus</i> spp.                             | –             | –              | –             | –              | 0.12          | 0.3            |
| <i>Pyrolaria pubera</i>                       | 0.18          | 0.5            | 0.08          | 0.8            | 0.67          | 1.8            |
| <i>Clethra acuminata</i>                      | 0.07          | 0.2            | 0.03          | 0.3            | 0.96          | 2.5            |
| <i>Rhododendron calendulaceum</i>             | 0.02          | 0.05           | 0.25          | 2.4            | 1.46          | 3.9            |
| <i>Rhus glabra</i>                            | –             | –              | 0.03          | 0.3            | –             | –              |
| <i>Evergreen shrubs</i>                       |               |                |               |                |               |                |
| <i>Kalmia latifolia</i> (clonal density=#/ha) | 28.0          | 78.7           | 3.67 (11,307) | 34.6           | 11.4 (9,285)  | 30.4           |
| <i>Herbs</i>                                  |               |                |               |                |               |                |
| <i>Epigea repens</i>                          | 0.55          | 1.5            | 0.10          | 0.9            | 0.33          | 0.9            |
| <i>Galax aphylla</i>                          | 0.40          | 1.1            | 0.10          | 0.9            | 0.92          | 2.4            |
| <i>Melampyrum lineare</i>                     | 0.22          | 0.6            | 0.02          | 0.2            | 1.17          | 3.1            |
| <i>Medeola virginiana</i>                     | 0.02          | 0.05           | –             | –              | 0.12          | 0.3            |
| <i>Solidago</i> spp.                          | 0.02          | 0.05           | –             | –              | –             | –              |
| <i>Galium</i> spp.                            | –             | –              | 0.13          | 1.2            | 1.33          | 3.5            |
| <i>Pteridium aquilinum</i>                    | –             | –              | 0.10          | 0.9            | 0.42          | 1.1            |
| <i>Coreopsis major</i>                        | –             | –              | 0.05          | 0.5            | –             | –              |
| <i>Hypoxis hirta</i>                          | –             | –              | 0.05          | 0.5            | –             | –              |
| <i>Uvularia</i> spp.                          | –             | –              | 0.03          | 0.3            | –             | –              |
| <i>Saxifraga michauxii</i>                    | –             | –              | 0.02          | 0.2            | 0.29          | 0.8            |
| <i>Thelypteris noveboracensis</i>             | –             | –              | 0.02          | 0.2            | –             | –              |
| <i>Froelichia floridana</i>                   | –             | –              | –             | –              | 0.12          | 0.3            |
| <i>Graminoids</i>                             |               |                |               |                |               |                |
| <i>Carex</i> spp.                             | 1.08          | 3.0            | 0.10          | 0.1            | –             | –              |
| <i>Andropogon scoparius</i>                   | –             | –              | 0.23          | 2.2            | 0.54          | 1.4            |
| <i>Panicum</i> spp.                           | –             | –              | –             | –              | 2.75          | 7.3            |
| <i>Vines</i>                                  |               |                |               |                |               |                |
| <i>Smilax</i> spp.                            | 0.63          | 1.8            | 0.40          | 3.8            | 2.71          | 7.2            |
| <b>Total</b>                                  | <b>35.6%a</b> |                | <b>10.6%b</b> |                | <b>37.7%a</b> |                |
| <i>H'</i>                                     | 1.01a         |                | 2.14b         |                | 2.50c         |                |
| <i>J</i>                                      | 0.32          |                | 0.61          |                | 0.77          |                |
| <i>S</i>                                      | 24            |                | 33            |                | 26            |                |

Values in rows followed by different letters are significantly different ( $p < 0.05$ ) between years.




Fig. 1. Relative percent cover by growth form for the herb-layer vegetation on the ridge, pre-burn 1994 and post-burn 1995 and 1996. Trees=seedlings and saplings <1.0 m height; Deciduous shrubs=shrubs that produce fleshy berries (i.e. *Vaccinium* and *Gaylussacia*) or nuts (i.e. *Pyrolaria pubera*); Evergreen shrubs=*Kalmia latifolia*; Total woody=all woody species; Herbs=herbaceous species not including grasses and vines; Total non-woody=herbs+grasses+vines; Total Cover=right axis, average percent cover of all species.

## 4. Discussion

### 4.1. Overstory responses

Before the prescribed burn at Wine Spring Creek in 1995, the degraded condition of the pine/hardwood community was characteristic of other pine/hardwood forests in the southern Appalachians (van Lear and Johnson, 1983; Nicholas and White, 1984; Smith, 1991; Swift et al., 1993; Clinton et al., 1993). Overstory mortality was the heaviest on the ridge and was related to the fire intensity. We observed 31% mortality of trees the first summer after burning and no additional overstory mortality the second year after the fire. This observation is somewhat consistent with wildfire effects in a pine/hardwood forest in West Virginia where overstory mortality was 20% after the first year and 40% after the second year (Groeschl et al., 1992).

Other studies have reported understory dominance by shade-tolerant *Acer rubrum*, which in the absence

of disturbance eventually replace *Quercus* species (Christensen, 1977). In the southern Appalachians, an increase in abundance of *A. rubrum* over the last two decades has been reported (Elliott et al., in review), and it has become a dominant species occurring across a wide range of elevation and environmental conditions. In our study, *A. rubrum*, a dominant species on the ridge before the burn, suffered heavier mortality than any other overstory species, and it was also substantially reduced in the understory layer. Conversely, *Quercus prinus* and *Quercus coccinea* had less overstory mortality, *Q. prinus* increased in importance value (IV=relative density+relative basal area/2), and both oak species increased in density in the understory and herb layer. The fire reduced the abundance of *A. rubrum*, while promoting the growth and recruitment of *Quercus* species.

On the ridge, overstory  $H'$  decreased after the burn due to the decline in species richness (S) rather than a change in evenness ( $J'$ ) of distribution of species. Four overstory species disappeared from the overstory after




Fig. 2. Tree seedling densities pre-burn 1994, and post-burn 1995 and 1996. (a) ridge, pine/hardwood community; (b) mid slope, mixed-oak community; and (c) low slope, near-riparian cove-hardwood community. ACERUB=*Acer rubrum*; ACESAC=*Acer saccharum*; AMEARB=*Amelanchier arborea*; CARYA=*Carya* s p p . ; HALCAR=*Halesia carolina*; MAGACU=*Magnolia acuminata*; OXYARB=*Oxydendrum arboreum*; QUEPRI=*Quercus prinus*; QUERUB=*Quercus rubra*; QUECOC=*Quercus coccinia*; QUEVEL=*Quercus velutina*; ROBPSE=*Robinia pseudoacacia*; PINRIG=*Pinus rigida*; SASALB=*Sassafras albidum*.

the burn (*Castanea dentata*, *Nyssa sylvatica*, *Robinia pseudoacacia*, and *Tsuga cacaadensis*). All were minor components of the ridge community pre-burn; with the exception of *T. canadensis*, all are regenerating in the understory or herb layer. On the mid and low slope, where fire intensity was moderate to light, no change in overstory composition or diversity was observed.

#### 4.2. Understory responses

On the ridge and mid slope, the increase in density and basal area of *Oxydendrum arboreum*, *Quercus coccinea*, *Robinia pseudoacacia*, and *Sassafras albidum* saplings after the burn corresponded to the substantial decrease in *Kalmia latifolia*. Consequently,  $H'$  and  $J'$  were significantly higher on the ridge because *K. latifolia* dominated this vegetation layer before the burn. The reduction of *K. latifolia* in the understory may be sufficient to allow regeneration of pine and oaks on the ridge and mid-slope communities. However, it is sprouting prolifically and may compete with other herb-layer species. *K. latifolia* is a vigorous sprouter that produces many stems (McGinty, 1972), but the growth of these stems is much slower than many woody seedlings (Hooper, 1969; McGee et al., 1995). The high number of *K. latifolia* clones that survived the fire suggests that it may regain its dominance in the understory stratum in a few years. Clinton et al. (1993) found that even after high intensity burning, *K. latifolia* reasserts its influence on microsite conditions at the forest floor within a few years and reduces the number of tree stems reaching the overstory. However, the early reduction in *K. latifolia* abundance allowed successful establishment of native pines (Clinton et al., 1993).

The mortality and regeneration of oak saplings were variable depending on species and intensity of the burn. For example, *Quercus alba*, *Quercus velutina*, *Quercus rubra* saplings suffered heavy mortality and have not reentered the understory-layer. While *Quercus coccinea* and *Quercus prinus* suffered heavy mortality in the overstory; saplings were more abundant in the understory and the number of *Q. coccinea* seedlings was significantly greater post-burn than pre-burn.

#### 4.3. Herb-layer responses

On the ridge, *Kalmia latifolia* percent cover was substantially reduced and  $H'$  increased. Total percent

cover decreased the first summer after the burn, then returned to pre-burn levels. However, the greater numbers of deciduous shrubs (e.g. *Vaccinium* spp. and *Gaylussacia baccata*) and grasses (e.g. *Panicum* spp. and *Andropogon scoparius*) after the fire provide soft mast and forage for wildlife. In general, non-woody species increased in relative percent cover while woody species decreased after the fire. In addition, deciduous species increased while evergreen species (i.e. *K. latifolia*) decreased.

#### 4.4. Tree regeneration

Regeneration of *Pinus rigida* may not occur at Wine Spring Creek without further disturbance. Although seedling numbers increased the first year after the burn, fewer seedlings were present in 1996 than were present before the burn. Fire is sometimes necessary to open the serotinous cones of *P. rigida* and most southern populations exhibit extensive stump sprouting after a fire (Ledig and Little, 1979). In our study, new germinants of *P. rigida* were abundant in the first summer after the burn. In a seed-bank study, viable *P. rigida* seeds were not present in pre-burn litter or mineral soil (Major, 1996), indicating that cones had opened and deposited viable seeds after the fire. However, most of these new germinants were not able to survive through the first year. After the burn, overstory basal area was reduced by only 30%; thus, the residual basal area ( $18.86 \text{ m}^2 \text{ ha}^{-1}$ ) may have been too high for many of the shade intolerant *P. rigida* seedlings to become established. In addition, burning consumed little of the humus layer on the ridge (Vose et al., in review) and roots of many germinants probably did not penetrate to mineral soil. Seedling mortality was high during the late growing season of 1995 when precipitation totaled only 6.6 cm in September – well below the long-term average of 13.0 cm for this month (based on a 63-year record at Coweeta Hydrologic Laboratory; Swift, unpublished data).

For other species, the regeneration response to fire was also linked to individual tree species and fire intensity. On the ridge, *Quercus coccinea* was the only species to significantly increase in seedling numbers every year from 1994 to 1996. However, the regeneration success of other species was greater than that shown by total seedling numbers alone. Before the burn, *Amelanchier arborea*, a shade-tolerant under-

story tree (Brown and Kirkman, 1990), accounted for over one-half the total number of seedlings (Fig. 2). After the fire, *A. arborea* seedling numbers decreased dramatically, while total number of seedlings increased. *Quercus* species seedling numbers increased significantly ( $p=0.013$ ) after the burn. With the exclusion of *A. arborea* from the data analysis, a significant increase ( $p=0.003$ ) in total seedling numbers was observed (7778 for 1994; 26,786 for 1995; and 19,603 for 1996).

#### 4.5. Restoration and recovery

Other studies have attributed community composition after a fire to the sprouting ability of dominant species, the failure of subordinate species to increase in numbers, and the failure of invasive species to persist (Abrahamson, 1984; Schmalzer and Hinkle, 1992; Matlack et al., 1993; McGee et al., 1995). In our study, all woody species sprouted, but increases in sprout densities among species varied. *Quercus* species, *Carya* spp., *Robinia pseudoacacia*, and *Sassafras albidum*, subordinate species in the understory before the burn, increased in numbers. *Kalmia latifolia*, the dominant species before the burn, decreased in density and basal area in the understory, but is sprouting prolifically in the herb layer. Invasive species such as *Andropogon scoparius*, *Panicum* spp., *Rubus* spp., and *Coreopsis major* that recruited into the herb layer are all early successional, shade-intolerant species which persist for only a few years after disturbance (Elliott et al., 1997).

A number of researchers have suggested that repeated burning may be necessary to promote successful oak regeneration (Johnson, 1985; van Lear and Waldrop, 1989; Lorimer, 1993; van Lear and Watt, 1993). van Lear and Waldrop (1989) reported that oaks resprouted more frequently than most other hardwood species after burning. Similar to other studies on the effects of fire on the understory (Langdon, 1981; Ducey et al., 1996; Keyser et al., 1996), we found that burning stimulated production of berries (*Gaylussacia baccata*, *Rubus* spp. and *Vaccinium* spp.) and grasses, both are important forage species for wildlife. The effect of intense fire on oak regeneration has received less attention and intense fires have produced the most dramatic results (Ward and Stephens, 1989; Nowacki et al., 1990).

## 5. Summary and conclusions

The effects of the prescribed fire varied along the hillslope gradient in this southern Appalachian watershed. Overstory mortality was the highest along with the ridge which decreased overstory diversity. Although mortality was also significant in the understory, the reduction of *Kalmia latifolia* abundance increased diversity in the understory and herb layer.

The first summer after the burn, *Pinus rigida* germinated prolifically. However, by summer of 1996 most of these new germinants had died and seedling numbers were less than before burning. *Quercus* spp. and *Carya* spp. seedlings were much more abundant after the burn in both 1995 and 1996. Prescribed fire may be successful in restoring the oak component of these ridge and mid-slope communities, but in this study it has not successfully restored the pine component of the xeric, ridge community.

The prescribed burn had varying effects on species richness and diversity across the hillslope gradient. On the ridge, where the fire was the most intense, *S* and *H'* significantly increased in the understory and herb layer but decreased in the overstory. Percent cover of *Kalmia latifolia* was substantially reduced, allowing for an increase in other species such as *Vaccinium* spp. and *Gaylussacia baccata* and the invasion of new species not formerly found on this site.

At the mid slope, where very little overstory mortality occurred, no significant change in *S* or *H'* was noted in the overstory, but *S* and *H'* significantly decreased in the understory. In the understory, many of the infrequent species disappeared. The decline in *H'* was attributed to both the loss of species and a change in evenness of distribution; *J'* was also significantly lower after the burn. At the low slope, no change in overstory or understory diversity was observed after the burn.

Without future fires, the regeneration of the pine/hardwood community will probably be transient. High intensity prescribed fires may help to regenerate declining pine stands, but they need to occur when the mature pines have sufficient cone crops to provide viable seeds. The fires must be intense enough to open the serotinous cones, remove the litter layer to provide favorable seedbed conditions, and reduce competing vegetation, especially *Kalmia latifolia*. Based on this study, the use of prescribed fire to restore degraded

pine/hardwood communities shows promise. However, residual basal area of overstory trees and the humus layer were not reduced sufficiently to allow for successful establishment of *Pinus rigida* seedlings. Further studies should evaluate the timing of the first fire, season of burn, stand age, and stage of stand development, and the frequency and intensity of fire needed to maintain these communities. Restoring and maintaining pine/hardwood communities and promoting oak regeneration in mixed-oak communities in the southern Appalachians may require more aggressive silviculture treatments. For example, an initial high intensity fire followed by low intensity burning at 5–10 year intervals may maintain *K. latifolia* at low densities while promoting successful establishment of *P. rigida* and *Quercus* species. Clearly, we need more research on the long-term effects of stand-replacement prescribed fire.

## Acknowledgements

The authors thank Patsy Clinton, Sonya Holland and Tony Elkîns for their assistance in field sampling. This research was supported by USDA Forest Service, Southern Research Station and in a contribution to the Wine Spring Creek Ecosystem Management Project.

## References

- Abrahamson, W.G., 1984. Post-fire recovery of Florida Lake Wales Ridge vegetation. *Am. J. Bot.* 71, 9–21.
- Abrams, M.D., Nowacki, G.J., 1992. Historical variation in fire, oak recruitment, and post-logging accelerated succession in central Pennsylvania. *Bull. Torr. Bot. Club* 119, 19–28.
- Barden, L.S., Woods, F.W., 1976. Effects of fire on pine and pine-hardwood forests in the southern Appalachians. *For. Sci.* 22, 399–403.
- Brown, CL., Kirkman, L.K., 1990. *Trees of Georgia and Adjacent States*. Timber Press, Portland, OR, 292 pp.
- Buckner, E.R., 1989. Evolution of forest types in the southeast. In: Waldrop, T.A. (Ed.), *Proceedings of pine-hardwood mixtures: A symposium on management and ecology of the type*, 18–19 April 1989 at Atlanta, GA. US For. Serv. Gen. Tech. Rep. SE–58, pp. 27–33.
- Christensen, N.L., 1977. Changes in structure, pattern and diversity associated with climax forest maturation in Piedmont, North Carolina. *Amer. Midl. Nat.* 97, 176–188.
- Clark, J.S., Robinson, J., 1993. Paleocology of fire. In: Crutzen P.J., Goldammer, J.G. (Eds.), *Wiley*, New York, pp. 193–214.
- Clinton, B.D., Vose, J.M., Swank, W.T., 1993. Site preparation burning to improve southern Appalachian pine-hardwood stands: Vegetation composition and diversity of 13-year-old stands. *Can. J. For. Res.* 23, 2271–2277.
- Crow, T.T., 1988. Reproductive mode and mechanisms for self-replacement of northern red oak (*Quercus rubra*) – A review. *For. Sci.* 34, 19–40.
- DeVivo, M.S., 1991. Indian use of fire and land clearance in the southern Appalachians. In: Nodvin, S.C., Waldrop, T.A. (Eds.), *Fire and the environment: ecological and cultural perspectives*. US For. Serv. Gen. Tech. Rep. SE-69, pp. 306–312.
- Ducey, M.J., Moser, W.K., Ashton, P.M.S., 1996. Effect of fire intensity on understory composition and diversity in a *Kalmia*-dominated oak forest, New England, USA. *Vegetatio* 123, 81–90.
- Elliott, K.J., Boring, L.R., Swank, W.T., Haines, B.R., 1997. Successional changes in plant species diversity and composition after clearcutting a southern Appalachian watershed. *For. Ecol. Manage.* 92, 67–85.
- Elliott, K.J., Vose, J.M., Swank, W.T., Bolstad, P.V., Long-term patterns in vegetation-site relationships in a southern Appalachian forest. *Journal of Vegetation Science*, in review.
- Groeschl, D.A., Johnson, J.E., Smith, D.W., 1992. Early vegetative response to wild fire in a table mountain – pitch pine forest. *Intern. J. Wildl. Fire* 2, 177–184.
- Harmon, M.E., 1982. Fire history of the westernmost portion of Great Smoky Mountains National Park. *Bull. Torr. Bot. Club* 109, 74–79.
- Hoffman, C.H., Anderson, R.F., 1945. Effect of southern pine beetle on timber losses and natural restocking. *J. For.* 43, 436–439.
- Hooper, R.M., 1969. Prescribed burning for laurel and rhododendron control in the southern Appalachians. *US. For. Serv. Res. Note SE-1 16*, p. 6.
- Johnson, P.S., 1985. Regenerating oaks in the Lake States. In: Johnson, J.E. (Ed.), *Proceedings, Challenges in oak management and utilization*, 28–29 March 1985 at Madison, WI, Cooperative Extension Service, University of Wisconsin-Extension, pp. 98–109.
- Keyser, P.D., Brose, P., van Lear, D., Burtner, K.M., 1996. Enhancing oak regeneration with fire in shelterwood stands: Preliminary trials. *Trans. 61st No. Am. Wildl. and Natur. Resour. Conf.*, pp. 215–219.
- Langdon, O.G., 1981. Some effects of prescribed fire on understory vegetation in loblolly pine stands. In: *Proceedings, Prescribed fire and wildfire in southern forests*, 6–8 April 1981 at Myrtle Beach, SC, Clemson University, pp. 143–153.
- Ledig, E.T., Little, S., 1979. Pitch pine (*Pinus rigida* Mill.): Ecology, physiology, and genetics. In: Forman, R.T.T. (Ed.), *Pine barrens: ecosystem and landscape*. Academic Press, New York, pp. 347–372.
- Lorimer, C.G., 1984. Development of the red maple understory in northeastern oak forests. *For. Sci.* 30, 3–22.
- Lorimer, C.G., 1985. The role of fire in perpetuation of oak forests. In: John, J.E. (Ed.), *Challenges in Oak Management and Utilization*, Cooperative Extension Service, University of Wisconsin, Madison, WI, pp. 8–25.



- Lorimer, C.G., 1993. Causes of the oak regeneration problem. In: Loftis, D.L., McGee, C.E. (Eds.), *Oak Regeneration: Serious Problems Practical Recommendations*, Symposium Proceedings, 8-10 September 1992 at Knoxville, TN, US. For. Serv. Gen. Tech. Rep. SE-84, pp. 66-78.
- Magurran, A.E., 1988. *Ecological Diversity and Its Measurement*. Princeton University Press, Princeton, NJ, p. 179.
- Major, A.E., 1996. The effects of stand-replacement fires on pine and oak communities in the southern Appalachians. M.Sc. Thesis, University of Georgia, Athens, GA, p. 89.
- Matlack, G.R., Gibson, D.J., Good, R.E., 1993. Regeneration of the shrub *Gaylussacia baccata* and associated species after low-intensity fire in an Atlantic coastal plain forest. *Am. J. Bot.* 80, 158-173.
- McGee, G.G., Leopold, D.J., Nyland, R.D., 1995. Understory response to spring-time prescribed fire in two New York transition oak forests. *For. Ecol. Manage.* 76, 149-168.
- McGinty, D.T., 1972. The ecological roles of *Kalmia latifolia* L. and *Rhododendron maximum* L. in the hardwood forest at Coweeta. M.Sc. thesis, University of Georgia, Athens, GA, p. 81.
- Nicholas, N.S., White, P.S., 1984. The effect of southern pine beetle on fuel loading in yellow pine forest of the Great Smoky Mountains National Park. Natl. Park Service, Research/Resource Management Report SER-73, U.S. Department of Interior, p. 3 1.
- Nowacki, G.J., Abrams, M.D., Lorimer, C.G., 1990. Composition, structure, and historical development of northern red oak stands along an edaphic gradient in north-central Wisconsin. *For. Sci.* 36, 276-292.
- Nowacki, G.J., Abrams, M.D., 1992. Community, edaphic, and historical analysis of mixed-oak forests of the Ridge and Valley province in central Pennsylvania. *Can. J. For. Res.* 22, 790-800.
- Pielou, E.C., 1966. The measurement of diversity in different types of biological collections. *J. Theor. Bio.* 13, 131-144.
- Radford, A.E., Ahles, H.E., Bell, C.R., 1968. *Manual of the Vascular Flora of the Carolinas*. University of North Carolina Press, Chapel Hill, p. 1183.
- Schmalzer, P.A., Hinkle, C.R., 1992. Recovery of oak-saw palmetto scrub after fire. *Castanea* 57, 158-173.
- Smith, R.N., 1991. Species composition, stand structure, and woody detrital dynamics associated with pine mortality in the southern Appalachians. M.Sc. Thesis, University of Georgia, Athens, GA, p. 163.
- Stephenson, L.L., Ash, A.N., Stauffer, D.F., 1993. Appalachian oak forests. In: Martin, W.H., Boyce, S.G., Echemacht, A.C. (Eds.), *Biodiversity of the Southeastern United States, Upland Terrestrial Communities*, Wiley, New York, pp. 305-338.
- Swank, W.T., McNulty, S.G., Swift, L.W., Jr., 1994. Opportunities for forest hydrology applications to ecosystem management. In: Ohta, T., Fukushima, Y., Suzuki, M. (Eds.), *Proceedings of the International Symposium on Forest Hydrology*; 24-28 October 1994 at Tokyo, Japan, International Union of Forestry Research Organization, Tokyo, Japan, pp. 19-29.
- Swift Jr., L.W., Elliott, K.J., Ottmar, D.A., R.D., Vihnanek, R.E., 1993. Site preparation burning to improve Southern Appalachian pine-hardwood stands: fire characteristics and soil erosion, moisture, and temperature. *Can. J. For. Res.* 23, 2242-2254.
- Thomas, D.J., 1996. *Soil Survey of Macon County, North Carolina*. USDA, Natural Resources Conservation Service, Washington, DC, p. 322.
- van Lear, D.H., 1991. Fire and oak regeneration in the southern Appalachians. In: Nodvin, S.C., Waldrop, T.A. (Eds.), *Fire and the environment: Ecological and cultural perspectives*, US For. Serv. Gen. Tech. Rep. SE-69, pp. 15-21.
- van Lear, D.H., Johnson, V.J., 1983. Effects of prescribed burning in the southern Appalachian and upper Piedmont forest: A review. Department of Forestry, Clemson University, Bulletin 36.
- van Lear, D.H., Waldrop, T.A., 1989. History, use, and effects of fire in the Appalachians. US For. Serv. Gen. Tech. Rep. SE-54, p. 20.
- van Lear, D.H., Watt, J.M., 1993. The role of fire in oak regeneration. In: Loftis, D.L., McGee, C.E. (Eds.), *Oak Regeneration: Serious Problems Practical Recommendations*, Symposium Proceedings, 8-10 September 1992 at Knoxville, TN, US For. Serv. Gen. Tech. Rep. SE-84, pp. 66-78.
- Vose, J.M., Swank, W.T., Clinton, B.D., 1994. Fire, drought, and forest management influences on pine/hardwood ecosystems in the southern Appalachians. In: *Proceedings of the 12th Conference on Fire and Forest Meteorology at Jekyll Island, GA*, 26-28 October 1993, pp. 232-238.
- Vose, J.M., Swank, W.T., Clinton, B.D., Hendrick, R.L., Major, A.E., 1997. Using fire to restore pine/hardwood ecosystems in the southern Appalachians of North Carolina. In: *Proceedings of Fire Effects on Rare and Endangered Species and Habitats Conference at Couer De Alene, ID*, 13-16 November 1995, Association of Wildland Fire, Spokane, WA.
- Vose, J.M., Swank, W.T., Clinton, B.D., Knoepp, J.D., Swift, L.W., Jr., Using prescribed fire to restore southern Appalachian pine-hardwood ecosystems: Effects on mass, carbon, and nutrients. *For. Ecol. Manage.*, in review.
- Ward, J.S., Stephens, G.R., 1989. Long-term effects of a 1932 surface fire on stand structure in a Connecticut mixed-hardwoods forest. In: Rink, G., Budelsky, C.A. (Eds.), *Proceedings, 7th Central Hardwood Forest conference*, Southern Illinois University. U.S. For. Serv. Gen. Tech. Rep. NC-132, pp. 267-273.

# Forest Ecology and Management

---

## Submission of manuscripts.

Manuscripts should be submitted in triplicate. Authors from the Americas, Australia, New Zealand and the Pacific are requested to send their manuscripts to *Forest Ecology and Management*, Dr. Richard F. Fisher, Department of Forest Science, Texas A&M University, College Station, TX77843-2135, USA; all other authors are requested to send their manuscripts to the Editorial Office, *forest Ecology and Management*, P.O. Box 181,1000 AD Amsterdam, The Netherlands.

**Authors in Japan please note:** Upon request, Elsevier Science Japan will provide authors with a list of people who can check and improve the English of their paper (*before submission*). Please contact our Tokyo office: Elsevier Science Japan, 1-9-15 Higashi-Azabu, Minato-ku, Tokyo 106-0044, Japan: tel. (+81)-3-5561-5033; fax (+81)-3-5561-5047.

**Electronic manuscripts:** Electronic manuscripts have the advantage that there is no need for the rekeying of text, thereby avoiding the possibility of introducing errors and resulting in reliable and fast delivery of proofs.

For the initial submission of manuscripts for consideration, hardcopies are sufficient. For the processing of *accepted papers*, electronic versions are preferred. After final *acceptance*, your disk plus two, final and exactly matching printed versions should be submitted together. Double density (DD) or high density (HD) diskettes (3.5 or 5.25 inch) are acceptable. It is important that the file saved is in the native format of the wordprocessor program used. Label the disk with the name of the computer and wordprocessing package used, your name, and the name of the file on the disk. Further information may be obtained from the Publisher.

**Enquiries concerning manuscripts and proofs:** questions arising after acceptance of the manuscript, especially those relating to proofs, should be directed to Elsevier Science Ireland Ltd., Bay 15K, Shannon Industrial Estate, Shannon, Co. Clare, Ireland, tel. (+353-61) 471944; fax(+353-61) 472144.

**Advertising information:** Advertising orders and enquiries can be sent to: **USA, Canada and South America:** Mr Tino de Carlo, The Advertising Department, Elsevier Science Inc., 655 Avenue of the Americas, New York, NY 10010-5107, USA; phone: (+1) (212) 633 3815; fax: (1) (212) 633 3820; e-mail: t.decarlo@elsevier.com **Japan:** The Advertising Department, Elsevier Science K.K., 9-15 Higashi-Azabu 1-chome, Minato-ku, Tokyo 106, Japan: phone: (+81) (3) 5561 5033; fax: (+81) (3) 5561 5047. **Europe and ROW:** Rachel Gresle-Farthing, The Advertising Department, Elsevier Science Ltd., The Boulevard, Langford Lane, Kidlington, Oxford OX5 1GB, UK; phone: (+44) (1865) 843565; fax: (+44) (1865) 843976; e-mail: r.gresle-farthing@elsevier.co.uk

**Orders, claims, and product enquiries:** please contact the Customer Support Department at the Regional Sales Office nearest you:

**New York:** Elsevier Science, PO Box 945, New York, NY 10159-0945, USA; Tel.: (+1) (212) 633 3730 [toll free number for North American customers: 1-888-4ES-INFO(437-4636)]; Fax: (+1) (212) 633 3680; E-mail: usinfo-f@elsevier.com

**Amsterdam:** Elsevier Science, PO Box 211,1000 AE Amsterdam, The Netherlands: Tel.: (+31) 20 4853757; Fax: (+31) 20 4853432; E-mail: nlinfo-f@elsevier.nl

**Tokyo:** Elsevier Science, 9-15, Higashi-Azabu 1-chome, Minato-ku, Tokyo 106-0044, Japan; Tel.: (+81) (3) 5561 5033; Fax: (+81) (3) 5561 5047; E-mail: info@elsevier.co.jp

**Singapore:** Elsevier Science, No. 1 Temasek Avenue, #17-01 Millenia Tower, Singapore 039192; Tel.: (+65) 434 3727; Fax: (+65) 337 2230; E-mail: asiainfo@elsevier.com.sg

**Rio de Janeiro:** Elsevier Science, Rua Sete de Setembro 111/16 Andar, 20050-002 Centro, Rio de Janeiro – RJ, Brazil; Tel.: (+55) (21) 509 5340; Fax: (+55) (21) 507 1991; E-mail: elsevier@campus.com.br [Note (Latin America): for orders, claims and help desk information, please contact the Regional Sales Office in New York as listed above]

**US mailing info:** *Forest Ecology and Management* (0378-1121) is published monthly by Elsevier Science B.V. (Molenwerf 1, Postbus 211,1000 AE Amsterdam). Annual subscription price in the USA is US\$ 2307.00 (valid in North, Central and South America), including air speed delivery. Second class postage rate is paid at Jamaica, NY 11431.

**USA POSTMASTERS:** Send address changes to *Forest Ecology and Management* Publications Expediting, Inc., 200 Meacham Avenue, Elmont, NY 11003.

**AIRFREIGHT AND MAILING** in the USA by Publications Expediting Inc., 200 Meacham Avenue, Elmont, NY 11003.

***Forest Ecology and Management* has no page charges**

For a full and complete Guide for Authors, please refer to *Forest Ecology and Management*, Vol. 113, No. 1, pp. 105–108. The instructions can also be found on the World Wide Web: access under <http://www.elsevier.nl> or <http://www.elsevier.com>

⊗ The paper used in this publication meets the requirements of ANSI/NISO 239.481992 (Permanence of Paper)

Printed in The Netherlands

# LANDSCAPE AND URBAN PLANNING

An International Journal of Landscape Ecology,  
Landscape Planning and Landscape design

## Editor-in-Chief:

J.E. Rodiek, College of Architecture, *Texas A & M University, College Station, TX 778433137, USA*

## AIMS AND SCOPE

A journal concerned with conceptual, scientific and design approaches to land use. By emphasizing ecological understanding and a multi-disciplinary approach to analysis and planning and design, it attempts to draw attention to the interrelated nature of problems posed by nature and human use of land. In addition, papers dealing with ecological processes and interactions within urban areas, and between these areas and the surrounding natural systems which support them, will be considered. Papers in which specific problems are examined are welcome. Topics might include but are not limited to landscape ecology, landscape planning and landscape design. Landscape ecology examines how heterogeneous combinations of ecosystems are structured, how they function and how they change. Landscape planning examines the various ways humans structure their land use changes. Landscape design involves the physical strategies and forms by which land use change is actually directed. **Landscape and Urban Planning** is based on

the premise that research linked to practice will ultimately improve the human made landscape.

## Editorial Advisory Board:

I.D. Bishop, *Parkville, Vic., Australia*  
E.G. Bolen, *Wilmington, NC, USA*  
I.D. Bruns, *Schorndorf, Germany*  
J.B. Byrom, *Edinburgh, UK*  
T.C. Daniel, *Tucson, AZ, USA*  
**R.M. DeGraaf**, *Amherst, MA, USA*  
J.G. Fabos, *Amherst, MA, USA*  
S. Gonzalez Alonso, *Madrid, Spain*  
M. Hough, *Etobicoke, ON, Canada*  
P. Jacobs, *Montreal, PQ, Canada*  
D.S. Jones, *Melbourne, Vic., Australia*  
H. Lavery, *Milton, Qld., Australia*  
W.M. Marsh, *Flint, MI, USA*  
D.L. Mitchell, *Dallas, TX, USA*  
D.G. Morrison, *Athens, GA, USA*  
J.I. Nassauer, *St. Paul, MN, USA*  
**M. Nelischer**, *Guelph, ON, Canada*  
D.D. Paterson, *Vancouver, BC, Canada*  
A. Ramos, *Madrid, Spain*  
P. Shepard, *Claremont, CA, USA*  
**O.R. Skage**, *Alnarp, Sweden*  
R.C. Smardon, *Syracuse, NY, USA*  
G. Sorte, *Alnarp, Sweden*  
F. Stearns, *Rhineland, W., USA*

R.C. Szaro, *Washington, DC, USA*  
J.W. Thomas, *La Grande, OR, USA*  
P.J. Trowbridge, *Ithaca, NY, USA*  
T.H.D. Turner, *London, UK*  
M.J. Vroom, *Wageningen, The Netherlands*  
W.V. Wendler, *College Station, TX, USA*  
**B.-E. Yang**, *Seoul, Korea*  
E.H. Zube, *Tucson, AZ, USA*

## ABSTRACTED/INDEXED IN

Applied Ecology Abstracts,  
Biological Abstracts,  
Current Contents B & S,  
Environmental Periodicals  
Bibliography, Geobase,  
Geographical Abstracts,  
LandSearch.

## 1994 SUBSCRIPTION DATA

Volumes 28-30 (in 9 issues)  
Subscription price:  
Dfl. 1080.00 (US \$584.00)  
incl. Postage  
ISSN 0169-2046

Elsevier Science Publishers,  
P.O. Box 211, 1000 AE Amsterdam,  
The Netherlands  
Fax: (020) 5803-203

Customers in the USA and Canada:

Elsevier Science Publishers  
P.O. Box 945, Madison Square Station,  
New York, NY 10160-0757, USA  
Fax: (212) 633-3680

*The Dutch Guildler price quoted applies worldwide, except in the Americas (North, Central and South America) The US Dollar price quoted applies in the Americas only. Non VAT registered customers in the European Community should add the appropriate VAT rate applicable in their country to the price.*



**ELSEVIER**  
SCIENCE PUBLISHERS