

United States
Department of
Agriculture

Forest Service



Southeastern Forest
Experiment Station

Research Note
SE-365

February 1993

Equations for Estimating Biomass of Herbaceous and Woody Vegetation in Early-Successional Southern Appalachian Pine-Hardwood Forests

Katherine J. Elliott and Barton D. Clinton

Abstract

Allometric equations were developed to predict aboveground dry weight of herbaceous and woody species on prescribe-burned sites in the Southern Appalachians. Best-fit least-square regression models were developed using diameter, height, or both, as the independent variables and dry weight as the dependent variable. Coefficients of determination for the selected total biomass models ranged from 0.620 to 0.992 for herbaceous species and from 0.698 to 0.999 for the woody species. Equations for foliage biomass generally had lower coefficients of determination than did equations for either stem or total biomass of woody species.

Keywords: Mountain-laurel, *Kalmia latifolia*, xeric upland forests, oak-pine, prescribed fire, disturbance.

Introduction

Estimation of total aboveground biomass is important in studies of ecosystem processes and disturbances. Weighing vegetation to measure biomass or to develop prediction equations is time consuming and expensive, and requires destructive sampling.

This paper provides regression equations for predicting total aboveground dry weight of some common herbaceous and woody species found on disturbed sites in the Southern Appalachians. The most common method for determining total aboveground biomass or productivity is through the use of allometric equations. These equations predict biomass of individual plants or their components from some easily measured variables such as diameter or height. Although many regression equations exist for large trees (Crow 1983, Monk and others 1970, Pastor and others 1984, Schreuder and

Swank 1971, Swank and Schreuder 1974, Whittaker and Woodwell 1968, Young 1976), few equations are available for herbaceous plants and small trees (Boring 1982, Boring and Swank 1986, Hitchcock 1978).

Methods

Site Description

Two research sites, each covering approximately 5.25 ha, were chosen from areas previously designated for site-preparation burning by the Land Management Plan for the Wayah Ranger District of the Nantahala National Forest in western North Carolina. The two sites, Jacob Branch East (JE) and Jacob Branch West (JW), are in the Blue Ridge physiographic province of the Southern Appalachians (lat. 35°11'44" N., long. 83°24'14" W.). JE is on a west aspect and JW is on a south aspect. Midslope elevations, a.re. about 755 m. Soils are in the Cowee-Evard complex, which includes fine loamy, mixed, mesic Typic Hapludults with only scattered rock outcrops and a clay-loam layer at about 30- to 60-cm depth. The overstory vegetation before treatment consisted primarily of scattered pitch pine (*Pinus rigida* Mill.), scarlet oak (*Quercus coccinea* Muenchh.), and chestnut oak (*Q. prinus* L.). Overstory basal area ranged from 9 to 19 m² ha⁻¹. Basal area of the shrub understory, which was dominated by mountain-laurel (*Kalmia latifolia* L.), ranged from 18 to 35 m² ha⁻¹.

On both sites, all vegetation was cut in June and July 1990 and left on site. After the cut vegetation had cured, the sites were burned on separate days (September 18 and 19, 1990). Consumption of dry foliage, loose forest floor litter, and fine woody material was complete except along the shaded margins of the cut area (well outside of the established plots). Large woody material (>75-mm diameter) was reduced by 31

Katherine J. Elliott is a Research Ecologist and Barton D. Clinton is an Associate Ecologist, Coweeta Hydrologic Laboratory, U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Otto, NC 28763.

percent on JE and 14 percent on JW (Swift and others, in press). During the first growing season after the burn, vegetative reproduction of most woody species and many grasses and herbs was substantial.

Sample Collection and Data Analysis

Random samples of plants of all species and sizes were collected from both sites in August 1991 (table 1). Total height (H) to the nearest 0.1 cm and diameter (D) to the nearest 0.01 cm at 1.0 cm above ground level were measured on each plant before the plants were clipped at ground level. Due to prolific sprouting in *Kalmia*, average diameters of the crowns of sprout clumps were measured in lieu of individual stem diameters. Crown diameters were measured by taking two perpendicular measurements through the center of each plant. Samples were dried to a constant weight at 70 °C (approximately 72 h) then weighed to the nearest 0.01 g to determine total aboveground dry weight. The tree and shrub samples were separated into foliage and wood components.

Best-fit least-square regression models were developed using PROC GLM (SAS Institute 1987) for the 49 species present on these sites. We considered the following eight models:

linear:

$$\begin{aligned}\hat{Y} &= \beta_1 + \beta_2 D \\ \hat{Y} &= f a + f a D + \beta_3 H \\ \hat{Y} &= \beta_1 + \beta_2 D^2 H \\ \hat{Y} &= \beta_1 + \beta_2 H \\ \hat{Y} &= \beta_1 + \beta_2 D^2 + \beta_3 H\end{aligned}$$

transformed nonlinear:

$$\begin{aligned}\ln \hat{Y} &= \ln \beta_1 + f \ln D \\ \ln \hat{Y} &= \ln \beta_1 + f \ln H \\ \ln \hat{Y} &= \ln \beta_1 + f \ln D + f \ln H\end{aligned}$$

To test for site differences, we included site as a dummy variable in all the regression models. In all cases, we found that site did not affect regressions significantly ($p < 0.05$), so data were pooled to develop regression equations for individual species across sites. Models were selected based on graphical and residual analysis, comparisons of standard errors, and comparisons of coefficients of determination (r^2).

Results and Discussion

Probably because of the variation in growth forms of the herbaceous species, four models were needed to reasonably predict total biomass for the herbaceous vegetation (table 2). Only two models were necessary to predict total and component biomass for the woody vegetation (table 3). Coefficients of determination for the selected total biomass models ranged from 0.620 to 0.992 for herbaceous species (table 2) and from 0.698 to 0.999 for the woody species (table 3). Equations for foliage biomass generally had lower coefficients of determination than did equations for either stem or total biomass of woody species. All of the selected equations were highly significant ($p < 0.02$). Standard errors of the estimate ($S_{y \cdot x}$) are provided to correct for bias in the logarithmic equations (Baskerville 1972) and to show the relative variation between equations. $S_{y \cdot x}$ were generally smaller for the herbaceous species than for the woody species. Height was included in all but 12 of the species-specific equations to improve the predictability. In some cases, the sample sizes were small ($n < 8$ for five herbaceous and two woody species). We chose to include equations for individual species rather than combining species with similar growth forms because there are few equations available for herbaceous plants. Even though sample sizes were small, the coefficients of determination were large ($r^2 > 0.80$ in all cases), the equations were highly significant, and the $S_{y \cdot x}$ were small (tables 2 and 3).

Hitchcock (1978) developed regression equations for predicting total aboveground dry and green weights of hardwood seedlings and saplings 4, 6, and 8 years after clearcutting oak-hickory forests in Tennessee. However, most of the species in his study originated from propagules. On burned sites in the Southern Appalachians, much of the regeneration is in the form of sprouts originating from stumps or roots (Van Lear and Waldrop 1988). Stored nutrient reserves support fast early-growth rates in sprouts. This initial surge of growth results in diameter to height ratios that are probably different from ratios found in seedlings. Moreover, in Hitchcock's (1978) study, densities were on the order of 6,000 to 12,000 stems/ha compared with 45,000 to 68,000 stems/ha in our study.

These differences in age, regeneration mode, and density result in variations in growth form that make Hitchcock's (1978) equations inappropriate for conditions on our site. For example, basal diameters for tree species ranged from 1.4 to 4.0 cm in Hitchcock's study and from 0.10 to 1.50 cm in our study. Heights ranged from 30 to 640 cm in Hitchcock's study and from 3.0 to 161 cm in our study. When considering sprout regeneration, allometric relationships developed by Hitchcock would overpredict biomass using diameter and

height. For example, using Hitchcock's equations for wood and median values of height and basal diameter from our study would overestimate stem biomass by 37 percent for blackgum (*Nyssasylvatica* Marsh.) and 14 percent for red maple (*Acer rubrum* L.).

Extremely productive sites normally have proportionally greater height than diameter growth. Equations developed on these sites overpredict biomass on poor sites. Boring (1982) developed biomass equations for tree sprouts on a relatively mesic and productive site in the Coweeta Basin 1 to 3 years after clearcutting. Using a double logarithmic transformation, he measured stem diameters 40 cm above ground on fast-growing species such as red maple and yellow-poplar (*Liriodendron tulipifera* L.) and 2 cm above ground on slow-growing species such as hickory (*Carya* spp.), sourwood (*Oxydendrum arboreum* (L.) DC.), and blackgum. Application of Boring's (1982) equations to the median diameters of three slow-growing species in our study resulted in overestimates of 5, 28, and 53 percent for blackgum, sourwood, and hickory, respectively. Hence, when estimates of biomass are desired, it is important to match the size-class ranges, regeneration mode, successional stage, and site productivity.

Developing biomass predictors is time consuming and expensive. Regardless of the approach and the scale of application, therefore, the possibility of using existing predictors should be considered before making a big investment in collecting new data. Although it is desirable to develop equations for individual sites, doing so may not be possible or practical. The prediction models presented here are most likely to be useful for stand and site conditions and ranges in plant sizes similar to those under which they were developed. Our regression equations were developed for studies in disturbed early-successional forests in the Southern Appalachians.

Acknowledgments

We thank James Buchanan for his assistance in sample collection and Lee Reynolds for his help in species identification. Gregory A. Ruark and Joseph R. Saucier provided helpful comments about the manuscript.

Literature Citations

- Baskerville, G.L. 1972. Use of logarithmic regression in the estimation of plant biomass. *Canadian Journal of Forest Research*. 2: 49-53.
- Boring, Lindsay Ross. 1982. The role of black locust (*Robinia pseudoacacia* L.) in forest regeneration and nitrogen fixation in the Southern Appalachians. Athens GA: University of Georgia. Ph.D. dissertation. 173 pp.
- Boring, Lindsay R.; Swank, Wayne T. 1986. Hardwood biomass and net primary production following clearcutting in the Coweeta Basin. In: Brooks, Robert T., Jr., ed. *Proceedings of the 1986 southern forest biomass workshop*; 1986 June 16-19; Knoxville, TN. Norris, TN: Tennessee Valley Authority: 43-50.
- Crow, Thomas R. 1983. Comparing biomass regressions by site and stand age for red maple. *Canadian Journal of Forest Research*. 13: 283-288.
- Hitchcock, Harry C., III. 1978. Aboveground tree weight equations for hardwood seedlings and saplings. *Tappi*. 6: 119-120.
- Monk, C.D.; Child, G.I.; Nicholson, S.A. 1970. Biomass, litter and leaf surface area estimates of an oak-hickory forest. *Oikos*. 21: 138-141.
- Pastor, John; Aber, John D.; Melillo, Jerry M. 1984. Biomass prediction using generalized allometric regressions for some Northeast tree species. *Forest Ecology and Management*. 7:265-274.
- SAS Institute. 1987. *SAS/STAT guide for personal computers*. 6th ed. Cary, NC: SAS Institute Inc. 1,028 pp.
- Schreuder, Hans T.; Swank, Wayne T. 1971. A comparison of several statistical models in forest biomass and surface area estimates. In: Young, Harold E., ed., *Forest biomass studies*, IUFRO, Section 25: growth and yield. Misc. Publ. 132. Orono, ME: University of Maine: 125-138.
- Swank, Wayne T.; Schreuder, Hans T. 1974. Comparison of three methods of estimating surface area and biomass for a forest of young eastern white pine. *Forest Science*. 20: 91-100.
- Swift, Lloyd W., Jr.; Elliott, Katherine J.; Ottmar, Roger D.; Zihnanek, Robert E. [In press]. Site preparation burning to improve Southern Appalachian pine-hardwood stands: fire characteristics and soil erosion, temperature and moisture. *Canadian Journal of Forest Research*.
- Van Lear, David H.; Waldrop, Thomas A. 1988. Effects of fire on natural regeneration in the Appalachian Mountains. In: Smith, H. Clay; Perkey, Arlyn W.; Kidd, William E., Jr., eds. *Workshop proceedings: Guidelines for regenerating Appalachian hardwood stands*; 1988 May 24-26; Morgantown, WV. SAF Publ. 88-03. Morgantown, WV: West Virginia University Books: 56-70.
- Whittaker, Robert H.; Woodwell, George M. 1968. Dimension and production relations of trees and shrubs in the Brookhaven Forest, New York. *Journal of Ecology*. 56: 1-25.
- Young, Harold E. 1976. A summary and analysis of weight table studies. In: Young, Harold E., ed. *Oslo biomass studies*. Orono, ME: University of Maine: 251-282.

Table 1--Ranges in height and diameter of sampled species

Species	Range	
	Height	Diameter
	----- cm -----	
Herbaceous		
<i>Acalypha rhomboidea</i> Raf.	27-56	0.20-0.40
<i>Andropogon virginicus</i> L.	13-125	0.35-5.50
<i>Aralla spinosa</i> L.	3-33	0.20-0.80
<i>Aster divaricatus</i> L.	22-83	0.20-0.60
<i>Aureolaria laevigata</i> (Raf.) Raf.	38-148	0.20-0.60
<i>Baptisia tinctoria</i> (L.) R. Br.	19-50	0.20-0.60
<i>Carex</i> spp.	3-10	0.20-4.50
<i>Cassia fasciculata</i> Michx.	10-44	0.20-0.30
<i>Coreopsis major</i> Walt.	20-96	0.30-0.90
<i>Desmodium cuspidatum</i> Muhl. ex Willd.	3-51	0.10-0.30
<i>Erechtites hieracifolia</i> (L.) Raf.	22-240	0.30-4.10
<i>Galax aphylla</i> L.	2-4	0.45-5.50
<i>Helianthus atrorubens</i> L.	67-155	0.20-0.90
<i>Hypoxis hirsuta</i> (L.) Coville	14-35	0.20-1.00
<i>Lespedeza hirta</i> (L.) Hornem.	21-85	0.20-0.50
<i>Lespedeza intermedia</i> (S. Wats.) Britt.	3-43	0.10-0.30
<i>Panicum commutatum</i> Schultes	3-45	0.75-5.00
<i>Panicum dichotomum</i> L.	2-19	0.25-3.50
<i>Phytolacca americana</i> L.	7-205	0.40-2.30
<i>Potentilla canadensis</i> L.	2-69	0.25-0.60
<i>Pteridium aquilinum</i> (L.) Kuhn	13-62	0.10-0.30
<i>Scleria triglomerata</i> Michx.	4-57	0.20-0.50
<i>Smilax glauca</i> Walter	4-140	0.10-0.40
<i>Smilax rotundifolia</i> L.	24-95	0.20-0.50
<i>Solidago odora</i> Aiton	68-140	0.40-0.90
<i>Trillium catesbaei</i> Ell.	8-20	0.20-0.30
<i>Viola pedata</i> L.	2-10	0.20-1.25
<i>Viola palmata</i> L.	4-26	0.25-1.50
<i>Vitis</i> spp.	9-26	0.10-0.30
Woody		
<i>Acer rubrum</i> L.	11-108	0.20-0.90
<i>Betula lenta</i> L.	6-40	0.20-0.40
<i>Carya glabra</i> (Mill.) Sweet	7-42	0.30-1.20
<i>Castanea pumila</i> (L.) Mill.	29-95	0.40-1.60
<i>Ilex ambigua</i> var. <i>montana</i> (T&G) Ahles	7-76	0.10-0.60
<i>Kalmia latifolia</i> L.	5-43	0.20-25.0
<i>Liriodendron tulipifera</i> L.	3-60	0.20-1.20
<i>Nyssa sylvatica</i> Marsh.	8-82	0.10-1.00
<i>Oxydendrum arboreum</i> (L.) DC.	14-161	0.30-1.90
<i>Pyrularia pubera</i> Michx.	2-23	0.10-0.65
<i>Quercus alba</i> L.	13-87	0.30-0.70
<i>Quercus coccinea</i> Muenchh.	10-81	0.30-1.20
<i>Quercus prinus</i> L.	4-96	0.20-1.20
<i>Quercus velutina</i> Lam.	6-65	0.20-1.10
<i>Rhus glabra</i> L.	3-48	0.10-0.90
<i>Robinia pseudoacacia</i> L.	3-138	0.10-1.50
<i>Rubus argutus</i> Link	4-38	0.20-0.60
<i>Rubus occidentalis</i> L.	5-70	0.30-0.60
<i>Sassafras albidum</i> (Nutt.) Nees	3-73	0.10-1.00
<i>Vaccinium vacillans</i> Torr.	8-46	0.20-1.50

Table 2--Equations for predicting biomass for herbaceous vegetation on Southern Appalachian clearcut and burned sites

Species	Model	r ²	p	n	S _{y,x}
<i>Acalypha rhomboidea</i>	Y = 0.20091 + 0.50335 D ² H	0.972	0.0003	6	0.282
<i>Andropogon virginicus</i>	Y = -0.1970 + 0.0072 D ² H	0.983	0.0001	10	1.242
<i>Aster divaricatus</i>	Y = -4.7462 + 23.8467 D + 0.0252 H	0.742	0.0337	8	1.705
<i>Aralia spinosa</i>	ln(Y) = 2.31932 + 2.54267 lnD	0.821	0.0008	9	0.744
<i>Aureolaria laevigata</i>	ln(Y) = 4.24777 + 2.72641 lnD	0.958	0.0001	8	0.234
<i>Baptisia tinctoria</i>	Y = 0.18389 + 2.07840 D ² H	0.870	0.0001	11	4.340
<i>Carex</i> spp.	Y = -0.5077 + 0.1006 D ² + 0.1352 H	0.924	0.0010	8	0.397
<i>Cassia fasciculata</i>	Y = -2.0669 + 9.9003 D + 0.0585 H	0.927	0.0004	9	0.292
<i>Coreopsis major</i>	ln(Y) = 3.82856 + 2.32476 lnD	0.802	0.0005	10	0.527
<i>Desmodium cuspidatum</i>	Y = 0.11574 + 0.94497 D ² H	0.962	0.0032	5	0.281
<i>Erechtites hieracifolia</i>	ln(Y) = 2.34273 + 2.57110 lnD	0.956	0.0001	13	0.499
<i>Galax aphylla</i>	Y = -0.48231 + 0.40338 D + 0.16388 H	0.931	0.0003	9	0.217
<i>Helianthus atrorubens</i>	ln(Y) = 3.17208 + 1.90949 lnD	0.816	0.0135	6	0.585
<i>Hypoxis hirsuta</i>	ln(Y) = 0.00826 + 1.64219 lnD	0.620	0.0040	11	0.735
<i>Lespedeza hirta</i>	Y = 0.75458 + 0.46254 D ² H	0.919	0.0001	13	0.866
<i>Lespedeza intermedia</i>	ln(Y) = -3.0108 + 0.5348 lnD + 1.0367 lnH	0.810	0.0006	12	0.512
<i>Panicum commutatum</i>	Y = 0.59040 + 0.01769 D ² H	0.796	0.0001	12	2.715
<i>Panicum dichotomum</i>	Y = -1.62756 + 2.04282 D + 0.14607 H	0.922	0.0001	13	0.718
<i>Phytolacca americana</i>	ln(Y) = 2.75839 + 3.00346 lnD	0.865	0.0001	13	0.680
<i>Potentilla canadensis</i>	Y = -0.6357 + 3.7505 D ² + 0.0101 H	0.679	0.0187	10	0.322
<i>Pteridium aquilinum</i>	Y = -0.4938 - 1.7262 D + 0.0716 H	0.930	0.0001	13	0.286
<i>Scleria triglomerata</i>	Y = -0.3398 + 0.8090 D + 0.0131 H	0.876	0.0001	14	0.071
<i>Smilax glauca</i>	Y = 0.48144 + 0.44240 D ² H	0.962	0.0001	14	0.663
<i>Smilax rotundifolia</i>	Y = -2.7891 + 6.2733 D + 0.1060 H	0.978	0.0005	7	0.674
<i>Solidago odora</i>	Y = 1.98681 + 0.41984 D ² H	0.992	0.0001	6	1.714
<i>Trillium catesbaei</i>	Y = 0.13064 + 0.30293 D ² H	0.880	0.0002	9	0.063
<i>Viola palmata</i>	Y = 0.20743 + 0.04288 D ² H	0.966	0.0001	8	0.182
<i>Viola pedata</i>	Y = -0.60562 + 0.29282 D + 0.18503 H	0.784	0.0046	10	0.376
<i>Vitis</i> spp.	Y = -0.9289 + 0.8012 D + 0.0953 H	0.934	0.0001	11	0.148

Note: S_{y,x} = standard error of the estimate.

Y = total aboveground biomass;

H = height;

D = diameter measured at ground level.

Table 3--Equations for predicting foliage, stem, and aboveground biomass for woody vegetation on Southern Appalachian clearcut and burned sites

Species	Model	r ²	P	n	S _{y,x}
<i>Acer rubrum</i>	Total = 1.73221 + 0.35811 D ² H	0.965	0.0001	13	1.973
	Foliage = 1.42077 + 0.18400 D ² H	0.943	0.0001	13	1.316
	Stem = 0.31144 + 0.17411 D ² H	0.957	0.0001	13	1.074
<i>Betula lenta</i>	Total = 0.03532 + 0.43961 D ² H	0.940	0.0001	10	0.303
	Foliage = 0.13673 + 0.22872 D ² H	0.755	0.0011	10	0.356
	Stem = -0.10140 + 0.21089 D ² H	0.877	0.0001	10	0.217
<i>Carya glabra</i>	ln(Total) = 3.5464 + 2.5956 lnD	0.892	0.0001	12	0.449
	ln(Foliage) = 3.0535 + 2.3755 lnD	0.821	0.0001	12	0.552
	ln(Stem) = 2.3091 + 3.0985 lnD	0.797	0.0001	12	0.779
<i>Castanea pumila</i>	Total = -0.34568 + 0.55872 D ² H	0.962	0.0001	11	7.808
	Foliage = 2.3370 + 0.28912 D ² H	0.966	0.0001	11	4.579
	Stem = -2.6827 + 0.26960 D ² H	0.945	0.0001	11	3.824
<i>Ilex ambigua</i>	Total = 1.6503 + 0.41170 D ² H	0.773	0.0001	15	1.873
	Foliage = 1.2387 + 0.18937 D ² H	0.622	0.0008	14	1.288
	Stem = 0.55820 + 0.21836 D ² H	0.870	0.0001	14	0.735
<i>Kalmia latifolia</i>	Total = 4.7570 + 0.00879 D ² H	0.991	0.0001	13	6.701
	Foliage = 4.2674 + 0.00617 D ² H	0.985	0.0001	13	6.185
	Stem = 0.48861 + 0.00262 D ² H	0.996	0.0001	13	1.316
<i>Liriodendron tulipifera</i>	Total = 0.37855 + 0.30788 D ² H	0.999	0.0001	10	0.255
	Foliage = 0.33588 + 0.19829 D ² H	0.998	0.0001	10	0.230
	Stem = 0.04267 + 0.10958 D ² H	0.999	0.0001	10	0.045
<i>Nyssa sylvatica</i>	Total = 2.7869 + 0.32181 D ² H	0.880	0.0001	20	2.624
	Foliage = 2.0739 + 0.18181 D ² H	0.813	0.0001	20	1.926
	Stem = 0.71297 + 0.14001 D ² H	0.911	0.0001	20	0.964
<i>Pyralaria pubera</i>	ln(Total) = 2.9598 + 2.7704 lnD	0.698	0.0014	11	0.430
<i>Oxydendrum arboreum</i>	Total = 4.3222 + 0.29848 D ² H	0.971	0.0001	13	8.315
	Foliage = 3.9818 + 0.10234 D ² H	0.904	0.0001	13	5.396
	Stem = 0.34041 + 0.19614 D ² H	0.989	0.0001	13	3.362
<i>Quercus alba</i>	Total = -0.0008 + 0.9838 D ² H	0.985	0.0001	10	1.625
	Foliage = 1.5105 + 0.42193 D ² H	0.920	0.0001	10	1.688
	Stem = -1.5063 + 0.56171 D ² H	0.979	0.0001	10	1.124
<i>Quercus coccinea</i>	Total = 7.2843 + 0.38518 D ² H	0.828	0.0017	8	7.367
	Foliage = 6.0265 + 0.19565 D ² H	0.682	0.0115	8	5.609
	Stem = 1.2578 + 0.18952 D ² H	0.947	0.0001	8	2.565
<i>Quercus prinus</i>	ln(Total) = 3.92693 + 2.97911 lnD	0.930	0.0001	13	0.588
	ln(Foliage) = 3.2388 + 2.6804 lnD	0.924	0.0001	13	0.554
	ln(Stem) = 3.1858 + 3.5281 lnD	0.903	0.0001	13	0.832
<i>Quercus velutina</i>	ln(Total) = 3.59651 + 2.43293 lnD	0.863	0.0001	15	0.593
	ln(Foliage) = 3.1641 + 2.2713 lnD	0.840	0.0001	15	0.606
	ln(Stem) = 2.5322 + 2.8710 lnD	0.899	0.0001	15	0.588

Table 3-Equations for predicting foliage, stem, and total aboveground biomass for woody vegetation on clearcut and burned sites in the Southern Appalachians-Continued

Species	Model	r ²	p	n	S _{y,x}
<i>Rhus glabra</i>	Total = 1.5130 + 0.62920 D ² H	0.974	0.0001	7	1.587
	Foliage = 1.2388 + 0.44405 D ² H	0.974	0.0001	7	1.126
	Stem = 0.27415 + 0.18516 D ² H	0.964	0.0001	7	0.548
<i>Robinia pseudoacacia</i>	ln(Total) = 3.50859 + 2.81508 lnD	0.984	0.0001	8	0.313
	ln(Foliage) = 2.7481 + 2.6673 lnD	0.965	0.0001	8	0.455
	ln(Stem) = 2.8293 + 2.9739 lnD	0.984	0.0001	8	0.336
<i>Rubus argutus</i>	Total = 0.30682 + 0.65899 D ² H	0.869	0.0001	12	0.698
	Foliage = 0.29750 + 0.46901 D ² H	0.854	0.0010	8	0.631
	Stem = -0.02260 + 0.18560 D ² H	0.947	0.0001	8	0.141
<i>Rubus occidentalis</i>	Total = 0.71972 + 0.13954 D ² H	0.794	0.0071	7	0.680
<i>Sassafras albidum</i>	Total = 2.63829 + 0.75199 D ² H	0.885	0.0001	15	4.589
	Foliage = 2.1520 + 0.40803 D ² H	0.831	0.0001	15	3.105
	Stem = 0.48632 + 0.34397 D ² H	0.911	0.0001	15	0.964
<i>Vaccinium vacillans</i>	Total = 1.4023 + 0.04855 D ² H	0.764	0.0001	14	0.754
	Foliage = 0.78760 + 0.02516 D ² H	0.674	0.0011	12	0.535
	Stem = 0.48738 + 0.02336 D ² H	0.897	0.0001	12	0.241

Note: S_{y,x} = standard error of the estimate;
H = height;
D = diameter measured at about 1.0 cm from ground level.