

# Response from Thinning Ponderosa Pine Plantations in Northern Idaho 

David L. Adams, Harold L. Osborne, Donald P. Hanley, Said Messat

## INTRODUCTION

Small private woodlands throughout the Pacific Northwest frequently do not attain maximum wood fiber production because they receive little or no stand management. In many cases the attainment of sawlog-sized trees is seriously reduced by the overcrowding of individual stems. Thinning is a simple method that land managers employ to alleviate overcrowding, thereby reallocating the available growing space to selected crop trees. Crop trees from thinned stands will grow more rapidly than comparable trees from unthinned stands, thus producing more usable, high-value wood products for the landowner.
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A 1976 paper in this series reported on the excellent growth responses obtained by thinning twenty-year-old ponderosa pine (Pinus ponderosa Laws.) plantations in the Palouse Range of northern Idaho (Hanley and Adams, 1976). This paper updates the progress of the same plantations, including the results of a second thinning undertaken at approximately age 35 years.

## STUDY METHODS

Ponderosa pine plantations were established on the University of Idaho Experimental Forest from 1941 to 1943. Between 1958 and 1964, twelve study plots were installed averaging .25 acres in size. All twelve plots were thinned from below at time of establishment, removing the smallest, least vigorous trees. Six of these plots were subject to a second "low" thinning in 1976. Three unthinned control plots were established in 1975, and tree ring measurements were used to recreate tree diameters at the time adjacent plots were thinned. Control plots were used to compare unmanaged growth with results in thinned stands.

The first thinning reduced the average tree density by 28 percent. Numbers of trees per acre after the first thinning ranged from 147, with an average spacing of $17 \mathrm{ft} \times 17 \mathrm{ft}$, to 355 , with an average spacing of 11 ft by 11 ft . The second thinning removed an additional 20 percent of the trees. Tree density per acre after the second thinning ranged from a minimum of 130 , with an average $18-\mathrm{ft} \times 18-\mathrm{ft}$ spacing, to a maximum of 318 , with an average $12-\mathrm{ft} \times 12-\mathrm{ft}$ spacing.

## STUDY RESULTS

The responses reported in this paper are based on diameter breast high (dbh) and total height measurements taken in 1977 and in 1987, providing average annual growth values for 10 growing seasons. Table 1 shows basic information for the thinned and unthinned plots. Average yearly growth data are presented in Table 2. Table 2 and Figure 1 show that diameter increment on once-thinned plots ( 0.22 inch $/ \mathrm{yr}$ ) was 120 percent greater than on the unthinned plots (. $10 \mathrm{inch} / \mathrm{yr}$ ). Average annual diameter growth on twice-thinned plots was
.27 inch/year, a 170 percent increase over unthinned plots and a 23 percent increase over once-thinned plots. Stated another way, the number of years required for a selected crop tree to grow an additional inch in diameter was 10.0 years in the unthinned stands, 4.6 years in the once-thinned plots, and only 3.7 years in the twice-thinned plots (Table 3).

Dramatic differences were also exhibited in cubic-footvolume growth per tree (Table 2 and Figure 1). One thinning increased individual tree growth by 188 percent; two thinnings increased tree growth by 227 percent. For a tree to produce one cubic foot of wood volume required about 3 years on unthinned plots, 1 year on once-thinned plots, and less than one year on twice-thinned plots (Table 3).

However, total per-acre annual fiber production was decreased by the thinnings during this 10 -year period. As compared with the unthinned control plots, one thinning decreased net per-acre volume growth by 50 percent; two thinnings by 54 percent.

Table 1. Basic information for the thinned and unthinned ponderosa pine plots for the 1977-1987 growth period.

| Plot No. | Plot size (Acre) | Trees per Acre |  | DBH (inches) |  | Volume per Acre (Cubic Feet) |  | Volume per Tree (Cubic Feet) |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | 1977 | 1987 | 1977 | 1987 | 1977 | 1987 | 1977 | 1987 |
| Unthinned |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 75-1 | 0.23 | 552 | 530 | 7.4 | 8.3 | 2419 | 4061 | 4.0 | 8.0 |
| 75-2 | 0.13 | 823 | 654 | 5.9 | 7.0 | 2077 | 3332 | 3.0 | 5.0 |
| 75-3 | 0.23 | 448 | 409 | 7.3 | 8.4 | 1863 | 3170 | 4.0 | 8.0 |
| Average | 0.20 | 608 | 531 | 6.9 | 7.9 | 2120 | 3521 | 3.7 | 7.0 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Thinned } \\ & \text { Once } \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 61-1 | 0.10 | 180 | 140 | 11.1 | 13.8 | 2115 | 3642 | 12.0 | 26.0 |
| 61-2 | 0.10 | 230 | 230 | 8.8 | 10.3 | 1578 | 2973 | 9.0 | 13.0 |
| 61-5 | 0.23 | 178 | 139 | 10.3 | 12.4 | 1740 | 2802 | 11.0 | 20.0 |
| 63-1 | 0.23 | 157 | 152 | 10.0 | 11.8 | 1403 | 2683 | 9.0 | 18.0 |
| 63-2 | 0.23 | 217 | 148 | 9.0 | 11.1 | 1487 | 2226 | 7.0 | 15.0 |
| 63-3 | 0.23 | 357 | 217 | 9.1 | 12.3 | 2598 | 4324 | 7.0 | 20.0 |
| Average | 0.19 | 220 | 171 | 9.7 | 12.0 | 1820 | 3108 | 9.2 | 18.7 |
| Thinned twice |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 59-1 | 0.40 | 173 | 130 | 8.9 | 11.2 | 1195 | 2080 | 7.0 | 16.0 |
| 59-2 | 0.40 | 278 | 135 | 8.2 | 11.0 | 1638 | 2126 | 6.0 | 16.0 |
| 59-3 | 0.40 | 318 | 143 | 7.7 | 10.6 | 1534 | 1973 | 5.0 | 14.0 |
| 61-3 | 0.23 | 174 | 91 | 10.8 | 13.5 | 1899 | 2260 | 11.0 | 25.0 |
| 61-4 | 0.23 | 130 | 96 | 10.9 | 13.3 | 1447 | 2239 | 11.0 | 23.0 |
| 64-1 | 0.23 | 170 | 113 | 9.3 | 12.1 | 1282 | 2129 | 8.0 | 19.0 |
| Average | 0.32 | 207 | 118 | 9.3 | 12.0 | 1499 | 2134 | 8.0 | 18.8 |

Table 2. Average yearly growth for the thinned and unthinned ponderosa pine plots for the 1977-1987 growth period.

| Plot No. | DBH <br> (inches) | Volume/acre <br> (cubic feet) | Volume/tree <br> (cubic feet) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Unthinned |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| $75-1$ | 0.09 | 164 | 0.40 |
| $75-2$ | 0.11 | 126 | 0.20 |
| $75-3$ | 0.11 | 131 | 0.40 |
| -140 | 0.333 |  |  |
| Mean | 0.10 | 140 |  |

Thinned once

| $61-1$ | 0.27 | 153 | 1.40 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $61-2$ | 0.15 | 140 | 0.40 |
| $61-5$ | 0.21 | 106 | 0.90 |
| $63-1$ | 0.18 | 128 | 0.90 |
| $63-2$ | 0.21 | 74 | 0.80 |
| $63-3$ | 0.32 | 173 | 1.30 |
| Mean | 0.22 | 129 | 0.95 |

Thinned twice

| $59-1$ | 0.23 | 88 | 0.90 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $59-2$ | 0.28 | 49 | 1.00 |
| $59-3$ | 0.29 | 44 | 0.90 |
| $61-3$ | 0.27 | 36 | 1.40 |
| $61-4$ | 0.24 | 79 | 1.20 |
| $64-1$ | 0.28 | 85 | 1.10 |
| - | 0.27 | 64 | 1.08 |

Table 3. Number of years required for a tree to grow one inch in DBH and one cubic foot in volume for thinned and unthinned ponderosa pine plantations.

| Plot No. | Number of years to grow one unit in <br> DBH | Volume |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Unthinned |  |  |
| $75-1$ | 11.1 | 2.5 |
| $75-2$ | 9.1 | 5.0 |
| $75-3$ | 9.1 | 2.5 |
| Mean | 10.0 | 3.0 |

Thinned once

| $61-1$ | 3.7 | 0.7 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $61-2$ | 6.7 | 2.5 |
| $61-5$ | 4.8 | 1.1 |
| $63-1$ | 5.6 | 1.9 |
| $63-2$ | 4.8 | 1.2 |
| $63-3$ | 3.1 | 0.8 |
| Mean | 4.6 | 1.0 |

Thinned twice

| $59-1$ | 4.4 | 1.1 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $59-2$ | 3.6 | 1.0 |
| $59-3$ | 3.4 | 1.1 |
| $61-3$ | 3.7 | 0.7 |
| $61-4$ | 4.2 | 0.8 |
| $64-1$ | 3.6 | 0.9 |
| Mean | 3.7 | 0.9 |



Figure 1. Average yearly growth for the thinned and unthinned ponderosa pine plots, 1977-1987.

## WHAT THIS MEANS TO THE LANDOWNER

This study illustrates that thinned pine plantations can result in:

- increased growth of the selected crop trees, resulting in-
- more rapid attainment of a marketable high-value wood product, resulting in-
- a faster and usually higher monetary return to the landowner,
- but, with a possible decrease in total cubic foot volume production.

Additionally, thinning overcrowded pine plantations results in a more vigorous plantation which is usually less vulnerable to insect and disease problems.
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