## Shaw Mountain Ice Storm Study, 1998-2002

DOWNED WOOD ANALYSIS

Comparisons of iced and control plots:

Hypothesis A: lced plots have greater density and mass of downed woody debris than Control plots following the ice storm.

For debris sizes of 1 to 3 " in diameter, the hypothesis is supported.

For small size classes, data do not necessarily support the hypothesis.

1. In general, woody debris was found at greater densities and mass in Iced plots than in Control plots (iced:control ratios > 1).

2. Woody debris in larger size classes (1 to 3") remained greater in Iced than in Control plots in all 5 years.

3. Small woody debris (< .25") was greatest in density and mass in year 1 lced plots (n.s.), but greater in Controls after that (n.s.).

Comparisons between years:

Hypothesis B: Fine woody debris will peak in abundance before coarse woody debris following the ice storm.

Data support this hypothesis for debris sizes ranging from 0 to 3". Coarser debris is not greater in year 3 than in year 1.

1. Density and mass of downed woody debris 1-3" in diameter increased in iced areas between years 1 and 3 (p=.05).

2. Density and mass of downed woody debris >3" in diameter increased in iced plots between years 1 and 5 (p = .05)

3. Density and mass of downed woody debris < .25" in diameter decreased in iced plots following a year 1 high (p = .19)

4. Iced:control ratios of density or mass were highest in year 1 for small size classes, and highest in year 5 for debris > 1".

MEANS by year and by size class

density		025	.25-1	1-3 >3	s >1	t	otal	mass		025	.25-1	1-3 >	•3 >1	t	total
1998	iced	110	71	34	9	43	223	1998 iced		0.050	0.655	2.510	3.295	5.805	6.510
	control	85	40	15	7	22	146	control		0.045	0.365	1.070	3.415	4.485	4.890
1999	iced	49	61	44	10	54	163	199	9 iced	0.023	0.561	3.246	4.291	7.537	8.122
	control	46	77	15	5	20	142		control	0.022	0.709	1.070	2.640	3.710	4.441
2000	iced	41	119	60	9	69	228	200	0 iced	0.020	1.099	4.390	3.685	8.075	9.196
	control	84	74	20	5	25	182		control	0.040	0.682	1.439	2.435	3.874	4.596
2001 iced		73	102	48	10	58	232	200	2001 iced		0.941	3.541	4.305	7.846	8.823
	control	109	70	25	6	31	209		control	0.053	0.644	1.845	2.935	4.780	5.477
2002	iced	83	65	80	12	92	239	200	2 iced	0.040	0.603	5.866	6.150	12.016	12.658
	control	95	75	23	6	29	198		control	0.046	0.691	1.697	3.035	4.732	5.469
ICED:CON	TROL RAT	IOS of mean	densties and	d mean mass											
density		025	.25-1	1-3 >3	>1	total		mass		025	.25-1	1-3 >	•3 >1	t	total
1998		1.29	1.80	2.34	1.21	1.98	1.53	199	1998		1.79	2.35	0.96	1.29	1.33
1999		1.07	0.79	3.03	1.90	2.74	1.15	199	1999		0.79	3.03	1.63	2.03	1.83
2000		0.49	1.61	3.05	1.80	2.80	1.25	2000		0.49	1.61	3.05	1.51	2.08	2.00
2001		0.67	1.46	1.92	1.67	1.87	1.11	2001		0.67	1.46	1.92	1.47	1.64	1.61
2002		0.87	0.87	3.46	2.00	3.16	1.21	200	2002		0.87	3.46	2.03	2.54	2.31
COMPARIS	SONS of ic	ed and contro	ol plots, and y	ears (all dowr	ned wood): t-t	ttests (p v	alues shown for	1-tailed tests)							
density		025	.25-1	1-3 >3	>1	t	otal	mass		025	.25-1	1-3 >	•3 >1	t	total
data	compare							data	compare						
1998	ice/ctrl	0.395	0.247	0.034	0.175	0.024	0.258	1998	ice/ctrl	0.458	0.247	0.033	0.469	0.172	0.146
1999	ice/ctrl	0.460	0.296	0.052	0.185	0.015	0.330	1999	ice/ctrl	0.460	0.296	0.052	0.183	0.088	0.108
2000	ice/ctrl	0.153	0.156	0.034	0.223	0.041	0.157	2000	ice/ctrl	0.153	0.156	0.034	0.174	0.051	0.052
2001	ice/ctrl	0.303	0.165	0.050	0.247	0.082	0.383	2001	ice/ctrl	0.303	0.165	0.050	0.261	0.162	0.130
2002	ice/ctrl	0.356	0.351	0.088	0.053	0.082	0.282	2002	ice/ctrl	0.356	0.351	0.088	0.072	0.082	0.082
iced	98/99	0.194	0.396	0.132	0.146	0.101	0.278	iced	98/99	0.197	0.399	0.132	0.202	0.067	0.137
control	98/99	0.326	0.167	0.500	0.312	0.346	0.479	control	98/99	0.315	0.166	0.500	0.334	0.322	0.403
iced	98/00	0.186	0.179	0.047	0.448	0.017	0.481	iced	98/00	0.185	0.176	0.047	0.371	0.061	0.061
control	98/00	0.493	0.018	0.239	0.312	0.380	0.344	control	98/00	0.459	0.017	0.237	0.275	0.352	0.424
iced	98/01	0.321	0.252	0.083	0.386	0.155	0.467	iced	98/01	0.343	0.248	0.083	0.313	0.232	0.189
control	98/01	0.390	0.009	0.076	0.356	0.103	0.257	control	98/01	0.432	0.008	0.072	0.375	0.410	0.329
iced	98/02	0.331	0.440	0.103	0.045	0.097	0.436	iced	98/02	0.355	0.443	0.103	0.056	0.089	0.085
control	98/02	0.454	0.154	0.101	0.276	0.085	0.291	control	98/02	0.493	0.153	0.096	0.395	0.412	0.309

- VARIABLES obs = observation number
  - pl = plot number (1, 2, 3, 4)
  - ice = ice treatment (1 = iced, 0 = control)
  - age = age relative to the time of the ice storm
    - (0 = wood downed before ice storm,
    - 1 = wood downed by ice storm,
    - 2 = all downed wood)
  - yr = year of observation
  - d0 = density of down stems 0 to .25" in diameter (number per 60 m transect)
  - d.25 = density of down stems .25 to 1" in diameter (number per 60 m transect)
  - d1\_3 = density of down stems 1 to 3" in diameter (number per 60 m transect)
  - d3 = density of down stems >3" in diameter (number per 60 m transect)
  - d1 = density of down stems >1" in diameter (number per 60 m transect)
  - dt = density of all down stems (number per 60 m transect)
  - m0 = mass of down stems 0 to .25" in diameter (tons/acre)
  - m.25 = mass of down stems .25 to 1" in diameter(tons/acre)
  - m1\_3 = mass of down stems 1 to 3" in diameter(tons/acre)
  - m3 = mass of down stems >3" in diameter (tons/acre)
  - m1 = mass of down stems >1" in diameter (tons/acre)
  - mt = mass of all down stems (tons/acre)
  - To convert tons/acre to Kg/ha, multiply tons/acre by 2241.74