2012

Identification of old-growth forest reference ecosystems using historic land surveys, Redwood National Park, California

Joy Fritschle
West Chester University of Pennsylvania, jfritschle@wcupa.edu

Identification of old-growth forest reference ecosystems using historic land surveys, Redwood National Park, California

Journal:	*Restoration Ecology*
Manuscript ID:	REC-11-207.R1
Manuscript Type:	Research Paper
Date Submitted by the Author:	02-Aug-2011

Complete List of Authors:	Fritschle, Joy; West Chester University of Pennsylvania, Geography and Planning

Keywords:	Geographic Information Systems (GIS), Public Land Survey, Sequoia sempervirens (coast redwood)

Title: Identification of old-growth forest reference ecosystems using historic land surveys, Redwood National Park, California

Running Title: Historic surveys identify reference ecosystems

Keywords: Geographic Information Systems (GIS), Public Land Survey, *Sequoia sempervirens* (coast redwood)

Manuscript Submission Category: Research Paper

Author: Joy A. Fritschle

Author's Affiliation: West Chester University

Corresponding Author's Contact Details: Department of Geography & Planning, West Chester University, West Chester, PA 19383, jfritschle@wcupa.edu

Abstract

Old-growth forests in the American West typically represent fragments of former, more extensive forests that were subjected to nineteenth and twentieth century land-clearing activities, such as logging. These present-day forest fragments are thought to be representative of the former landscape, and thus are capable of serving as living references for guiding restoration of logged forests. Yet how do we determine the extent to which existing old-growth stands represent the former forest, especially when little of the surrounding original vegetation remains? Historic land surveys conducted prior to significant logging can reconstruct the former forest at the stand level, thus allowing an analysis of old-growth patches within the larger historic landscape. This study utilized original Public Land Surveys to assess the applicability of old-growth stands in Redwood National Park as reference ecosystems. A GIS and statistical analysis of the nineteenth century forest found that vegetation communities, woody species composition, and ratios of dominant canopy species in unlogged patches were highly representative of the forests that were logged. Significance testing (H_o: $\mu_1 = \mu_2$) revealed p-values greater than 0.10000 in all measures of community and species composition, except for the higher abundance of oak in present-day old-growth (*p*-value = 0.0395). The results of this study suggest that the national park should increase efforts to protect old-growth reference ecosystems from further human impacts, and minimize on-going degradation from edge effects by prioritizing restoration of adjoining second-growth forest.

Introduction

Reference ecosystems are critical components of planning and evaluating ecological restoration projects. They represent a single state or snapshot in the range of natural variability for the ecosystem in need of restoration (SER 2004). Thus, identification of the goals and objectives for restoration requires multiple lines of evidence, or multiple references, to understand ecosystem structure, composition, and functional processes (Foster et al. 1996; Moore et al. 1999; SER 2004).

This study fills in a significant gap in the knowledge of reference ecosystems for restoration of logged forests in Redwood National Park in northern California (41°N, 124°W): an assessment of old-growth forest based on a basin-wide reconstruction of ecosystems using historic land surveys. In conjunction with the analysis of aerial photographs (Best 1995), dendrochronology (Veirs 1982; Sugihara & Reed 1987), field surveys of the vegetation (Sugihara & Reed 1987; Lenihan 1990; Russell & Jones 2001), and qualitative historical accounts (e.g., Murdock 1921; Stover 1999), the original Public Land Surveys (PLS) contribute to the "composite description" of the basin necessary for restoration planning (SER 2004). Each one of these lines of evidence provides unique information regarding the ecosystem prior to damage, although the most effective restoration depends on understanding the range of historic variability. Thus, the original PLS field notes provide a better understanding of the forests that existed prior to logging, and thereby contribute to identifying restoration goals for second-growth forests in Redwood National Park.

Dendroecological reconstructions are limited in the national park to old-growth trees that remain standing today and the presence of intact stumps. Stumps and trees that were destroyed by tractor-logging cannot be sampled in a present-day field study. The earliest aerial photographs of the study area date to 1936—eighty-plus years after EuroAmerican settlement—and are incapable of stand-level reconstruction. Only the PLS record is capable of reconstructing the entire historic forest at the stand level. An extensive body of research has developed concerning the reliability and quality of vegetation reconstructions based on historic land surveys (e.g., Bourdo 1956; Galatowitsch 1980; Whitney 1990; Radeloff et al. 1999; Black et al. 2002; Bolliger et al. 2004; Wang 2007; Fritschle 2008, 2009). In Redwood National Park, the time period of the original PLS records is especially pertinent in identification of reference ecosystems because these surveys were conducted prior to widespread fire suppression, introduction of non-native species, and logging in the basin.

Using the original PLS field notes, Fritschle (2009) reconstructed the historic vegetation communities and spatial distributions of major woody species in the lower Redwood Creek basin of Redwood National Park. This study assesses the applicability of these historic communities and the remaining old-growth forest as reference ecosystems. The old-growth coast redwood communities found in the Little Lost Man Creek subbasin are considered highly representative of historic redwood-dominated communities in the park, and are studied in more detail. Using the PLS record as a basis for describing the historic nineteenth century forest, this study will answer the following questions: (1) What coniferous forest communities were logged in the lower Redwood Creek basin? (2) To what extent are the remaining old-growth coniferous forest communities representative of the historic forest? (3) Are the Little Lost Man Creek redwood forest communities representative samples of the redwood forests that were logged?

Nineteenth century surveyors noted species types according to common names rather than scientific nomenclature. Thus, the common names noted in the surveys are used throughout this paper.

Some second-growth stands in the park were re-entered by timber companies and thus technically constitute third- and fourth-growth forest (Best 1995). For the sake of convenience, I will refer to all logged coniferous forests in the lower Redwood Creek basin as "second-growth."

Methods

The lower Redwood Creek basin in Redwood National Park was systematically surveyed under the auspices of the U.S. General Land Office beginning in 1875 to 1886. In the century following the original PLS, the lower Redwood Creek basin in Redwood National Park was subjected to extensive logging activities. Unlike many of the *Sequoia sempervirens* (coast redwood) forests further south in California, the more isolated Redwood Creek basin was not extensively logged until the mid-twentieth century (Bearss 1969, Best 1995). Prior to 1936, only 2 percent of the basin had been cleared; much of this was *Picea sitchensis* (Sitka spruce) forest near Orick. In 1954, 15 percent of the coniferous forests in the lower Redwood Creek basin had been logged. By the time most of the lower basin became national park land in 1978, 69% of the coniferous forests had been logged (Best 1995). Restoration of these second-growth forests to old-growth conditions has been identified as an important management concern in the national park (RNSP 2000; Sarr et al. 2004).

The restoration of second-growth coniferous forests in the lower Redwood Creek basin is a significant challenge for park scientists and managers. Timber companies aerially seeded and planted mostly *Pseudotsuga menziesii* (Douglas fir) on clearcut lands in the basin (RNP 1980; RNSP 2000). As a result, second-growth forests consist of very dense stands of small trees ranging from 5,000 to 25,000 trees per hectare, with a 10:2 overstory ratio of Douglas fir to coast redwood (Muldavin et al. 1981; Veirs & Lennox 1981; Veirs 1986; RNSP 1999). This density of trees is two to three orders of magnitude higher than old-growth stands in the lower basin which possess more redwood and typically have 25 to 90 large trees per hectare (Veirs 1982). In the overstory of old-growth stands in the park, redwood trees outnumber Douglas fir trees ranging from 3:1 to 10:1 (RNSP 2000). Such high densities of Douglas fir in second-growth forests effectively limit the growth of redwood. If these stands are left untreated, redwood may take as long as 100 to 200 years to start dominating the overstory (RNP 1980).

Although the old-growth stands in lower Redwood Creek suffer from the influence of edge effects resulting from adjacent logged forest (Russell & Jones 2001), park scientists believe that the old-growth forests found in the Little Lost Man Creek subbasin are largely representative of the historic coast redwood forests (RNP 1994) (Figure 1). These forests are to be managed as the most “pristine” in the park (RNSP 2000). The subbasin comprises 957 hectares, of which 89 percent (852 ha) remains as old-growth forest (RNP 1998).

In order to answer the questions posed in this study, the following analysis relied primarily on the processing of three GIS datasets in *ArcMap 9.1* (ESRI 2005):

- **Line coverage of PLS-derived nineteenth century vegetation communities and species relative weights assigned to one-mile section lines.** Fritschle (2009) reconstructed the historical distribution of dominant woody species and vegetation communities in the lower Redwood Creek basin according to the original PLS record. Specifically, that analysis resulted in identification of six vegetation communities and the relative weights of species in the basin. Relative weights indicate the dominance of species within communities, but differ from more commonly employed importance values due to the absence of basal area data (Seischab 1990). Instead, relative weights derive from quantifying ranked lists of overstory and understory species noted at the end of every section mile (line summaries). For both the classification of communities and the calculation of relative weights, each one-mile long section line was treated as a sampling plot. Since each plot (section line) was approximately the same length (1.61 km), the average relative weight of species by community was derived from simply averaging the relative weights of all section lines within a community.
- **1:24,000 polygon coverage of present-day second-growth and old-growth coniferous forest** created by Redwood National Park (RNP 1998).
- **1:100,000 polygon coverages of present-day vegetation alliances** (USDA 2004, 2005).

To compare the historic coniferous forest with the present-day extent of old-growth and logged coniferous forest, PLS section lines were intersected with both the old-growth and logged polygons. The resulting GIS shapefiles included the original one-mile long PLS section lines divided into smaller segments within old-growth and logged coniferous forest. The composition of old-growth PLS-derived communities was determined by adding up the line segments lengths for each community type found in old-growth coniferous forest, dividing by the total length of old-growth line segments, and multiplying by 100 percent. Since the data were normally distributed according to normal probability and residual plots, two-tailed Student's t-tests were performed to assess significant difference between the historic and present-day old-growth forest communities. The relative weights of species within a community were also recalculated based on the length of line segments found in old-growth coniferous forest. When considering the entire study area of the lower Redwood Creek basin in Fritschle (2009), all section lines were approximately the same length (one mile). Thus, calculation of average relative weight for a species within a community required simply averaging all relative weights within a particular community. However, portions of these section lines were logged, resulting in differing lengths of old-growth section lines and requiring calculation of relative weights adjusted to the length of each line (Table 1).

To determine the degree to which the Little Lost Man Creek subbasin could serve as a reference redwood ecosystem required a definition of what constitutes "redwood forest" in lower Redwood Creek. Six coniferous forest alliances have been identified in the lower Redwood Creek basin: Pacific Douglas-fir (covers 4.4% of the lower basin), Redwood – Douglas-fir (37.4%), Sitka Spruce (1.4%), Sitka Spruce – Grand Fir (0.8%), Sitka Spruce – Redwood (5.1%), and Redwood (50.8%) (USDA 2004, 2005). Alliances represent a more generalized classification of vegetation associations (Tart et al. 2005).

The coniferous forest alliances were derived from remotely sensed data with a minimum mapping area of 6.25 hectares and greater than 10 percent conifer cover (USDA 2004, 2005). Just over 90 percent of PLS section lines in the Little Lost Man Creek subbasin occur within the Redwood Alliance (a coniferous forest alliance with greater than 50 percent redwood canopy cover). Redwood – Douglas-fir (9.3%) and Douglas-fir (0.3%) alliances encompass the remaining PLS lines. Thus, the old-growth redwood forest in the subbasin was most appropriately compared to historic forests found within the Redwood Alliance. In the northern redwood range, this type of redwood-dominated forest exists on alluvial and colluvial soils along the coast and at maritime-influenced inland sites with elevations below 610 meters (USDA 2004). Associated woody species include Douglas fir, *Lithocarpus densiflorus* (tanoak), *Tsuga heterophylla* (western hemlock), *Corylus cornuta californica* (California hazel), *Gaultheria shallon* (salal), and *Rhododendron macrophyllum* (Pacific rhododendron). The composition of PLS-communities and species relative weights within the historic redwood forest and Little Lost Man Creek redwood forest were derived in the same manner as described earlier for present-day old-growth vs. historic coniferous forest.

Results

Pre- and post-logging coniferous forest

Historic vegetation community section lines covered 193,817 meters (~120 miles) in the lower Redwood Creek basin (Table 2, Figure 2). At the time of the original surveys, 46 percent of the lower Redwood Creek basin was comprised of fir-dominated communities; after logging nearly two-thirds of the original fir-dominated communities remained old-growth. Prior to logging, redwood- and oak-dominated communities accounted for 21 percent and 33 percent, respectively, of the vegetation communities in the basin. Roughly half of these communities were subsequently logged. The proportion of fir-, redwood-, and oak-dominated communities changed slightly between 1875 and the present-day: fir-dominated communities, which historically comprised 46 percent of the basin increased to 52 percent of the basin, redwood-dominated communities decreased from 21 to 20 percent, and oak-dominated communities decreased from 33 to 28 percent.

The most heavily logged communities were heavy redwood-fir and oak-fir-madrone. One-third of the heavy redwood-fir community and two-fifths of the oak-fir-madrone community remain in the basin today as old-growth forest. Originally, heavy redwood-fir represented 41 percent of the redwood-dominated communities in the basin and included the highest average relative weight of redwood. Today, less than one-third of the redwood-dominated old-growth forest is comprised of the heavy redwood-fir community. The oak-fir-madrone community included the highest average weight of fir. Thus, the communities that experienced the greatest amount of logging in the lower Redwood Creek basin had the greatest abundance (as measured by relative weights) of either redwood or fir. Communities with lower relative weights of these two species and a more equal mix of species experienced less logging.

Abundance of minor woody species such as *Vaccinium* spp. (huckleberry), *Acer* spp. (maple), and red alder were the most different, while the most dominant species—fir, redwood, and oak—were the most similar between the historic versus present-day old-growth coniferous forest (Table 3). On average, the heavy redwood-fir community possessed the greatest differences in relative weights of species between the old-growth and historic forest. In the old-growth heavy redwood-fir community, only redwood had a higher average relative weight compared to the historic forest. Except for oak (p-value = 0.0395), the increase or decrease in mean relative weight between the historic and old-growth forest were not significantly different. Similarly, the ratios of fir vs. redwood average relative weights were not significantly different between the entire historic coniferous forest and the forests that now constitute logged and old-growth coniferous forest (Table 4).

Overall, these results suggest that while a significant amount of these communities were logged (p-value = 0.00007, H_o: $\mu_1 = \mu_2$), the proportions of communities within their dominant species type are not significantly different in the remaining old-growth forest (p-value = 0.50000, H_o: $\mu_1 = \mu_2$). In other words, the differences within the fir-dominated communities between historic coniferous forest and present-day old-growth coniferous forest are not significantly different. Similarly, the composition of all species except oak is not significantly different within communities.

<u>Old-growth redwood forest in the Little Lost Man Creek subbasin</u>

A comparison of redwood forest found throughout the lower Redwood Creek basin verses redwood forest in the Little Lost Man Creek subbasin yielded slightly higher average relative weight values in the subbasin for redwood, Sitka spruce, *Pinus* spp. (pine), red alder, *Aesculus californica* (California buckeye), *Baccharis pilularis* (chaparral), and huckleberry species (Table 5). Thus the dominance of these species is slightly overrepresented in the subbasin compared to the redwood forest found throughout the lower basin in 1875-1886. Fir, oak, *Arbutus menziesii* (Pacific madrone), maple, *Corylus cornuta californica* (hazel), and salal are slightly less dominant in the subbasin. However, only the average relative weight of oak was found to be significantly different (p-value = 0.0462, H_o: $\mu_1 = \mu_2$). A comparison of fir to redwood ratios revealed that redwood was significantly more important in Little Lost Man Creek subbasin compared to the basin-wide redwood forest (p-value = 0.0341, H_o: $\mu_1 = \mu_2$) (Table 6).

The composition of communities in redwood forest between Little Lost Man Creek old-growth and the historic Redwood Creek basin redwood forest are not significantly different (p-value = 0.4526, H_o: $\mu_1 = \mu_2$). The largest differences in the proportion of communities within their dominant species types are the amount of redwood- and oak-dominated forest, 43 percent and 46 percent more important in the subbasin respectively. Nonetheless, these differences are not significantly different. The composition of communities within the Little Lost Man Creek old-growth forest is representative of the historic redwood forest in the lower Redwood Creek basin.

In sum, the 852 ha of old-growth redwood forest in the Little Lost Man Creek subbasin is largely representative of the 11,708 ha of redwood forest found throughout the lower Redwood Creek basin, however redwood is more dominant over fir in the subbasin.

Discussion

The results of this analysis suggest that the remaining old-growth coniferous forest in the lower Redwood Creek basin, including the old-growth redwood forest in the Little Lost Man Creek subbasin, is highly representative of the historic forest. The composition of communities and the average relative weights of species within those communities are not significantly different between the present-day old-growth forest and the logged forest. Thus, the coniferous forest in the lower Redwood Creek basin identified as effective old-growth (Russell & Jones 2001) can serve as a reference ecosystem for restoration of logged forests to old-growth conditions.

How might this evaluation of old-growth forests using the original PLS records affect on-going park policies and ecological restoration activities? This question applies to both the parklands of Redwood Creek as well as to other parklands possessing representative old-growth forests. The implications for park policy and management are two-fold.

First, if stands of old-growth are found to be highly representative of landscapes requiring ecological restoration, park policies should reflect the added importance of protecting these reference ecosystems. Protection should be geared toward as little human interference as possible in order to protect functioning, intact reference ecosystems. The task of national parks to balance visitor use and environmental protection can still be achieved as smaller fragments of old-growth forest serve the needs of interpretive programs and visitor enjoyment. Although access and visitor development of these reference ecosystems should be limited, the old-growth stands can be intensively studied in order to inform specific objectives in second-growth restoration.

In Redwood Creek, park managers have taken this step for the Redwood Alliance forest. The Little Lost Man Creek subbasin, as this study has shown, contains highly representative old-growth redwood forest. The subbasin has been designated a Research Natural Area subzone of the primitive zone within the national park (RNSP 2000). Research Natural Areas in the national parks are permanently designated for the purpose of observation, monitoring, and long-term environmental research in areas typifying an ecological community type (NPS 2004). The results of the PLS analysis found that other old-growth forest alliances in the basin are also highly representative of the former forest. Although less extensive in area and more fragmented, Redwood – Douglas fir Alliance old-growth in the southern half of the park warrants enhanced protection and further study as a reference ecosystem (Figure 3). Twenty percent of old-growth in the lower Redwood Creek basin is found within this alliance (RNP 1998, USDA 2004, 2005).

The second implication for park policy and management activities relates to prioritizing restoration of second-growth forest stands. Since the protection of reference ecosystems is paramount to restoring second-growth stands, it follows that stands surrounding reference ecosystems should be restored first. In Redwood Creek, formerly clear-cut stands are directly adjacent to old-growth forest, resulting in up to a 50 percent reduction in effective old-growth (Russell and Williams 2001). Thus, in order to protect the reference ecosystems from further edge effects, the first objective in second-growth restoration should deal with the edges along the old-growth forest. Key biotic and abiotic variables should be identified for forest edges that will change the forest structure to reflect, for example, old-growth microclimatic, soil moisture, and disturbance regimes. The identification of key variables allows us to identify those organisms and abiotic processes most likely to encourage further structural and processes development (Moore et al. 1999). In Redwood Creek, buffering the reference ecosystems in such a manner would likely involve furthering the work that the park has identified as management objectives, specifically thinning the thickets of Douglas-fir and exotic species, re-introducing fire, and planting native species (RNSP 2000).

Unlike many studies that have used the PLS to reconstruct historic vegetation, significant stands of old-growth forest still exist in the lower Redwood Creek basin. This allows us to gauge how representative current old-growth is compared to the historic forest.

The PLS reconstruction provides a historical reference for forests that no longer exist today, thus it can contribute to on-going restoration and management decisions. Future work in restoration of coast redwood forests would benefit from a field study mimicking the original PLS in old-growth forest to better gauge the strengths and limitations of this reconstruction, similar to work by Manies and Mladenoff (2000) in northern Wisconsin. Although that study made significant contributions to understanding PLS records, especially in relation to scales and methodologies for creating presettlement vegetation maps, forests in the Pacific Northwest differ substantially in the terrain surveyors had to traverse, the types of species and ecosystems found, and the historical context of the surveys, including differing sets of instructions and problems with land fraud. Such a study would also assist in uncovering biases that may exist in the PLS record for this region and enable more direct comparisons with other field-based studies of redwood forests.

Implications for Practice

- A GIS analysis of historic land surveys, such as the original Public Land Surveys, can be used to determine the degree to which remnant old-growth patches are representative of the former forest (reference ecosystems). This analysis can also identify ecosystems that occupied a specialized, narrow niche in the historic landscape.

- Identification of representative old-growth patches can aid in the triaging of landscape protection and restoration, prioritizing protection of highly representative patches and restoration of adjacent damaged ecosystems to buffer further damage to the representative ecosystem.

Acknowledgements

I would like to thank Ted Sickley for assistance in GIS data preparation. I am also grateful to Tom Vale, Matt Turner, Greg Turner, Caroline Fritschle, Nancy Langston, the section editor, and two anonymous reviewers for their constructive comments on the manuscript.

References

Bearss, E.C. 1969. History basic data, Redwood National Park, Del Norte and Humboldt Counties, California. National Park Service, Division of History, Office of Archeology and Historic Preservation, United States Department of the Interior.

Best, D.W. 1995. History of timber harvest in the Redwood Creek basin, northwestern California. U.S. Geological Survey Professional Paper 1454-C. PagesC1-C7 in K.M. Nolan, H.M. Kelsey, and D.C. Marron, editors. Geomorphic processes and aquatic habitat in the Redwood Creek basin, northwestern California. United States Geological Survey, Washington, D.C.

Black, B.A., M.D. Abrams, and H.T. Foster. 2002. Combining environmentally dependent and independent analyses of witness tree data in east-central Alabama. Canadian Journal of Forest Research **32**:2060-2075.

Bolliger J, L.A. Schulte, S.N. Burrows, T.A. Sickley, and D.J. Mladenoff. 2004. Assessing ecological restoration potentials of Wisconsin (U.S.A.) using historical landscapes reconstruction. Restoration Ecology **12**(1):124-142.

Bourdo, Jr., E.A. 1956. A review of the General Land Office Survey and of its use in quantitative studies of former forests. Ecology **37**:754-768.

Calflora: Information on California plants for education, research and conservation (web application). 2009. The Calflora Database, Berkeley, California. URL http://www.calflora.org/ [accessed on 29 July 2011]

Chase, A.W. 1874. Timber belts of the Pacific coast. Overland Monthly and Out West Magazine **13**(3):242-249.

Cooper, W.S. 1926. Vegetational development upon alluvial fans in the vicinity of Palo Alto, California. Ecology **7**(1):1-30.

ESRI. 2005. ArcMap 9.1. Environmental Systems Research Institute, Redlands, California.

Fritschle, J.A. 2007. An intermediate-scale reconstruction of historic vegetation in Redwood National Park using the Public Land Survey. Dissertation. University of Wisconsin-Madison.

Fritschle, J.A. 2008. Reconstructing historic ecotones using the Public Land Survey: the lost prairies of Redwood National Park. Annals of the Association of American Geographers **98**(1):24-39.

Fritschle, J.A. 2009. Pre-EuroAmerican settlement forests in Redwood National Park, California, U.S.A.: a reconstruction using line summaries in historic land surveys. Landscape Ecology **24**(6):833-847.

Foster, D.R., D.A. Orwig, and J.S. McLachlan. 1996. Ecological and conservation insights from reconstructive studies of temperate old-growth forests. Trends in Ecology & Evolution **11**(10):419-424.

Galatowitsch, S.M. 1990. Using the original land survey notes to reconstruct presettlement landscapes in the American west. Great Basin Naturalist **50**:181-191.

Lenihan, J.M. 1990. Forest associations of Little Lost Man Creek, Humboldt County, California: reference-level in the hierarchical structure of old-growth coastal redwood vegetation. Madroño **37**(2):69-87.

Little, E.L. 1994. National Audubon Society field guide to North American trees, western region. Alfred A. Knopf, New York.

Manies, K.L., and D.J. Mladenoff. 2000. Testing methods to produce landscape-scale presettlement vegetation maps from the U.S. public land survey records. Landscape Ecology **15**:741-754.

Moore, M.M., W.W. Covington, and P.Z. Fule. 1999. Reference conditions and ecological restoration: a southwestern Ponderosa pine perspective. Ecological Applications **9**(4):1266-1277.

Muldavin, E.H., J.M. Lenihan, W.S. Lennox, and S.D. Veirs. 1981. Vegetation succession in the first ten years following logging of the coast redwood forests.

Technical Report No. 6. Redwood National Park, National Park Service, United States Department of the Interior, Arcata, California.

Murdock, C.A. 1921. A backward glance at eighty, recollections & comments; Massachusetts 1841, Humboldt Bay 1855, San Francisco 1864. P. Elder and Company, San Francisco, California. URL http://hdl.loc.gov/loc.gdc/calbk.137 [accessed on 29 July 2011]

National Park Service (NPS). 2004. Natural Resource Management Reference Manual #77. National Park Service, United States Department of the Interior. URL http://www.nature.nps.gov/rm77/specialdesignations/RNA.cfm [accessed on 29 July 2011].

National Park Service (NPS). 2005. Base Boundaries for California and Oregon (1:24,000 Quads, Counties, States, and Parks). Inventory and Monitoring Program, National Park Service, U.S. Department of Interior, Fort Collins, Colorado. URL http://nrdata.nps.gov/networks/klmn/data/basedata/boudary/ca_or_basecarto_bnd.zip [accessed on 29 July 2011].

Radeloff, V.C., D.J. Mladenoff, H.S. He, and M.S. Boyce. 1999. Forest landscape change in the northwestern Wisconsin pine barrens from pre-European settlement to the present. Canadian Journal of Forest Research **29**:1649-1659.

Redwood National and State Parks (RNSP). 1999. Final general management plan/general plan environmental impact statement/environmental impact report. Redwood National and State Parks, Humboldt and Del Norte Counties, California. National Park Service and California Department of Parks and

Recreation, United States Department of Interior, Denver Service Center, Denver, Colorado.

Redwood National and State Parks (RNSP). 2000. General management plan. Redwood National and State Parks, Humboldt and Del Norte Counties, California. National Park Service and California Department of Parks and Recreation, United States Department of Interior, Denver Service Center, Denver, Colorado.

Redwood National Park (RNP). 1980. Watershed rehabilitation plan environmental assessment, Redwood National Park, Del Norte and Humboldt Counties, California. National Park Service, United States Department of the Interior, Denver, Colorado.

Redwood National Park (RNP). 1994. Resources Management Plan. Redwood National Park, National Park Service, U.S. Department of the Interior, Arcata, California.

Redwood National Park (RNP). 1996. Checklist of the vascular plants of Redwood National Park. Biological Inventories of the World's Protected Areas, Online Query System. Information Center for the Environment, University of California, Davis, California. URL http://www.ice.ucdavis.edu/bioinventory/bioinventory.html [accessed on 29 July 2011]

Redwood National Park (RNP). 1998. Best available vegetation: Redwood National and State Parks (1:24,000). Redwood National Park, National Park Service, United States Department of the Interior, Arcata, California.

Russell, W.H., and C. Jones. 2001. The effects of timber harvesting on the structure and composition of adjacent old-growth coast redwood forest, California, USA. Landscape Ecology **16**:731-741.

Sarr, D., K. Puettmann, R. Pabst, M. Cornett, and L. Arguello. 2004. Restoration ecology: new perspectives and opportunities for forestry. Journal of Forestry **102**(5):20-24.

Society for Ecological Restoration Science & Policy Working Group (SER). 2004. The SER International primer on ecological restoration, version 2. URL http://www.ser.org/content/ecological_restoration_primer.asp [accessed on 29 July 2011]

Stover, M. 1999. Oral history interview with Marlin Stover conducted by Steve Horner and Patsy Givens, September 1, 1999, Arcata, California. Humboldt County Historical Society Archives, Eureka, California.

Sugihara, N.G., and L.J. Reed. 1987. Vegetation ecology of the Bald Hills oak woodlands of Redwood National Park. Redwood National Park Research and Development Technical Report Number 21. Redwood National Park South Operations Center, National Park Service, United States Department of the Interior, Orick, California.

Tart, D., C. Williams, J. DiBenedetto, E. Crowe, M. Girard, H. Gordon, K. Sleavin, M. Manning, J. Haglund, B. Short, and D. Wheeler. 2005. Section 2: Existing Vegetation Classification Protocol. Pages2.1-2.34 in R. Brohman and L. Bryant, editors. Existing Vegetation Classification and Mapping Technical Guide, Gen. Tech. Rep. WO–67. Forest Service, United States Department of Agriculture, Washington, D.C.

USDA Forest Service (USDA). 2004. Vegetation Classification, Vegetation Descriptions, North Coast and Montane Ecological Province – CALVEG Zone 1. Remote Sensing Lab, Pacific Southwest Region, Forest Service, United States Department of Agriculture. URL http://www.fs.fed.us/r5/rsl/projects/classification/ncoast-veg-descript.shtml [accessed on 29 July 2011]

USDA Forest Service (USDA). 2005. FSSDE.EvegTile01A/B (vector digital data), 1:100,000. Remote Sensing Lab, Pacific Southwest Region, Forest Service, United States Department of Agriculture, McClellan, California. URL http://www.fs.fed.us/r5/rsl/clearinghouse/aa-ref-sec263a.shtml [accessed on 29 July 2011]

Veirs, S.D. 1982. Coast redwood forest: stand dynamics, successional status, and the role of fire. Pages119-141 in J.E. Means, editor. Forest succession and stand development research in the northwest. Oregon State University, Forest Research Laboratory, Corvallis, Oregon.

Veirs, S.D. 1986. Redwood second-growth forest stand rehabilitation study, Redwood National Park: evaluation of 1978-79 thinning experiments, Redwood National Park. Redwood National Park, United States Department of Interior, Orick, California.

Veirs, S.D., and Lennox, W.S. 1981. Rehabilitation and Long-term Park Management of Cutover Redwood Forests: Problems of Natural Succession. Redwood National Park, United States Department of the Interior, Arcata, California.

Wang, Y. 2007. Spatial patterns and vegetation-site relationships of the presettlement forests in western New York, USA. Journal of Biogeography **34**:500-513.

Whitney, G.G. 1990. The history and status of the Hemlock-Hardwood forests of the Allegheny Plateau. The Journal of Ecology **78**(2):443-458.

Table 1: Procedure for calculating average relative weights of community species in old-growth coniferous forest. Adjusted relative weights resulted from multiplying the original relative weight by the percent that line contributed to the total old-growth lines. For example, in the first section line listed below, the adjusted relative weight of fir was 33.30 x 26.7% = 8.88. To find the adjusted average relative weight for a species within a particular community, the adjusted relative weights are added together. Thus, the average relative weight of fir within the old-growth heavy redwood-fir community is (8.88 + 0.17 + 0.36 + 9.27 + 9.18 + 1.37 + 2.19) = 31.41. Species abbreviations are as follows: FR - Fir, HB - Huckleberry, RW - Redwood, and SL - salal.

Heavy Redwood-Fir Community

Original Relative Weights				**Remaining Line Segments**		**Adjusted Relative Weights**			
FR	HB	RW	SL	Length (meters)	Percent	FR	HB	RW	SL
33.30	0.00	66.70	0.00	1585.33	26.7	8.88	0.00	17.78	0.00
16.65	33.3	33.30	16.65	60.01	1.0	0.17	0.34	0.34	0.17
16.65	33.3	33.30	16.65	126.88	2.1	0.36	0.71	0.71	0.36
33.30	0.00	66.70	0.00	1655.36	27.8	9.27	0.00	18.56	0.00
33.30	0.00	66.70	0.00	1640.33	27.6	9.18	1.37	18.40	0.00
16.65	16.65	33.30	33.30	488.23	8.2	1.37	0.00	2.73	2.73
33.30	0.00	66.70	0.00	391.43	6.6	2.19	2.41	4.39	0.00
Original Average Relative Weights for heavy redwood-fir community in entire study area						*Adjusted Average Relative Weights for heavy redwood-fir community in old-growth forest*			
31.98	*8.33*	*49.84*	*6.66*			*31.41*	*4.83*	*62.91*	*3.26*

Table 2: Public Land Survey communities (% area) and average redwood and fir overstory relative weights (RW) found in old-growth forest.

Community Type	Area in basin, 1875	Area in basin as old-growth forest, 1998	Proportion of community that remains old-growth	Average Overstory Fir RW	Average Overstory Redwood RW
Fir-Mixed Conifer-Mixed Hardwood/Chaparral	23.6	14.8	62.9	21.8	19.4
Fir-Redwood-Mixed Hardwood	22.0	13.7	62.2	30.1	27.4
Fir-dominated communities (weighted average)	*22.8*	*14.3*	*62.6*	*25.8*	*23.2*
Fir-dominated communities (total)	45.6	28.5			
Heavy Redwood-Fir	8.7	3.0	34.4	26.6	48.3
Redwood-Mixed Conifer/Chaparral	12.6	7.6	60.2	13.0	23.2
Redwood-dominated communities (weighted average)	*10.6*	*5.3*	*49.6*	*18.7*	*33.7*
Redwood-dominated communities (total)	21.3	10.6			
Oak-Fir-Madrone	15.6	6.4	41.1	41.5	0
Oak-Pine-Mixed Conifer/Chaparral	17.5	8.5	48.8	18.8	13.5
Oak-dominated communities (weighted average)	*16.6*	*7.5*	*45.2*	*29.5*	*7.1*
Oak-dominated communities (total)	33.1	14.9			
			Overall Average:	54.1	

Table 3: Average relative weight of species by community, pre-logging coniferous forest (PC) vs. uncut coniferous forest (UC).

	PL	*UC*	*PL*	*UC*	*PL*	*UC*	*PL*	*UC*	*PL*	*UC*	*PL*	*UC*	*PL*	*UC*
Community	**Fir**		**Redwood**		**Oak**		**Spruce**		**Pine**		**Alder**		**Madrone**	
Fir-Mixed Conifer-Mixed Hardwood/Chaparral	30.5	29.7	26.8	25.5	17.5	19.2	15.3	14.7	0.4	1.1	4.0	3.3	0.8	1.0
Fir-Redwood-Mixed Hardwood	30.8	31.1	28.0	24.5	20.4	22.1	0.0	0.0	0.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	5.5	6.1
Fir-dominated communities	*30.7*	*30.4*	*27.4*	*25.0*	*19.0*	*20.7*	*7.7*	*7.4*	*0.5*	*0.6*	*2.0*	*1.7*	*3.2*	*3.6*
Heavy Redwood-Fir	32.0	31.4	49.8	62.9	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.7	0.0	0.0	0.0
Redwood-Mixed Conifer/Chaparral	15.1	17.7	24.3	24.6	2.6	3.7	12.7	11.4	9.0	15.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Redwood-dominated communities	*23.5*	*24.6*	*37.1*	*43.8*	*1.3*	*1.8*	*6.3*	*5.7*	*4.5*	*7.5*	*1.3*	*0.0*	*0.0*	*0.0*
Oak-Fir-Madrone	41.8	33.1	0.0	0.0	36.2	41.1	0.0	0.0	5.2	10.2	0.5	1.1	16.2	14.6
Oak-Pine-Mixed Conifer/Chaparral	20.6	24.0	15.1	17.4	20.0	20.3	0.5	0.8	25.0	23.9	0.0	0.0	1.1	1.7
Oak-dominated communities	*31.2*	*28.5*	*7.6*	*8.7*	*28.1*	*30.7*	*0.2*	*0.3*	15.1	*17.1*	*0.3*	*0.5*	*8.7*	*8.1*
Overall Average RW	***28.5***	***27.8***	***24.0***	***25.8***	***16.1***	***17.7***	***4.7***	***4.5***	***6.7***	***8.4***	***1.2***	***0.7***	***3.9***	***3.9***
p-value	0.6917		0.4026		0.0395*		0.2447		0.1661		0.2722		0.8736	

Community	*PL* Maple	*UC*	*PL* Buckeye	*UC*	*PL* Hazel	*UC*	*PL* Salal	*UC*	*PL* Chaparral	*UC*	*PL* Huckleberry	*UC*
Fir-Mixed Conifer-Mixed Hardwood/Chaparral	0.6	0.9	0.0	0.0	1.4	2.2	0.9	0.6	1.6	2.1	0.1	0.0
Fir-Redwood-Mixed Hardwood	0.6	0.0	1.0	1.6	0.0	0.0	2.9	3.1	0.1	0.1	2.2	1.4
Fir-dominated communities	*0.6*	*0.5*	*0.5*	*0.8*	*0.7*	*1.1*	*1.9*	*1.9*	*0.9*	*1.1*	*1.2*	*0.7*
Heavy Redwood-Fir	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	6.7	3.3	0.5	0.0	8.3	2.4
Redwood-Mixed Conifer/Chaparral	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.4	0.8	5.4	4.7	29.4	19.5	1.2	2.6
Redwood-dominated communities	*0.0*	*0.0*	*0.0*	*0.0*	*0.2*	*0.4*	*6.1*	*4.0*	*14.9*	*9.7*	*4.8*	*2.5*
Oak-Fir-Madrone	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Oak-Pine-Mixed Conifer/Chaparral	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	3.1	20.3	14.6	10.2	0.0	0.0
Oak-dominated communities	*0.0*	*0.0*	*0.0*	*0.0*	*0.0*	*0.0*	*1.6*	*10.2*	*7.3*	*5.1*	*0.0*	*0.0*
Overall Average RW	***0.2***	***0.2***	***0.2***	***0.3***	***0.3***	***0.5***	***3.2***	***5.3***	***7.7***	***5.3***	***2.0***	***1.1***
p-value	0.5348		0.2815		0.1299		0.0818		0.1419		0.3437	

[*] significant at the 0.05 level

Table 4: Fir vs. Redwood average relative weight ratios by community in coniferous forest. Ratio values >1.0 indicate higher average relative weights of the species listed first; values <1.0 indicate higher average relative weights of the species listed second; a value of 1.0 indicates the same average relative weight for both species.

Community	Pre-logged Forest 1875-1886	Old-growth Forest, 1998	Logged Forest, (cut 1945-1978)
Fir-Mixed Conifer-Mixed Hardwood/Chaparral	1.14	1.16	1.23
Fir-Redwood-Mixed Hardwood	1.10	1.27	1.02
Heavy Redwood-Fir	0.64	0.50	0.61
Redwood-Mixed Conifer/Chaparral	0.63	0.72	0.59
Oak-Fir-Madrone	No redwood	No redwood	No redwood
Oak-Pine-Mixed Conifer/Chaparral	1.36	1.38	1.62
Overall	**0.97**	**1.01**	**1.01**

Pre-logged vs. uncut *p*-value: 0.5653

Pre-logged vs. logged *p*-value: 0.5533

Old-growth vs. logged *p*-value: 0.9317

Table 5: Comparison of species average relative weights for lower Redwood Creek (RC) redwood forest vs. Little Lost Man Creek (LM) old-growth redwood forest (%).

	RC	*LM*	*RC*	*LM*	*RC*	*LM*	*RC*	*LM*	*RC*	*LM*
Community	**Fir**		**Redwood**		**Oak**		**Spruce**		**Pine**	
Fir-Mixed Conifer-Mix Hardwood/Chaparral	29.5	26.8	24.9	33.9	19.9	16.1	15.2	16.3	0.7	0.0
Fir-Redwood-Mixed Hardwood	31.3	25.9	32.3	29.6	18.4	11.1	0.0	0.0	1.7	0.0
Fir-dominated communities	*30.4*	*26.4*	*28.6*	*31.7*	*19.2*	*13.6*	*7.6*	*8.2*	*1.2*	*0.0*
Heavy Redwood-Fir	28.6	27.1	56.6	54.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Redwood-Mixed Conifer/Chaparral	15.6	23.9	23.4	35.7	2.8	0.0	12.2	11.0	10.4	18.7
Redwood-dominated communities	*22.1*	*25.5*	*40.0*	*45.0*	*1.4*	*0.0*	*6.1*	*5.5*	*5.2*	*9.4*
Oak-Pine-Mixed Conifer/Chaparral	21.7	8.4	15.0	25.0	17.0	0.0	1.1	0.0	20.7	16.7
Overall Average Relative Weight	***25.3***	***22.8***	***30.4***	***35.7***	***11.6***	***3.9***	***5.7***	***7.0***	***6.7***	***10.4***
p-value	0.1587		0.2562		0.0462*		0.4833		0.1326	

	RC	*LM*	*RC*	*LM*	*RC*	*LM*	*RC*	*LM*	*RC*	*LM*
Community	**Alder**		**Madrone**		**Maple**		**Buckeye**		**Hazel**	
Fir-Mixed Conifer-Mix Hardwood/Chaparral	2.1	4.0	1.1	0.0	1.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.1	0.0
Fir-Redwood-Mixed Hardwood	0.0	0.0	5.0	7.4	0.0	0.0	1.9	3.7	0.0	0.0
Fir-dominated communities	*1.1*	*2.0*	*3.1*	*3.7*	*0.5*	*0.0*	*0.9*	*1.9*	*1.1*	*0.0*
Heavy Redwood-Fir	0.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Redwood-Mixed Conifer/Chaparral	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.5	0.0
Redwood-dominated communities	*0.1*	*0.0*	*0.0*	*0.0*	*0.0*	*0.0*	*0.0*	*0.0*	*0.2*	*0.0*

Oak-Pine-Mixed Conifer/Chaparral	0.0	0.0	1.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Overall Average RW	***0.5***	***0.6***	***1.4***	***1.1***	***0.2***	***0.0***	***0.4***	***0.5***	***0.5***	***0.0***
p-value	0.2218		0.2413		0.1870		0.1870		0.2902	

	RC	*LM*	*RC*	*LM*	*RC*	*LM*
Community	**Salal**		**Chaparral**		**Huckleberry**	
Fir-Mixed Conifer-Mix Hardwood/Chaparral	1.2	0.0	2.2	2.9	0.0	0.0
Fir-Redwood-Mixed Hardwood	3.7	7.4	0.1	0.0	2.3	14.9
Fir-dominated communities	*2.5*	*3.7*	*1.2*	*1.4*	*1.2*	*7.4*
Heavy Redwood-Fir	5.9	12.5	0.1	0.0	8.5	6.2
Redwood-Mixed Conifer/Chaparral	3.8	0.0	29.8	10.7	1.5	0.0
Redwood-dominated communities	*4.9*	*6.2*	*14.9*	*5.4*	*5.0*	*3.1*
Oak-Pine-Mixed Conifer/Chaparral	3.2	0.0	20.3	50.0	0.0	0.0
Overall Average RW	***3.6***	***2.8***	***10.5***	***12.2***	***2.5***	***3.0***
p-value	0.4649		0.4809		0.2902	

[*] significant at the 0.05 level

Table 6: Fir vs. Redwood average relative weight ratios by community in Redwood Alliance forest. Ratio values >1.0 indicate higher average relative weights of the species listed first; values <1.0 indicate higher average relative weights of the species listed second; a value of 1.0 indicates the same average relative weight for both species.

Community	**Redwood Forest in entire Redwood Creek basin**	**Redwood Forest in Little Lost Man Creek Subbasin**
Fir-Mixed Conifer-Mixed Hardwood/Chaparral	1.19	0.79
Fir-Redwood-Mixed Hardwood	1.01	1.01
Heavy Redwood-Fir	0.51	0.51
Redwood-Mixed Conifer/Chaparral	0.73	0.67
Oak-Fir-Madrone	No redwood	No redwood
Oak-Pine-Mixed Conifer/Chaparral	0.67	0.33
Overall	**0.82**	**0.63**
p-value	0.0341*	

* significant at the 0.05 level

Figure 1: Old-growth forest stands, including the Little Lost Man Creek subbasin, in the lower Redwood Creek basin, Redwood National Park, California. Data sources: RNP 1998; NPS 2005.

Figure 2: Breakdown of pre- and post-logging communities according to dominant woody species.

Figure 3: Redwood and Redwood—Douglas-fir Alliances in Lower Redwood Creek. Data sources: RNP 1998; USDA 2004, 2005; NPS 2005.


OREGON
Redwood National Park
NEVADA
CALIFORNIA
Little Lost Man Creek Subbasin
PACIFIC OCEAN
Old-growth forest
Redwood National Park
0
10 Kilometers
N


Fir-dominated communities
Historic
Old-growth
48%
52%
48%
52%
Fir-Mixed Conifer-Mixed Hardwood/Chaparral
Fir-Redwood-Mixed Hardwood
Redwood-dominated communities
Historic
Old-growth
41%
59%
28%
72%
Heavy Redwood-Fir
Redwood-Mixed Conifer/Chaparral
Oak-dominated communities
Historic
Old-growth
47%
53%
43%
57%
Oak-Fir-Madrone
Oak-Pine-Mixed Conifer/Chaparral


N
0
10 Kilometers
Redwood Alliance old-growth
Redwood -- Douglas-fir Alliance old-growth
Redwood National Park