Mississippi State University Scholars Junction

Bulletins

Mississippi Agricultural and Forestry Experiment Station (MAFES)

8-1-1981

Stand-age analysis of timber on Mississippi's private, nonindustrial forests

Steven H. Bullard

G. H. Weaver


Hees Willem van W.

Follow this and additional works at: https://scholarsjunction.msstate.edu/mafes-bulletins

Recommended Citation

Bullard, Steven H.; Weaver, G. H.; and van, Hees Willem W., "Stand-age analysis of timber on Mississippi's private, nonindustrial forests" (1981). *Bulletins*. 775. https://scholarsjunction.msstate.edu/mafes-bulletins/775

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Mississippi Agricultural and Forestry Experiment Station (MAFES) at Scholars Junction. It has been accepted for inclusion in Bulletins by an authorized administrator of Scholars Junction. For more information, please contact scholcomm@msstate.libanswers.com.



Mississippi State University

James D. McComas, President

Louis N. Wise, Vice President

,

•

STAND-AGE ANALYSIS OF TIMBER ON MISSISSIPPI'S PRIVATE, NONINDUSTRIAL FORESTS

Steven H. Bullard, research assistant, Department of Forestry, Mississippi State University

G. H. Weaver, associate professor and associate forester, Department of Forestry, Mississippi State University

Willem W. S. van Hees, research forester Southern Forest Experiment Station, USFS

Summary & Conclusions

Most of the current pine timber acreage in Mississippi developed through the reversion of large acreages of agricultural cropland to forestry. Now that cropland retirement has ceased, management practices must provide for pine regeneration on existing forest lands. Harvesting practices that remove higher-valued pine timber from private, nonindustrial pine lands have created large acreages of poorly stocked, low quality hardwood stands.

Effective provision for softwood regeneration at the time of final harvest is essential to the future of the State's forest economy. Present rates of pine regeneration will not sustain present softwood production in Mississippi beyond the next 20 years.

There will be enough pine timber to satisfy the industrial wood requirements in Mississippi, at current consumption levels, through the year 2000 A. D. Private, nonindustrial landowners must contribute a large portion of this raw material requirement. Industrial expansion appears to be most attractive in the North Region where much more softwood is being grown than is being cut. Any sustained increases in the State's short-run softwood consumption, however, must result from increased production per acre through improved technology, management and utilization.

Poor regeneration on private, nonindustrial lands cut in the last 20 years may constrain softwood consumption by about the year 2000 A. D. Constrained future availability of pine timber and the forest industry's continued dependence on private, nonindustrial timber supplies provide a favorable outlook for today's forestry investments. Individuals often reject forestry investments because of the long time period, high time preference for money and uncertain stumpage prices. Landowners with pine stands less than 30 years old need to be encouraged to invest in cultural practices that will help produce more sawtimber at the turn of the century. Private, nonindustrial forests, as a productive resource, are vital to Mississippi's economy, and the outlook is bright for individuals with the foresight to invest now in future pine production.

Continuation of present pine regeneration trends on private, nonindustrial ownerships developed over the past 10 years will lead to a major reduction in pine forest types available for harvest after 2000-2010 A. D. The anticipated shortfall in Mississippi 20 to 30 years from now can be reduced i: regeneration efforts are en couraged. The private, nonin dustrial ownership group must double regeneration performance over the next decade. This goal car: be accomplished only with a well coordinated cooperative effort or the part of all concerned groups. agencies, companies and pro fessionals. Investments in forest industry development will not be undertaken without assurances that future raw material supplies will be adequate. Future raw material supplies in Mississipp will be determined to a large extent by regeneration accomplishments. private, nonindustria. on ownerships.

Current public assistance programs are working, but these programs are restrained by limited budgets and manpower of the sponsoring agency. The current public assistance programs must be increased by 33% to guarantee a minimum of 400,000 acres of pine regeneration in the 1980s. Forest industries bear much responsibility for future softwood availability. and their management needs to consider the benefits possible from the increasing landowner as sistance progams.

Stand-Age Analysis of Timber on Mississippi's Private, Nonindustrial Forests

Forestry dominates land use in Mississippi with 55% of the total land area classified as commercial forest, and 73% of this is in private, nonindustrial ownerships (Moak 1977). Therefore, private, nonindustrial forests must contribute a high proportion of future industrial wood requirements. This report focuses on the relationship of the present age distribution of Mississippi's softwood timber to the future availability of timber.

Stand-age profiles may be used to define the age-class distribution of an even-aged forest, with each age class represented by areas of equal productivity in an optimum regulated situation (Knight 1977). A balanced age-class distribution permits sustained harvest at a constant rate over time, but shortfalls and overages may occur because of changing economic circumstances. We present in this bulletin current stand-age profiles of Mississippi's forest resource as a guide to projecting potential problems in timber availability. The primary emphasis of the publication is on nonindustrial, private landowners and the forest resource base controlled by this group.

Highlights

Pine regeneration reached a high level in 10 years-old age class (Figure 1a). Mississippi in the early 1950s. Almost 1.2 million acres of pine on all ownerships is now between 20 and 29 years old. Pine regeneration, particularly on the private, nonindustrial ownerships, has declined by about 50% since the early 1950s, and less than 600 thousand acres of pine in Mississippi are in the less than

Private, nonindustrial owners control a major portion of Mississippi's valuable pine and oak-pine forest lands. Therefore, the state's future timber economy will be determined largely by the management and investment decisions of these forest landowners.

Stand-Age Profiles

Statewide Analysis

Stand-age profiles were developed for Mississippi to provide information on prospective softwood availability from private, nonindustrial forests over the next 30-40 years. The data were derived from 1977 Forest Survey plot summaries provided by the Southern Forest Experiment Station, U. S. Forest Service, New Orleans, Louisiana.


We define an ideal stand age distribution as equal acreages

among stand-age classes up to a rotation age. Uniform age-class distributions permit a sustained allowable cut based on area control. Statewide differences in objectives, ownerships, species, sites, markets and other factors cause acreage variations among age classes, but general analyses of stand-age patterns provide an assessment of future softwood availability. This stand-age analysis of Mississippi's

timberland provides particular insight because most of the State's timber stands are classified as even age^1 (Figure 1).

Statewide stand-age profiles are very unbalanced (Figure 1). Private, nonindustrial ownerships dominate nearly all age classes and forest types and contribute significantly to the uneven distribution below age 40. Age classes 20-29 and 30-39 years are consistently high regardless of forest

¹Even-aged stands defined by the USFS Forest Survey occur when 50% of the dominant and codominant trees are within a single 20 year age class.



type. This condition result primarily from the high rates o cropland retirement in Mississipp during the late 1940s and early 1950s. The relatively low acreage in the older age classes indicate that much of the area that reverted to forestry more than 40 years age has been harvested.

Age classes less than 10 and 10 t 19 years (Figure 1a) provide a measure of pine regeneration. Mis sissippi's forest industry is produce ing reasonably well-balanced age class distributions of pine through regeneration efforts on industria. holdings, but this is not occurring on private, nonindustrial lands Private, nonindustrial pine fores types include 811 M acres in the 20 to 29-years age class, 575 M acres in the 10- to 19-years age class and only 293 M acres in the less than 10 years age class. The smaller pin acreages in the younger age classe on private, nonindustrial land have resulted from discontinue cropland retirement and postharvest invasion of hardwoods on many pine sites harvested in the last 20 years. This hardwood er croachment has resulted in mor uniform age-class distributions i the oak-pine and upland hardwoo forest types (Figures 1b & c).

Most private, nonindustrie landowners have never perceive that investing in pine regeneratio is to their economic self-interest (Boyce and Knight 1977). The southern pine timber available today occurs primarily becaus: retired farmland seeded naturall from adjacent stands. Owners (these lands did not intentionall plan for Mississippi's preser softwood resource but merely sav personal advantages from net farming. There have been no net additions of pine-regenerated acre to the forest land base since the discontinuation of cropland retire ment about 15 to 20 years ago. As result, only 9% of Mississippi's 3. million acres of private, nonir dustrial pine forests is less than 1. years old. Many private, nonindustrial pine stands harvested in the last 20 years have reverted to poor quality, low value hardwoods. Consequently, future softwood supplies may be limited. Providing pine regeneration after harvest of pine lands is essential if Mississippi's current softwood production is to be maintained beyond the next 20 years.

Regional Analysis


The U. S. Forest Service divides Mississippi into five regions based on physical geography (Figure 2). Stand-age profiles for the Delta, North, Central, South and Southwest Regions are presented in Figures 3 to 7, respectively. The upland and bottomland hardwood forest types were analyzed as a single hardwood category in this study.

Delta Region---Pine and oakpine forest types occupied a relatively small acreage in the region and are omitted from Figure 3. The total forested acreage in the Delta is diminishing over time, and smaller acreages in the younger age classes have resulted. This trend is expected to continue as harvested private, nonindustrial acreage is converted to agricultural use.

North Region--- Private, nonindustrial ownership's dominate forest types and age classes in the region (Figure 4). A large proportion of the commercial forest land is in private, nonindustrial hardwoods. The relatively high proportion of private, nonindustrially owned pine growing stock reaching pulpwood and small sawlog ages may be the result of planting efforts on the Yazoo-Little Tallahatchie Watershed.

Central Region---Private, nonindustrial landowners control much of the acreage of merchantable-age stands (Figure 5). The stand-age profile (Figure 5a) indicates significant decreases in total pine area as

The full impact of current state and federal assistance programs on private, nonindustrial reforestation is not reflected in Figure 1 because these programs were initiated only a few years before the 1977 Forest Survey. The Forest Incentives Program (FIP) and Mississippi's Forest Resource Development Program (FRDP) will have a significant impact on future pine age-class distributions at the present 30 M-acre annual rate of planting and seeding private, nonindustrial land. However, these programs will not create a balanced distribution at current levels of regeneration. Program accomplishments will have to increase 33% to guarantee 400,000 acres of pine regeneration in Mississippi during the 1980s.





stand age decreases. The acreage decreases are due chiefly to private, nonindustrial timber-harvesting activity.

South Region---The region has a relatively lower proportion of oakpine and hardwood forest types, irrespective of ownership class (Figure 6). The dominance of pine forest types over other forest types occurs across all age classes. Industry is less dependent on private, nonindustrial lands for softwood supply than in other regions. High industrial wood consumption and Hurricane Camille resulted in a softwood inventory increase of only 8% from 1967 to 1977 (Murphy 1978). Areas damaged by Hurricane Camille in 1969 have since been reforested, and age class is more balanced. More recent damage by Hurricane Frederick, not reflected in this analysis of 1977 data, may result in another imbalance between softwood growth and removals.

Southwest Region---This is geographically the smallest forest survey region in the state. A high proportion of the total forested area is in private, nonindustrial ownerships and covered with hardwood forest types. Future softwood availability becomes a problem in this region because of lower pine acreages in younger age classes, the proximity of high levels of industry activity and a high level of private, nonindustrial ownership.


All Regions---Several implications for the future may be drawn from the regional stand-age analyses. The Delta produces very little softwood material and is not expected to contribute significant ly to future softwood requirements The North Region has a high proportion of softwood growing stock reaching merchantable age and offers opportunities for industrial expansion. Two pulpmills will be constructed in this Regior





during the 1980s. The North Region experienced a 78% net gain in softwood growing-stock volume from 1967 to 1977 (Murphy 1978). The Central and the North Regions offer many opportunities for increasing future softwood production. Both regions contain large acreages of private, nonindustrial upland hardwoods that could be converted to pine forest types. Industry in the Central Region will be able to sustain harvests from company lands, but competition for private, nonindustrial softwoods will increase as future supplies become more restricted. Improving forest management will become more attractive to individual landowners as their resource becomes more valuable and markets improve.

The stand-age distribution of softwoods in the South Region is nearly balanced. Future expansion by the forest industry in the region does not appear likely without





technological advances because pany lands than was grown in 1976 growth and removals are nearly (Murphy 1978), and the high equal.

Southwest Region harvested 60% increasing share of future remore pine sawtimber from com- quirements. Favorable conditions

proportion of private, nonin-The forest industry in the dustrial lands must contribute an

for improving forest management on private, nonindustrial lands will result from the increased competition for softwood in the Region.





Stand-Age Distribution by Site

Site quality determines the ability of an area to respond to forest management practices in both the short run and the long run. Distributions of acres of forest land by stand-age class for four forest types and three ownership groups are presented in Tables 1 and 2 for high and medium sites. High sites are considered to be capable of producing 120 cubic feet of wood per acre per year in fully stocked natural stands. Medium sites are capable of producing between 50 and 120 cubic feet. Low sites were not examined because fewer than 350 M acres in Mississippi were classed in the 1977 Forest Survey as incapable of producing at least 50 cubic feet of wood per acre per year.

Private, nonindustrial forests include 67% of the 3 MM acres classified as good site and 62% of the pine acreage on good sites. Only 5% of the private, nonindustrial pine area on good sites stocked in pine is in the less than 10-years age class while 31% is in the 30- to 39-years age class.

Industrial lands support a

Stand-Age Distribution of Volume

Average volumes of growing stock per acre on Mississippi's commercial forest land by ownership group, forest type and stand-age class are presented in Table 3. Growing stock levels of industrial and private, nonindustrial landowners are comparable for both pine and oak-pine forest types, but these groups are producing at only 60 and 56% of their productive potentials (Porterfield et al, 1978).

Total volume estimates were developed by adjusting average volume per acre by acreage. Estimated total volumes statewide are presented by stand-age classes for three ownership groups and four forest types (Table 4). Private, reasonably uniform age-class distribution of pine on medium sites, but private, nonindustrial lands do not (Table 2). However, both industrial and private, nonindustrial high-site lands support an unbalanced distribution of pine acress because of smaller acreages in the younger age classes (Table 1). More regeneration efforts need to be devoted to higher site lands. The better sites need a higher priority for harvesting and replanting because of their higher productive capacity.

nonindustrial landowners control 59% of the estimated total pine volume.

An estimated 484.3 MMCF of pine were removed from Mississippi forests in 1976 (Murphy 1978). No significant shortfall in softwood supply is expected in the next 20 years, assuming the 1976 harvest level continues. However,

Table l. Area class		ial forest ppi, 1977.	land on		-		pe and own	ership grou	ip and by	stand-age
Broad Forest	A11			S	TAND-AGE-	CLASS				
Type and Owner-	Classes	10	10-19	20-29	30-39	40-49	50-59	60-69	70+	Mixed
ship Class										
					M ACRE	S				
PINE					_					
Public	158.1	-	7.0	-	40.0	52.6	12.8	16.3	5.6	23.8
Industry	180.4	12.9	23.8	37.5	51.8	-	37.2	-	-	17.2
PNI	549.6	28.8	102.7	150.7	168.1	41.7	11.3	-	6.6	39.7
Total	888.1	41.7	133.5	188.2	259.9	94.3	61.3	16.3	12.2	80.7
OAK-PINE										
Public	56.7	-	10.5	4.3	11.2	24.5	-	-	-	6.2
Industry	119.3	5.3	-	30.1	33.2	27.8	11.9	5.8	-	5.2
PNI	469.4	33.8	33.7	119.2	109.0	85.7	11.2	20.6	-	56.2
Total	645.4	39.1	44.2	153.6	153.4	138.0	23.1	26.4	-	67.6
UPLAND HWD.								· <u>·</u> · · · ·		
Public	38.2	-	5.2	5.7	_	10.9	10.8	-	-	5.6
Industry	96.8	23.7	12.3	18.5	21.6	6.3	_	_	_	14.4
PNI	447.9	59.1	45.9	66.6	108.5	62.1	19.9	25.1	-	60.7
Total	582.9	82.8	63.4	90.8	130.1	79.3	30.7	25.1	-	80.7
BOTTOMLAND HWD.										
Public	73.2	_	-	21.4	9.6	6.2	18.8	5.6	_	11.6
Industry	249.9	29.5	12.9	42.2	54.9	36.1	24.2	6.7	_	43.4
PNI	607.9	19.0	30.0	83.7	121.5	140.4	59.2	10.9	7.2	136.0
Total	931.0	48.5	42.9	147.3	186.0	182.7	102.2	23.2	7.2	191.0
iocai	,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,									

will be harvested, and industry needs to prepare for processing smaller raw material.

short-run consumption will have to supply can be increased effectively be achieved by increasing per acre by technological improvements.

younger stands with smaller stems augumented through better use and through improved management and technology.

The pulpwood industry in the Any substantial increases in South is an example of how timber output. Per acre outputs can be Production can be increased 10 to

15% by using tree-length harvesting and log transportation systems (Porterfield and von Seger 1976). Short-run availability alse may be increased by per acre production gains obtained through thinning and timber stand im provement.

ship Class M ACRES PINE File 610.5 22.0 63.3 280.4 102.7 194.8 53.1 9.6 5.4 7 Industry 1,123.0 221.5 231.3 280.4 107.9 79.5 44.8 - - 9 PNI 2,131.5 221.6 24.8 24.7 17.9 79.5 44.8 - - - 9 PNI 2,251.5 221.6 12.7 10.00.6 850.9 55.5 223.0 22.8 12.4 36 OAK-PINE Public 300.5 17.9 38.7 38.2 59.3 34.7 23.6 11.7 5.6 7 - 28 Total 2,762.0 36.3 369.3 467.1 480.1 274.4 163.7 7.0 11.2 6 16.7 2 16.4 48.9 - 5.6 16.7 2 164.1 17.9 53.7 10.7 53.7 10.7	Table 2. Area and	of commerce by stand-age				es, by bro	oad forest	type and	ownership c	lass	
Type and Concer - Classes 10 10-19 20-29 30-39 40-49 50-59 60-69 70+ NI Ship Class M ACRES	Broad Forest	Δ11			C'	TAND-ACE (22410				
M ACRES PINE Pholic 610.5 22.0 63.3 80.4 102.7 194.8 53.1 9.6 5.4 77 Industry 1,123.0 221.5 218.1 284.3 177.9 79.5 44.8 - - - 99 Total 4,255.0 425.3 747.7 1,000.6 850.9 555.6 223.0 221.8 13.2 7.0 19 Total 4,255.0 445.3 747.7 1,000.6 850.9 555.6 223.0 221.8 12.4 36 OME-FINE Total 2,7592.0 363.8 389.3 487.1 480.1 274.6 137.7 24.4 16.8 41 UPLAND IND. 106.4.8 17.9 17.8 62.2 29.8 48.9 - 5.6 16.7 2 164.8 49.9 5.7 9.6 7.7 11.0 15.7 24.4 16.8 41.7 30.6 21.7 35.7 10.7	Type and Owner		10	10-19				50 - 59	60-69	70+	MIXE
Public 610.5 22.0 63.3 80.4 102.7 194.8 53.1 9.6 5.4 7.7 Industry 1,123.0 221.5 221.8 248.3 177.9 79.5 44.8 - - 9.9 Total 4,265.0 485.3 747.7 1,000.6 850.9 555.6 223.0 22.8 12.4 36 OAK-PINE Public 300.5 17.9 38.7 38.2 59.3 34.7 23.6 11.7 5.6 7 Industry 523.5 149.1 45.1 78.3 83.9 71.2 17.3 7.0 11.2 6 PNI 1,768.0 196.8 335.5 370.6 336.7 168.7 96.8 57.7 - 28.7 Total 2,5592.0 363.8 389.3 487.1 480.1 274.6 137.7 24.4 16.8 44 UPLAND HUD. PNI 3,021.7 338.3 450.4 451.3 661.4 340.6 201.7 35.7 10.7 55 75.7 83.6						M ACRES	5	·			
Public 610.5 22.0 63.3 80.4 102.7 194.8 53.1 9.6 5.4 7.7 Industry 1,123.0 221.5 221.8 248.3 177.9 79.5 44.8 - - 9.9 Total 4,265.0 485.3 747.7 1,000.6 850.9 555.6 223.0 22.8 12.4 36 OAK-PINE Public 300.5 17.9 38.7 38.2 59.3 34.7 23.6 11.7 5.6 7 Industry 523.5 149.1 45.1 78.3 83.9 71.2 17.3 7.0 11.2 6 PNI 1,768.0 196.8 335.5 370.6 336.7 168.7 96.8 57.7 - 28.7 Total 2,5592.0 363.8 389.3 487.1 480.1 274.6 137.7 24.4 16.8 44 UPLAND HUD. PNI 3,021.7 338.3 450.4 451.3 661.4 340.6 201.7 35.7 10.7 55 75.7 83.6											
Industry 1,122.0 221.5 218.1 284.3 177.9 79.5 44.8 - - 9 Total 2,531.5 241.8 666.3 635.9 575.0 223.0 22.8 12.7 132 7.0 19 Potal 4,265.0 485.3 747.7 1,000.6 850.9 555.6 223.0 22.8 12.4 36 OMAC-PINE Public 300.5 17.9 38.7 38.2 59.3 34.7 23.6 11.7 5.6 7 Industry 523.5 149.1 45.1 78.3 38.9 71.2 17.3 7.0 11.2 66.8 5.7 - 28 Total 2,592.0 363.8 389.3 487.1 480.1 274.6 137.7 24.4 16.8 41 ULADD IMD. 104.7 78.5 64.2 29.8 48.9 - 5.6 16.7 2 17.9 58.7 9.8 - 7 3.5 10.7 53.7 10.7 53.7 17.0 13.5 7 17.5											_
PPI 2,531,5 241.8 6466,3 635.9 570.3 281.3 125.1 13.2 7,0 19.7 OAK-PINE											79.
Total 4,265.0 485.3 747.7 1,000.6 850.9 555.6 223.0 22.8 12.4 36 OAK-PINE Public 300.5 17.9 38.7 38.2 59.3 34.7 23.6 11.7 5.6 7 Industry 523.5 149.1 45.1 78.3 83.9 71.2 17.3 7.0 11.2 6 7 23.6 11.7 5.6 7 - 28 Total 2,592.0 363.8 389.3 487.1 480.1 274.6 137.7 24.4 16.8 41 UPLAND HED. Total 3,622.6 479.9 58.7 9.8 - 7.6 16.7 2 PNI 3,021.7 38.3 450.4 461.4 360.6 201.7 9.8 - 7.6 16.7 2 BOTTOMLAND HED. 90.7 - 10.6 16.4 48.4 34.7 33.9 18.0 - 2 2 2 6.6	· ·										96.
OAK-PINE Dablic 300.5 17.9 38.7 38.2 59.3 34.7 23.6 11.7 5.6 7 Industry 523.5 199.1 45.1 78.3 83.9 71.2 17.3 7.0 11.2 69 PHI 1.768.0 96.8 5.7 - 28 64.1 137.7 24.4 16.8 411 UPLAND HED. hubitc 164.8 17.9 17.8 6.2 29.8 48.9 - 5.6 16.7 2 Industry 3.021.7 338.3 450.4 451.3 661.4 30.6.6 201.7 3.7 17.7 3.7 7.4 62 BOTTOMLAND HED. numetry 3.652.6 479.9 537.3 506.9 754.1 407.4 260.4 51.1 27.4 62 BOTTOMLAND HED. numetry 78.3 23.9 27.4 29.7 124.9 75.7 81.6 1.1 11.9 17.5 81.6 1.2											<u>190.</u> 366.
Public 300.5 17.9 38.7 38.2 59.3 34.7 23.6 11.7 5.6 7 Industry 523.5 149.4 45.1 78.3 38.9 71.2 17.3 7.0 11.2 61.8 5.7 - 28 PNI 1.768.0 196.8 305.5 370.6 336.9 168.7 96.8 5.7 - 28 UPLAND HAD. 1.7.9 17.8 6.2 29.8 48.9 - 5.6 16.7 2 Industry 466.1 123.7 69.1 49.4 62.9 17.9 58.7 9.8 - 7 PNI 3.021.7 338.3 450.4 451.3 661.4 340.6 201.7 35.7 10.7 53 BOTTOMLAND HAD. Public 190.7 - 10.6 16.4 48.4 34.7 33.9 18.0 - 2 29.6 34 Total 1.888.9 87.5 97.4 29.7 121.3 315.6 17.8,3 15.2 29.6 34 T	10121	9,205.0	-02.5	/] / • /	1,000.0	050.5		223.0	22.0	12.9	500.
Public 300.5 17.9 38.7 38.2 59.3 34.7 23.6 11.7 5.6 7 Industry 523.5 140.1 45.1 78.3 83.9 71.2 17.3 7.0 11.2 61.8 PNI 1.768.0 196.8 305.5 370.6 336.9 168.7 96.8 5.7 - 28 UPLAND E. 1.7.9 363.8 389.3 487.1 480.1 274.6 137.7 24.4 16.8 41 UPLAND HD. 164.8 17.9 17.8 6.2 29.8 48.9 - 5.6 16.7 2 Industry 466.1 123.7 69.1 49.4 62.9 17.9 58.7 9.8 - 7 PNI 3.021.7 338.3 450.4 451.3 661.4 340.6 201.7 35.7 10.7 35 BOTTOMLAND HD. P - 10.6 16.4 48.4 34.7 33.9 18.0 - 2 2 16.4 13.5 315											
Industry 523.5 149.1 45.1 78.3 83.9 71.2 17.3 7.0 11.2 6 PNI 1.768.0 196.8 305.5 306.9 168.7 96.8 5.7 - 28 Total 2.592.0 363.8 389.3 487.1 480.1 274.6 137.7 24.4 16.8 41 UPLAND HD. 164.8 17.9 17.8 6.2 29.8 48.9 - 5.6 16.7 2 Industry 466.1 123.7 69.1 49.4 62.9 17.9 58.7 9.8 - 7.7 10.7 53.3 Total 3.021.7 33.83 450.4 451.3 661.4 340.6 201.7 53.7 10.7 5.7 10.7 10.6 16.4 48.4 34.7 33.9 18.0 - 2.5 11.1 27.4 29.7 124.9 75.7 83.6 11.7 11.1 11.4 134.1 35		300 5	17 0	38 7	38.2	50 3	3/1 7	23 6	11 7	5 6	70.
PNI 1.768.0 196.8 305.5 370.6 336.9 168.7 96.8 5.7 - 28 Total 2.592.0 363.8 389.3 487.1 480.1 274.6 137.7 24.4 16.8 41 UPLAND HMD. Rubitc 164.8 17.9 17.8 6.2 29.8 48.9 - 5.6 16.7 2 Industry 466.1 123.7 39.3 450.4 451.3 661.4 340.6 201.7 35.7 10.7 53 Total 3.652.6 479.9 537.3 506.9 754.1 407.4 260.4 51.1 27.4 62 Public 190.7 - 10.6 16.4 48.4 34.7 33.9 18.0 - 2 2 144.9 75.7 83.6 11.7 11.1 9 9 174.4 29.7 124.9 75.7 83.6 11.7 11.1 9 29 34 7 78.1 15.2 29.6 34 Total 1.888.9 87.5 96.1											60.
Total 2,592.0 363.8 389.3 487.1 480.1 274.6 137.7 24.4 16.8 411 UPLAND H&D. Public 164.8 17.9 17.8 6.2 29.8 48.9 - 5.6 16.7 2 Industry 466.1 123.7 69.1 49.4 62.9 17.9 58.7 9.8 - 7 Total 3,652.6 479.9 537.3 506.9 754.1 407.4 260.4 51.1 27.4 62 BOTTOMLAND HWD. - - 10.6 16.4 48.4 34.7 33.9 18.0 - 27.4 62 BOTTOMLAND HWD. - 10.7 - 10.6 16.4 48.4 34.7 33.6 11.7 11.1 19 PNI 1.888.9 87.5 96.1 306.1 513.5 315.6 178.3 15.2 29.6 34 Total 2,557.9 111.4 134.1 352.2 686.8											287.
UPLAND HAD. Public 164.8 17.9 17.8 6.2 29.8 48.9 - 5.6 16.7 2 Industry 466.1 123.7 69.1 49.4 62.9 17.9 58.7 9.8 - 7 PNI 3.021.7 338.3 450.4 451.3 661.4 340.6 201.7 35.7 10.7 53 BOTTOMLAND HWD. Public 100.7 - 10.6 16.4 48.4 34.7 33.9 18.0 - 22.4 BOTTOMLAND HWD. Public 180.7 - 11.4 134.1 36.1 513.5 15.6 178.3 15.2 29.6 34 Total 2.557.9 111.4 134.1 134.1 35.2 66.8 426.0 295.8 44.9 40.7 46.9 Total 2.557.9 111.4 134.1 35.2 66.8 426.0 295.8 44.9 40.7 46.9 Procest Type Classes 10 10-19 20-29 30-39 40-49 50-59 60-69 <td< td=""><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td>418.</td></td<>											418.
Public 164.8 17.9 17.8 6.2 29.8 48.9 - 5.6 16.7 2 Industry 466.1 123.7 69.1 49.4 62.9 17.9 58.7 9.8 - 7 33 - 7 33 - 7 33 - 7 33 - 7 35.7 10.7 33 7 10.7 33 7 10.7 33 7 10.7 33 7 10.7 - 33 7 10.7 33 7 10.7 33 7 10.7 33 7 10.7 33 10.7 13 10.7 33 10.7 13.1 10.7 13.1 10.7 13.1 10.1 1		2,572.0	505.0	10,00	407.1	400.1	274.0	15/	24.4	10.0	410.
Public 164.8 17.9 17.8 6.2 29.8 48.9 - 5.6 16.7 2 Industry 466.1 123.7 69.1 49.4 62.9 17.9 58.7 9.8 - 7 33 - 7 33 - 7 33 - 7 35.7 10.7 33 Total 3,652.6 479.9 537.3 506.9 754.1 407.4 260.4 51.1 27.4 62.7 BOTTOMLAND HWD. - - 10.6 16.4 48.4 34.7 33.9 18.0 - - 2 Industry 478.3 23.9 27.4 29.7 124.9 75.7 83.6 11.7 11.1 9 9 17.1 19.8 15.2 29.6 34 Total 2,557.9 111.4 134.1 352.2 686.8 426.0 295.8 44.9 40.7 46.7 Total 2,557.9 111.4 <td>UPLAND HUD</td> <td></td>	UPLAND HUD										
Industry 466.1 123.7 69.1 49.4 62.9 17.9 58.7 9.8 - 7.7 PNI 3,021.7 338.3 450.4 451.3 661.4 340.6 201.7 35.7 10.7 53 Total 3,652.6 479.9 537.3 506.9 754.1 407.4 260.4 51.1 27.4 62 BOTTOMLAND HWD. Public 100.7 - 10.6 16.4 48.4 34.7 33.9 18.0 - 2 Industry 478.3 23.9 27.4 29.7 124.9 75.7 83.6 11.7 11.1 9 PNI 1,888.9 87.5 96.1 306.1 513.5 617.8.3 15.2 29.6 34 Total 2,557.9 111.4 134.1 352.2 686.8 426.0 295.8 44.9 40.7 46.7 Total 2,557.9 111.4 134.1 352.2 686.8 426.0 295.8 44.9 40.7 Total 2,557.9 10.177. 50.5 <td></td> <td>164.8</td> <td>17.9</td> <td>17.8</td> <td>6.2</td> <td>29.8</td> <td>48.9</td> <td>-</td> <td>5.6</td> <td>16.7</td> <td>21.</td>		164.8	17.9	17.8	6.2	29.8	48.9	-	5.6	16.7	21.
PNI Total 3.021.7 338.3 450.4 451.3 661.4 340.6 201.7 35.7 10.7 53 BOTTOMLAND HWD. - - - - - 620.4 51.1 27.4 62 BOTTOMLAND HWD. - - - 10.6 16.4 48.4 34.7 33.9 18.0 - 2 Public 190.7 - 10.6 16.4 48.4 34.7 33.6 11.7 11.1 11.1 9 PNI 1.488.9 87.5 96.1 306.1 513.5 315.6 178.3 15.2 29.6 34 Total 2.557.9 111.4 134.1 352.2 686.8 426.0 295.8 44.9 40.7 46											74.
Total 3,652.6 479.9 537.3 506.9 754.1 407.4 260.4 51.1 27.4 62 BOTTOMLAND HWD. Public 190.7 - 10.6 16.4 48.4 34.7 33.9 18.0 - 2 Industry 478.3 23.9 27.4 29.7 124.9 75.7 83.6 11.7 11.1 9 PNI 1.888.9 87.5 96.1 306.1 513.5 315.6 178.3 15.2 29.6 34 Total 2,557.9 111.4 134.1 352.2 686.8 426.0 295.8 44.9 40.7 46 Table 3. Average volume on commercial forest land, by broad ownership class and forest type and by stand-age class, Mississippi, 1977. Broad Owner Classes 10 10-19 20-29 30-39 40-49 50-59 60-69 70+ Mi CUBIC FET PER ACRE Pine 1918 232 626 1519 2179 200 <td>~</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>531.</td>	~										531.
Public 190.7 - 10.6 16.4 48.4 34.7 33.9 18.0 - 2 Industry 478.3 23.9 27.4 29.7 124.9 75.7 83.6 11.7 11.1 9 PNI 1.888.9 87.5 96.1 306.1 513.5 515.6 178.3 15.2 29.6 34 Total 2.557.9 111.4 134.1 352.2 686.8 426.0 295.8 44.9 40.7 46	Total						407.4				628.
class, Mississipp1, 1977. Broad Owner- ship and Forest Type All Classes STAND-ACE CLASS 10 STAND-ACE CLASS 30-39 40-49 50-59 60-69 70+ Mississipp1, 1977. CUBIC FEET PER ACRE	Public Industry PNI	190.7 478.3 1,888.9	23.9 87.5	27.4 96.1	29.7 306.1	124.9 513.5	75.7 315.6	83.6 178.3	11.7 15.2	11.1 29.6	28. 90. <u>347.</u> 466.
ship and Forest Type Classes 10 10–19 20–29 30–39 40–49 50–59 60–69 70+ Mix Forest Type					st land, by	broad own	nership cla	ss and fo	rest type a	ind by stand	d-age
CUBIC FEET PER ACRE PUBLIC CUBIC FEET PER ACRE PIne 1918 232 626 1519 2179 2209 2343 2297 3073 200 Oak-Pine 1457 693 835 927 1482 1971 1815 2197 2425 166 Upland Hwd. 1390 361 888 1731 1234 1611 1858 2802 2165 100 Bottomland Hwd. 1794 - 649 1585 1817 1807 1979 2434 - 160 INDUSTRY Pine 1293 148 957 1552 1768 1941 2391 - - 144 Oak-Pine 1079 157 599 1108 1570 1786 2491 1765 932 100 Upland Hwd. 878 182 408 682 1539 1240 1580 1076 - 144 Bottomland Hwd 1569											
CUBIC FEET PER ACRE PUBLIC Pine 1918 232 626 1519 2179 2209 2343 2297 3073 20. Oak-Pine 1457 693 835 927 1482 1971 1815 2197 2425 16. Upland Hwd. 1390 361 888 1731 1234 1611 1858 2802 2165 10. Bottomland Hwd.1794 - 649 1585 1817 1807 1979 2434 - 160 INDUSTRY Pine 1293 148 957 1552 1768 1941 2391 - - 144. Oak-Pine 1079 157 599 1108 1570 1786 2491 1765 932 100 Upland Hwd. 878 182 408 682 1539 1240 1580 1076 - 144. Bottomland Hwd 1569 329 1059 968	•	Classes	10	10-19	20-29	30-39	40-49	50-59	60-69	70+	Mixed
Pine 1918 232 626 1519 2179 2209 2343 2297 3073 20. Oak-Pine 1457 693 835 927 1482 1971 1815 2197 2425 16. Upland Hwd. 1390 361 888 1731 1234 1611 1858 2802 2165 100. Bottomland Hwd.1794 - 649 1585 1817 1807 1979 2434 - 166 INDUSTRY - 649 1585 1817 1807 1979 2434 - 166 INDUSTRY - - 649 1552 1768 1941 2391 - - 144 Oak-Pine 1079 157 599 1108 1570 1786 2491 1765 932 100 Upland Hwd. 878 182 408 682 1539 1240 1580 1076 - 144 Bottomland Hwd 1569 329 1059 968 1484 2006 1914	Torest Type				Ci	JBIC FEET	PER ACRE				
Pine 1918 232 626 1519 2179 2209 2343 2297 3073 20. Oak-Pine 1457 693 835 927 1482 1971 1815 2197 2425 16. Upland Hwd. 1390 361 888 1731 1234 1611 1858 2802 2165 10. Bottomland Hwd.1794 - 649 1585 1817 1807 1979 2434 - 166 INDUSTRY - 649 1585 1817 1807 1979 2434 - 166 INDUSTRY - - 649 1552 1768 1941 2391 - - 144 Oak-Pine 1079 157 599 1108 1570 1786 2491 1765 932 100 Upland Hwd. 878 182 408 682 1539 1240 1580 1076 - 144 Bottomland Hwd 1569 329 1059 968 1484 2006 1914 <	DUBLIC										
Oak-Pine 1457 693 835 927 1482 1971 1815 2197 2425 166 Upland Hwd. 1390 361 888 1731 1234 1611 1858 2802 2165 100 Bottomland Hwd. 1794 - 649 1585 1817 1807 1979 2434 - 166 INDUSTRY - 649 1552 1768 1941 2391 - - - 164 0ak-Pine 1079 157 599 1108 1570 1786 2491 1765 932 100 Upland Hwd. 878 182 408 682 1539 1240 1580 1076 - 144 Bottomland Hwd 1569 329 1059 968 1484 2006 1914 2109 2086 184 PRIVATE NONIND. - - 1508 1778 1901 1764 1653 1900 144 Upland Hwd. 1022 337 599 884 1248 1410 <td></td> <td>1018</td> <td>232</td> <td>626</td> <td>1519</td> <td>2179</td> <td>2209</td> <td>2343</td> <td>2297</td> <td>3073</td> <td>2017</td>		1018	232	626	1519	2179	2209	2343	2297	3073	2017
Upland Hwd. 1390 361 888 1731 1234 1611 1858 2802 2165 100 Bottomland Hwd.1794 - 649 1585 1817 1807 1979 2434 - 160 INDUSTRY Pine 1293 148 957 1552 1768 1941 2391 144 Oak-Pine 1079 157 599 1108 1570 1786 2491 1765 932 100 Upland Hwd. 878 182 408 682 1539 1240 1580 1076 - 144 Bottomland Hwd 1569 329 1059 968 1484 2006 1914 2109 2086 186 PRIVATE NONIND. Pine 1435 565 972 1508 1778 1901 1764 1653 1900 144 Oak-Pine 1118 292 608 1068 1460 1624 1465 2948 - 114 Upland Hwd. 1022 337 599 884 1248 1410 1537 1733 1984 110											1646
Bottomland Hwd.1794 - 649 1585 1817 1807 1979 2434 - 160 INDUSTRY Pine 1293 148 957 1552 1768 1941 2391 - - 144 Oak-Pine 1079 157 599 1108 1570 1786 2491 1765 932 100 Upland Hwd. 878 182 408 682 1539 1240 1580 1076 - 144 Bottomland Hwd.1569 329 1059 968 1484 2006 1914 2109 2086 186 PRIVATE NONIND. Prine 1435 565 972 1508 1778 1901 1764 1653 1900 144 Oak-Pine 1118 292 608 1068 1460 1624 1465 2948 - 114 Upland Hwd. 1022 337 599 884 1248 1410 1537 1733 1984 114											1051
Pine 1293 148 957 1552 1768 1941 2391 - - 143 Oak-Pine 1079 157 599 1108 1570 1786 2491 1765 932 100 Upland Hwd. 878 182 408 682 1539 1240 1580 1076 - 144 Bottomland Hwd 1569 329 1059 968 1484 2006 1914 2109 2086 186 PRIVATE NONIND. - - 1508 1778 1901 1764 1653 1900 144 Oak-Pine 1118 292 608 1068 1460 1624 1465 2948 - 114 Upland Hwd. 1022 337 599 884 1248 1410 1537 1733 1984 110	•										1662
Pine 1293 148 957 1552 1768 1941 2391 - - 143 Oak-Pine 1079 157 599 1108 1570 1786 2491 1765 932 100 Upland Hwd. 878 182 408 682 1539 1240 1580 1076 - 144 Bottomland Hwd 1569 329 1059 968 1484 2006 1914 2109 2086 186 PRIVATE NONIND. - - 1508 1778 1901 1764 1653 1900 144 Oak-Pine 1118 292 608 1068 1460 1624 1465 2948 - 114 Upland Hwd. 1022 337 599 884 1248 1410 1537 1733 1984 110	TNDUSTRY										
Oak-Pine 1079 157 599 1108 1570 1786 2491 1765 932 100 Upland Hwd. 878 182 408 682 1539 1240 1580 1076 - 144 Bottomland Hwd 1569 329 1059 968 1484 2006 1914 2109 2086 184 PRIVATE NONIND. - - 1508 1778 1901 1764 1653 1900 144 Oak-Pine 1118 292 608 1068 1460 1624 1465 2948 - 114 Upland Hwd. 1022 337 599 884 1248 1410 1537 1733 1984 110		1293	148	957	1552	1768	1941	2391	-	-	1424
Upland Hwd. 878 182 408 682 1539 1240 1580 1076 - 144 Bottomland Hwd 1569 329 1059 968 1484 2006 1914 2109 2086 184 PRIVATE NONIND. Pine 1435 565 972 1508 1778 1901 1764 1653 1900 144 Oak-Pine 1118 292 608 1068 1460 1624 1465 2948 - 114 Upland Hwd. 1022 337 599 884 1248 1410 1537 1733 1984 110										932	1014
PRIVATE NONIND. Pine 1435 565 972 1508 1778 1901 1764 1653 1900 144 Oak-Pine 1118 292 608 1068 1460 1624 1465 2948 - 114 Upland Hwd. 1022 337 599 884 1248 1410 1537 1733 1984 110									1076	-	1415
Pine 1435 565 972 1508 1778 1901 1764 1653 1900 144 Oak-Pine 1118 292 608 1068 1460 1624 1465 2948 - 114 Upland Hwd. 1022 337 599 884 1248 1410 1537 1733 1984 110	Bottomland H	Hwd 1569	329	1059	968	1484	2006	1914	2109	2086	1866
Oak-Pine111829260810681460162414652948-116Upland Hwd.102233759988412481410153717331984110	PRIVATE NONINI	D.									
Upland Hwd, 1022 337 599 884 1248 1410 1537 1733 1984 110	Pine		565	972						1900	1410
			292	608							1186
Bottomland Hwd 1399 278 501 1273 1525 1665 1685 1925 1349 144	Upland Hwd.	1022									1101
	Bottomland H	Hwd 1399	278	501	1273	1525	1665	1685	1925	1349	1441

Table 4. Total volume on commercial forest land, by broad ownership class and forest type and by stand-age class, Mississippi, 1977.

Broad Owner-				STAND-A	GE CLASS					
ship class and	A11									
forest type	Classes	10	10-19	20-29	30-39	40-49	50-59	60-69	70+	Mixed
MMCF										
PUBLIC										
Pine	1,511.0	6.6	47.7	131.0	311.0	558.1	154.4	71.6	22.8	207.8
Oak-Pine	522.8	12.4	41.1	39.4	104.5	116.7	42.8	25.7	13.5	126.7
Upland Hwd.	281.4	6.5	20.5	20.6	36.8	96.2	20.1	15.6	36.2	28.9
Bottomland Hwo	d. 465.1	-	6.9	59.8	105.4	74.0	104.3	57.3	-	57.4
Total	2,780.3	25.5	116.2	250.8	557.7	845.0	321.6	170.2	72.5	420.8
INDUSTRY										
Pine	1,716.4	34.8	242.4	507.7	406.0	154.4	208.6	-	_	162.5
Oak-Pine	742.9	25.1	31.2	132.8	192.3	176.8	73.0	22.4	10.4	78.9
Upland Hwd.	498.2	26.9	35.7	46.3	130.0	30.0	92.8	10.6	-	125.9
Bottomland Hwo	d 1,097.5	17.6	42.7	59.3	259.0	212.7	195.1	38.7	23.1	249.3
Total	4,055.0	104.4	352.0	746.1	987.3	573.9	569.5	71.7	33.5	616.6
PRIVATE NONIND.										
Pine	4,476.2	115.5	558.8	1,222.9	1,323.5	614.1	253.6	21.8	25.8	340.2
Oak-Pine	2,545.8	67.3	213.3	534.3	651.1	421.7	167.2	77.6	-	413.3
Upland Hwd.	3,634.6	140.0	300.2	462.6	1,008.9	587.3	350.6	105.5	21.2	658.3
Bottomland Hwo	d 3,441.7	24.2	69.0	482.2	927.8	750.1	400.1	50.2	49.6	688.5
Total	14,098.3	347.0	1,141.3	2,702.0	3,911.3	2,373.2	1,171.5	255.1	96.6	2,100.3

LITERATURE CITED

- Boyce, Stephen G. and Herbert A. Knight. 1977. Harvesting pine without pine regeneration. Paper presented at annual meeting, La. For. Assoc., Lake Charles, La., Sept. 14-15, 1977.
- Knight, Herbert A. 1977. Stand-age profile of North Carolina's timberland. USDA For. Serv. Res. Bull. SE-38. Southeast. For. Exp. Sta., Asheville, N.C., 15 pp.
- Moak, James E. 1977. Mississippi's timber resources and their economic importance. Bull. 854. Miss. Agri. and For. Exp. Sta., Miss. State, Miss., 12 pp.
- Murphy, Paul A. 1978. Mississippi forests: trends and outlook. USDA For. Serv. Res. Bull. SO-67. Southern For. Exp. Sta., New Orleans, La., 32 pp.
- Porterfield, Richard L. and W. W.

Von Segen. 1976. Improved utilization approaching the goal in Arkansas. J. of For. 74(6): 417-430.

Porterfield, Richard L., Thomas R. Terfehr, and James E. Moak. 1978. Forestry and the Mississippi economy. Bull. 869. Miss. Agri. and For. Exp. Sta., Miss. State, Miss., 51 pp.

Mention of a trademark or proprietary product does not constitute a guarantee or warranty of the product by the Mississippi Agricultural and Forestry Experiment Station and does not imply its approval to the exclusion of other products that also may be suitable.

Mississippi State University does not discriminate on the basis of race, color, religion, national origin, sex, age, or handicap.

In conformity with Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972 and Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, Dr. T. K. Martin, Vice President, 610 Allen Hall, P. O. Drawer J, Mississippi State, Mississippi 39762, office telephone number 325-3221, has been designated as the responsible employee to coordinate efforts to carry out responsibilities and make investigation of complaints relating to nondiscrimination.