United States
Department of
Agriculture

Forest Service

**Southern Forest
Experiment Station**

New Orleans,
Louisiana

Research Paper
so-205
June, 1984

Sugarberry Volume and Weight Tables

Bryce E. Schlaegel



SUMMARY

Volume and weight tables were constructed from a 121-tree sample of sugarberry *(Celtis Zaeuigata* Willd.) taken in the Mississippi Delta. The tables present cubic-foot volume, green weight, and dry weight of bole wood, bole wood plus bark, and total tree excluding leaves above a l-foot stump as predicted from the allometric model $Ln\ Y = b_0 + b_1 Ln(D^2H)$. Merchantable bole volume and weight estimates can be made to any outside bark diameter limit. More precise bole estimates can be obtained from equations using upper bole diameters taken at relative heights of 25, 33, and 50 percent of total tree height.

Sugarberry Volume and Weight Tables

Bryce E. Schlaegel

INTRODUCTION

Sugarberry *(Celtis laevigata* Willd.) grows on bottomlands of the Piedmont and Coastal Plain of the southern United States from southeastern Virginia, south to southern Florida, then west along the Gulf Coast into Texas, north to western Oklahoma, Missouri, southern Illinois and Indiana, and western Kentucky (Little 1979) (fig. 1). It is most commonly found on clay soils of broad flats or shallow sloughs within the flood plains of major southern rivers but thrives on various types of soils. This is a slow growing species, with trees reaching 80 feet in height and 20 inches in dbh.

In recent years there has been considerable demand for volume and weight tables for bottomland hardwood species. This paper is the fourth in a series of six giving both volume and weight tables for some of the major bottomland hardwood species. The other five species in the series are willow *oak (Quercus phellos* L.) (Schlaegel 1981), Nuttall *oak (Q. nuttallii* Palmer) (Schlaegel and Willson 1983), overcup oak *(Q. lyrata* Walt.) (Schlaegel 1984a), sweetgum *(Liquidambar styraciflua* L.) (Schlaegel 1984b), and green ash *(Fraxinus pennsylvanica* Marsh.) (Schlaegel 1984c).

METHODS

The data were collected from 15 natural bottomland hardwood stands in west-central Mississippi. Stands were either even- or uneven-aged with a mixed species composition. Each stand was measured for species composition and diameter distribution; 121 trees, ranging in dbh from 1 through 22 inches, were chosen for destructive sampling. Growing stock trees with healthy crowns and no visible signs of disease or decay were selected from both the overstory and understory. When available, three trees were selected from each l-inch diameter class. Cutting was done throughout the year.

Stump height and total height were measured on each felled sample tree. Disks about l-inch thick were cut from the bole at regular intervals from the stump to the top of the tree. These were then sealed in separate polyethylene bags for laboratory determination of moisture content and specific gravity. The first disk was at stump height and the remainder at 5-foot intervals measured from ground level for trees 5 inches dbh and larger and at 3-foot intervals for trees smaller than 5 inches dbh. All limbs, including leaves, were weighed on 115 of the trees.

In the laboratory, both wood and bark moisture content and specific gravity were determined as follows:

1. Wood and bark were separated with a hammer and chisel.
2. Each component was weighed green.
3. Both wood and bark were soaked in water for at least an hour to ensure complete swelling.
4. Volumes were obtained by immersion (Heinrichs and Lassen 1970).
5. Wood and bark were dried in a forced-air oven at 105°C for at least 48 hours.
6. Wood or bark moisture content =
$$\frac{\text{green weight} - \text{ovendry weight.}}{\text{ovendry weight}}$$
7. Specific gravity =
$$\frac{\text{ovendry wood or bark weight (g)}}{\text{green wood or bark volume (cm}^3\text{)}}$$

Average tree moisture content and specific gravity were calculated from weighted averages of the disk moisture contents and specific gravities; each disk specific gravity or moisture content was weighted by its squared average diameter.

Taper functions (Schlaegel 1981, Schlaegel and Willson 1983) of the form

$$Y = b_1(X^1 - 1) + b_2(X^2 - 1) + \ldots + b_p(X^p - 1)$$

where

$Y = d/D$,
d = diameter at height h on the bole,
D = dbh,
$X = h/H$,
h = height from ground to a specific measurement point,
H = total height,
b_i = coefficients estimated for each tree by linear regression; $i = 1, 2, \ldots p$; $4 \leq p \leq 7$,

Bryce E. Schlaegel is Principal Mensuration&t at the Southern Hardwoods Laboratory, maintained at Stoneville, Mississippi, by the Southern Forest Experiment Station, Forest Service-USDA, in cooperation with the Mississippi Agricultural and Forestry Experiment Station and the Southern Hardwood Forest Research Group.

were calculated for each tree, both inside and outside bark. Cubic-foot volumes were obtained for each tree by integrating the taper function to heights of specific top diameters to obtain both total and merchantable bole volumes. Bole green and dry weights were calculated from estimated tree volume and weighted average tree density and moisture content.

Allometric regression equations were used to estimate volume, green weight, and dry weight of bole wood, bole wood plus bark, and bole wood plus bark plus limbs.

RESULTS

Characteristics of the trees used in this study are:

	Average	Range
Age *(years)*	38	8-156
Dbh *(in)*	8.1	0.8 – 21.9
Total height *(ft)*	54	11-92
Wood moisture content *(percent)*	80	56-9'7
Bark moisture content *(percent)*	74	44 201
Wood specific gravity	0.481	0.330 – 0.572
Bark specific gravity	0.579	0.283 – 0.782
Wood+barkgreen density *(lb/ft)*	54.63	34.88 – 64.53
Wood i-bark dry density *(lb/ft)*)	30.54	20.62 – 34.72
Wood + bark moisture content *(percent)*	*79*	57 – 101
Wood + bark specific gravity	0.489	0.330 – 0.556

Individual tree volumes and weights were fitted to the allometric model:

$$Ln(Y) = b_0 + b, Ln(D^2H) \quad (1)$$

where

Y = the volume or weight variable of interest,
Ln is a natural logarithm;
b_0 and b, are coefficients estimated from the data.

Estimates of the coefficients b_0 and b, are presented in table 1 for predicting cubic foot volume and green and dry weight of bole wood, bole bark, total bole, and total tree excluding leaves. Additional statistics presented are the component average, fit index, regression standard error of estimate ($\hat{S}_e$) based on residuals after converting to actual units, and coefficient of variation (C.V.) of predictions in arithmetic units. Fit index, which is similar to R^2, is used to judge equation efficiency when the dependent varia-



Figure *1.-The range of sugarberry (Fowells 1965).* **(F-506584)**

ble has been transformed (Farrar 1978) and is calculated in untransformed units from the total and residual sums of squares.[1] The fit index and R^2 are equal when a simple linear regression analysis is performed on an untransformed dependent variable.

Fit indices range from 0.792 for dry bark weight to 0.988 for bole wood volume. A fit index of 1.0 indicates that predictions can be made without error with the data used to fit the model; a value close to 1 is desirable. Coefficients of variation, which are indices of relative precision of prediction, range from 66.1 percent for dry bark weight to 13.8 percent for bole wood volume.

Using measures of individual tree dbh and total height, estimates can be made using table 1 for tree volume (given in table 2), green weight (given in table 3), and dry weight (given in table 4) for bole wood, bole wood plus bark, and for bole wood plus bark plus limbs excluding leaves.

The equations were developed using trees from a limited geographic range compared to the total range. Therefore, predictions may be less precise when the equations are applied in other parts of the range. Using an upper bole diameter measurement in addition to dbh as described later should alleviate this problem.

MERCHANTABLE BOLE ESTIMATES

The merchantable bole is defined as the tree bole from a l-foot stump to a specified top diameter, ignoring limbs. Merchantable bole volume or weight can be expressed as a proportion of the total bole by a generalized form of the logistic model

$$R_I = (1.0 + e^{f(X)})^{-1} \quad (2)$$

where

R_I = ratio of merchantable bole volume or weight to total bole volume or weight, where I = top outside bark diameter of merchantable bole,

$X = (D - d_I)/D$,

D = tree dbh outside bark, and

d_I = outside bark top diameter.

For a specific top diameter, the ratio of merchantable bole to total bole is the same for volume, green weight, dry weight, and inside and outside bark (Schlaegel and Willson 1983).

Model 2 was fitted to the overcup oak data for trees ≥4.6 inches dbh, with $f(X) = b_0 + b_1X + b_2X^2 + b_3X^3 + b_4X^4$. Inverting (2) and taking the natural logarithm results in

$$\mathrm{Ln}\left(\frac{1-R_I}{R_I}\right) = b_0 + b_1X + b_2X^2 + b_3X^3 + b_4X^4;$$

this was solved using multiple linear regression techniques giving:

$$R_I = [1.0 + \mathrm{EXP}(1.58529 + 1.83111\,X - 51.10565\,X^2 + 91.90861\,X^3 - 54.30496\,X^4)]^{-1} \quad (3)$$

with fit index = 0.951 and $\hat{S}_e = 0.052$; EXP is the base of the natural logarithm and equals 2.71828.

Volume or weight to any top diameter (V_I) is found by multiplying the ratio estimate obtained from (3) by a total bole volume or weight estimate from either table 2, 3, or 4:

$$V_I = R_I \cdot V_T,$$

where V_T is the total bole volume or weight of interest.

IMPROVED TOTAL BOLE ESTIMATES

The precision of the merchantable bole estimate depends upon accuracy in measuring total bole. Total bole estimates can be significantly improved by measuring one or two additional diameters. Tables 5 and 6 give regression statistics for total bole volume and weight under two different model forms:

$$\mathrm{Ln}(Y) = b_0 + b_1\,\mathrm{Ln}(D \cdot D_{1/3} \cdot H) \quad (4)$$

and

$$\mathrm{Ln}(Y) = b_0 + b_1\,\mathrm{Ln}[(D \cdot D_{1/2} + D^2_{1/4}) \cdot H] \quad (5)$$

where D, H, and Y are as defined previously, and $D_{1/3}$, $D_{1/2}$, and $D_{1/4}$ are diameters measured outside the bark at one-third, one-half, and one-fourth the total height.

Statistics from tables 5 and 6 show the significant ($a = 0.05$) improvement over the previous D^2H equations of table 1. Measuring one additional diameter at one-third the tree height reduces S_e for bole wood volume, total bole volume, green wood and total bole weight, and total dry bole weight by 31, 45, 18, 32, and 30 percent, respectively. Other standard errors are reduced but not significantly.

Measuring two upper bole diameters at one-fourth and one-half total height will result in further significant increases in precision. Improvements over the D^2H model range from 17 to 53 percent for bole wood and total bole and from 6 to 9 percent for bark.

Taking additional bole measures means a higher inventory cost, since more time will be spent at each tree, but most of the inventory cost is in traveling to the candidate tree. Data presented in this paper allow total and merchantable bole estimates to be made with high reliability. Each user has to decide when increased precision is needed and whether the need offsets the higher cost.

LOCAL VOLUME TABLES

There are many occasions when the only tree variable available is dbh, or perhaps only a rough estimate of tree volume or weight is needed. In these cases a local volume table will suffice. Table 7 gives the sta-

[1] $FI = \{1 - [\Sigma(Y_i - \hat{Y}_i)^2] / [\Sigma(Y_i - \bar{Y})^2]\}$

tistics needed for estimating by the local volume table technique. However, it must be realized that estimation precision may be considerably lessened. The local volume or weight model is

$$Ln(Y) = b_0 + b, Ln(D^2). \quad (6)$$

Precision is significantly (a = 0.05) reduced when only dbh is used to predict bole wood, total bole, and total tree. But bark estimates are more precise using the local equations.

CALCULATING CONFIDENCE LIMITS

Confidence limits ((1 – a) percent confidence limits) of individual predictions can be calculated using statistics presented in table 8. Clark et al. (1980) used the technique of Land (1972) to estimate approximate . confidence limits for lognormal means of scarlet oak:

$$Y_{U.L.} = EXP \left\{ Ln(Y) \pm Z_{\alpha/2} \left[S^2_{y \cdot x} \left[\frac{1}{n} + \frac{(X - \bar{X})^2}{\Sigma(X - \bar{X})^2} \right] + \frac{S^4_{y \cdot x}}{2(n+1)} \right]^{1/2} \right\}$$

where:

$Y_{U.L.}$ = upper and lower limits for Y,
EXP= base of natural logarithm; EXP = e = 2.71828,
Y = predicted volume or weight of component,
$Z_{\alpha/2}$ = value for the upper a /2 percentage point from the standard normal table,
$S_{y \cdot x}$ = standard error of estimate for prediction equation,
n= number of observations used to develop the equation,
$\bar{X}$ = sample mean of Ln(X),
$\Sigma(X - \bar{X})^2$ = corrected sum of squares for Ln(X),
X = $Ln(D^2H)$; D = dbh and H = total height of tree for which Y is predicted.

LITERATURE CITED

Clark, Alexander, III; Phillips, Douglas R.; Hitchcock, Harry C., III. Predicted weights and volumes of scarlet oak trees on the Tennessee Cumberland Plateau. Res. Pap. SE-214, Asheville, NC: U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Southeastern Forest Experiment Station; 1980.23 p.

Farrar, R. M., Jr. Silvicultural implications of the growth response of naturally regenerated even-aged stands of longleaf pine *(Pinus palustris* Mill.) to varying stand age, site quality, and density and certain stand structure measures. Athens, GA: University of Georgia; 1978. 132 p. Ph.D. Dissertation.

Fowells, H. A., comp. Silvics of forest trees of the United States. Agric. Handb. 271. Washington, DC: US. Department of Agriculture; 1965.762 p.

Heinrichs, J. Frank; Lassen, L. E. Improved technique for determining the volume of irregularly shaped wood blocks. For. Prod. J. 20(4): 24; 1970.

Land, Charles E. An evaluation of approximate confidence interval estimation methods for lognormal means. Technometrics 14(1): 145 – 158; 1972.

Little, Elbert L., Jr. Checklist of United States Trees. Agric. Handb. 541. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Agriculture; 1979.375 p.

Schlaegel, Bryce E. Willow oak volume and weight tables for the Mississippi Delta. Res. Pap. SO-173, New Orleans, LA: U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Southern Forest Experiment Station; 1981. 14 p.

Schlaegel, Bryce E. Overcup oak volume and weight tables. Res. Pap. SO-207, New Orleans, LA: U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Southern Forest Experiment Station; 1984a. 14 p.

Schlaegel, Bryce E. Sweetgum volume and weight tables. Res. Pap. SO-204, New Orleans, LA: U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Southern Forest Experiment Station; 1984b. 14 p.

Schlaegel, Bryce E. Green ash volume and weight tables. Res. Pap. SO-206, New Orleans, LA: U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Southern Forest Experiment Station; 1984c. 14 p.

Schlaegel, Bryce E.; Willson, Regan B. Nuttall oak volume and weight tables. Res. Pap. SO-186, New Orleans, LA: U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Southern Forest Experiment Station; 1983. 14 p.

Table *I.-Regression statistics forpredicting sugarberry tree volumes and weights using dbh anu total height* [1]

Component	Average Y	b_0	b_1	Fit index[2]	$\hat{S}_e$[3]	C.V. percent[4]
			Volume *(cubic feet)*			
Bole wood	13.1	-5.862	0.95323	0.988	1.81	13.8
Bole bark	1.2	-1.223	0.83390	0.825	0.67	56.9
Total bole	14.3	-5.649	0.93856	0.986	2.07	14.5
Total tree, excluding leaves	21.1	-5.484	0.95437	0.962	5.28	25.0
			Green weight *(pounds)*			
Bole wood	708	-1.892	0.95566	0.984	111	15.6
Bole bark	78	-3.332	0.86691	0.806	48	62.2
Total bole	786	-1.683	0.94340	0.983	126	16.1
Total tree, excluding leaves	1158	-1.515	0.95778	0.963	283	24.4
			Dry weight *(pounds)*			
Bole wood	393	-2.474	0.95535	0.982	64	16.4
Bole bark	48	-4.067	0.89204	0.792	32	66.1
Total bole	441	-2.287	0.94643	0.984	70	15.8
Total tree, excluding leaves	652	-2.118	0.96116	0.963	160	24.5

[1]Volumes and weights of trees from a l-foot stump to the tree tip, using $Ln(Y) = b_0 + b, Ln(D^2H)$; D = dbh, H = total tree height.

[2]Fit index = $1.0 - [\Sigma(Y - Y)' / \Sigma(Y - \bar{Y})^2]$, using untransformedvalues.

[3]$\hat{S}_e = [\Sigma(Y - \hat{Y})^2 / (n - 2)]^{1/2}$, using untransformed values.

[4]Coefficient of variation = $100\ S_e / \bar{Y}$.

Table *2.-Cubic-foot volume for sugarberry bole wood, bole wood plus bark, and total tree'*

Dbh	Total height in feet									
	10	20	30	40	50	60	70	80	90	100
inches	*cubic feet*									
1	0.03'	0.05								
	0.03'	0.06								
	0.04	0.07								
2	0.10	0.19	0.27							
	0.11	0.22	0.31							
	0.14	0.27	0.40							
3		0.40	0.59	0.78						
		0.46	0.67	0.88						
		0.59	0.87	1.14						
4		0.70	1.02	1.35	1.67	*1.98*				
		0.79	1.16	1.52	1.87	2.22				
		1.02	1.50	1.98	2.45	2.91				
5			1.57	2.06	2.55	3.03				
			1.76	2.30	2.84	3.37				
			2.30	3.03	3.75	4.46				
6				2.92	3.61	4.29	*4.97*			
				3.24	4.00	4.75	5.48			
				4.29	5.31	6.32	7.32			
7				3.91	4.84	5.76	6.67	7.58		
				4.33	5.34	6.34	7.32	8.30		
				5.76	7.13	8.48	9.82	11.20		
8				5.05	6.24	7.43	8.60	9.77		
				5.57	6.86	8.14	9.41	10.70		
				7.43	9.19	10.90	12.70	14.40		
9					7.81	9.30	10.8	12.2		
					8.56	10.20	11.7	13.3		
					11.50	13.70	15.9	18.0		
10					9.55	11.4	13.2	14.9	16.7	
					10.40	12.4	14.3	16.2	18.1	
					14.10	16.7	19.4	22.0	24.7	
11					11.5	13.6	15.8	17.9	20.1	
					12.5	14.8	17.1	19.4	21.7	
					16.9	20.1	23.3	26.4	29.6	
12					13.5	16.1	18.6	21.2	23.7	
					14.7	17.4	20.1	22.8	25.5	
					19.9	23.7	27.5	31.2	34.9	
13					15.7	18.7	21.7	24.7	27.6	
					17.1	20.3	23.4	26.5	29.6	
					23.2	27.6	32.0	36.4	40.7	
14						21.6	25.0	28.4	31.8	
						23.3	26.9	30.5	34.1	
						31.8	36.9	41.9	46.9	
15						24.6	28.5	32.4	36.2	
						26.5	30.6	34.7	38.8	
						36.3	42.1	47.8	53.5	
16						27.8	32.2	36.6	41.0	45.3
						29.9	34.6	39.2	43.8	48.3
						41.1	47.6	54.1	60.5	66.9
17						31.3	36.2	41.1	46.0	50.9
						33.5	38.7	43.9	49.0	54.1
						46.1	53.4	60.7	67.9	75.1
18						34.9	40.4	45.8	51.3	56.7
						37.3	43.1	48.9	54.6	60.3
						51.4	59.6	67.7	75.7	83.8

Table 2.-Cubic-foot volume for sugarbeny bole wood, bole wood plus bark, and total tree-(Continued)

Dbh	Total height in feet									
	10	20	30	40	50	60	70	80	90	100
inches	*cubic feet*									
19						38.6	44.8	50.8	56.9	62.9
						41.3	47.7	54.1	66.4	66.7
						57.0	66.1	75.1	84.0	92.8
20						42.6	49.4	56.0	62.7	69.3
						45.5	52.5	59.6	66.5	73.4
						62.9	72.9	82.8	92.6	102.0
21						46.8	54.2	61.5	68.8	76.1
						49.8	57.6	65.3	72.9	80.5
						69.0	80.0	90.9	102.0	112.0
22						51.1	59.2	67.2	75.2	83.2
						54.4	62.8	71.2	79.6	87.8
						75.4	87.4	99.3	111.0	123.0
23						55.6	64.4	73.2	81.9	90.5
						59.1	68.3	77.4	86.5	95.5
						82.1	95.2	108.0	121.0	134.0
24						60.3	69.9	79.3	88.8	98.2
						64.0	74.0	83.9	93.7	103.0
						89.1	103.0	117.0	131.0	145.0
25						65.2	75.5	85.8	96.0	106
						69.1	79.9	90.6	101.0	112
						96.3	112.0	127.0	142.0	157
26						70.3	81.4	92.4	103	114
						74.4	86.0	97.5	109	120
						104.0	120.0	137.0	153	169

'Tree volume from a l-foot stump to the tree tip.

'The three vertical figures for each dbh give volumes of bole wood first, bole wood plus bark second, and total tree (bole wood plus bark plus limbs excluding leaves) last.

[3]Boldface numbers span the range of the data.

Table 3.-Green weight in pounds for sugarbeny bole wood, bole wood plus bark, and total tree'

Dbh	Total height in feet									
	10	20	30	40	50	60	70	80	90	100
inches	*pounds*									
1	1.4'	2.6								
	1.6'	3.1								
	2.0	3.9								
2	5.1	9.9	15							
	6.0	11.6	17							
	7.5	14.6	22							
3		22	32	42						
		25	37	48						
		32	47	62						
4		37	55	72	90	107				
		43	63	82	102	121				
		55	81	107	133	158				
5			84	111	137	164				
			96	126	155	184				
			125	164	203	242				
6				157	195	232	268			
				177	219	260	301			
				233	288	343	398			
7				211	261	311	360	410		
				237	293	348	402	456		
				313	387	461	535	608		
8				273	337	402	465	529		
				305	377	447	517	587		
				404	500	596	691	785		

Table *S.-Green weight in pounds for sugarberry bole wood bole wood plus bark, and total tree-(Continued)*

Dbh	Total height in feat									
	10	20	30	40	50	60	70	80	90	100
inches	*pounds*									
9					422	503	*583*	662		
					470	559	646	733		
					627	**747**	**865**	**983**		
10					**517**	**615**	**713**	**810**	*906*	
					574	681	**788**	**894**	*999*	
					767	913	1059	1203	1347	
11					**620**	738	**855**	**972**	1087	
					687	**816**	**943**	1070	1196	
					921	**1096**	1271	1444	1617	
12					**732**	872	1010	1147	1284	
					809	**961**	1112	1261	1409	
					1088	**1295**	1501	1706	1910	
13					**853**	1016	1177	1337	1496	
					941	1118	**1293**	1466	1639	
					1268	1510	1750	1989	**2226**	
14						1170	1356	1540	**1724**	
						1286	1487	1686	**1885**	
						1740	2017	**2292**	**2566**	
15						1335	1547	1758	1967	
						1464	1694	1921	2147	
						1986	**2302**	2616	2929	
16						1510	1750	1988	2225	2461
						1654	1913	2170	2425	2678
						2247	2605	**2960**	3314	3666
17						1696	**1965**	2233	2499	2763
						1854	2145	2433	2718	3003
						2524	2926	3325	3722	4117
18						1892	2192	**2490**	2787	3082
						2066	2389	2710	3028	3344
						2816	3264	3710	4153	4594
19						2098	2431	2761	3080	3418
						2287	**2645**	3001	3353	3704
						3124	**3621**	4114	4606	5095
20						2314	2681	3046	**3409**	3770
						2520	2914	3306	3694	4080
						3446	3994	4539	5081	5621
21						**2540**	2943	3344	3742	4138
						2763	3195	3624	4050	4473
						3784	4386	4984	5579	6172
22						2776	3217	3654	**4090**	4523
						3016	3488	3957	4422	4884
						4136	4794	5448	6099	6747
23						3022	3502	3979	4452	4924
						3 2 8 0	3794	4303	4809	5311
						4504	5221	5933	6641	7346
24						3278	3799	4316	4830	5341
						3554	4111	4663	5211	5755
						4887	5664	6437	7205	7970
25						3544	4107	4666	5222	5775
						3839	4440	5036	5628	6216
						5284	6125	6960	7791	8619
26						3820	4427	5029	5628	6224
						4134	4781	5423	6060	6694
						5696	6602	7503	8399	9291

'Tree weight from a l-foot stump to the tree tip.

'The three vertical figures for each dbh give weights of bole wood first, bole wood plus bark second, and total tree (bole wood plus bark plus limbs excluding leaves) last.

'Boldface numbers span the range of the data.

Table 4.—*Dry weight in pounds for sugarberry bole wood bole wood plus bark, and total tree'*

	Total height in feet									
Dbh	**10**	20	30	40	50	60	70	80	**90**	**100**
inches	*pounds*									
1	0.8'	1.5								
	0.9'	1.7								
	1.1	2.1								
2	2.9	5.5	8.2							
	3.3	6.4	9.4							
	4.2	8.1	12.0							
3		12	18	23						
		14	20	27						
		18	26	***34***						
4		21	31	40	**50**	60				
		24	35	46	57	67				
		31	45	**60**	74	88				
5			47	62	77	**91**				
			53	70	87	**103**				
			70	92	114	136				
6				88	**109**	**129**	**150**			
				99	122	145	**168**			
				131	**162**	**193**	224			
7				118	**146**	173	201	228		
				133	**164**	**195**	225	256		
				176	**218**	259	301	342		
8				152	**188**	224	259	**295**		
				171	211	251	**290**	**329**		
				227	281	335	389	442		
9					235	280	325	**369**		
					264	313	362	411		
					353	420	487	554		
10					288	343	397	451	505	
					322	382	442	502	561	
					432	515	597	679	760	
11					346	411	476	541	606	
					385	458	530	**601**	672	
					519	618	717	**815**	**913**	
12					408	486	563	639	715	
					454	540	625	709	**793**	
					613	731	847	**964**	**1079**	
13					475	576	656	745	834	
					529	628	727	825	**922**	
					715	852	988	1124	**1259**	
14						652	755	858	**960**	
						723	837	949	1061	
						983	1140	**1296**	1451	
15						744	862	**979**	**1096**	
						824	**953**	**1082**	**1209**	
						1122	1301	**1480**	1657	
16						841	**975**	**1108**	1240	**1371**
						931	1077	**1222**	1366	**1510**
						1270	1473	**1675**	1876	2076
17						**945**	1095	**1244**	1392	**1539**
						1044	1208	**1371**	1532	**1693**
						1427	1655	**1882**	2108	2332
18						**1054**	1221	**1387**	1552	1717
						1163	1346	**1527**	1708	1887
						1593	1848	**2101**	2353	2603

Table *4.-Dry weight in pounds for sugarberry bole wood, bole wood plus bark, and total tree—(Continued)*

Dbh	Total height in feet									
	10	20	30	40	50	60	70	80	90	100
inches'	*pounds*									
19						1168	1354	1538	1721	**1904**
						1289	1491	1692	**1892**	2090
						1768	2050	2331	2610	2888
20						1289	1493	1696	1899	2100
						1420	1643	1865	2084	2303
						1951	2263	2572	2881	3188
21						**1415**	1639	1862	2084	2305
						1558	1802	2045	2286	2526
						2143	2485	2825	3164	3501
22						1546	1792	2035	2278	2519
						1701	1968	2233	2497	2758
						2343	2717	3090	3466	3829
23						1683	1950	2216	2480	2742
						1850	2141	2429	2716	3000
						2552	2960	3365	3769	4170
24						1826	2116	2403	2690	2975
						2005	2320	2633	2944	3252
						2770	3212	3652	4090	4526
25						1974	2287	2598	2908	3216
						2167	2507	2845	3180	3513
						2996	3474	3950	4424	4895
26						2128	2465	2801	3134	3466
						2334	2700	3064	3425	3784
						3231	3747	4260	4770	5279

'Tree weight from a l-foot stump to the tree tip.

²The three vertical figures for each dbh give weights of bole wood first, bole wood plus bark second, and total tree (bole wood plus bark plus limbs excluding leaves) last.

'Boldface numbers span the range of the data.

Table *5.-Regression statistics forpredicting sugarberry bole volumes and weights* **using** *two bole diameter measurements and total height'*

Component	Average Y	b_0	b_1	Fit index'	$\hat{S}_e$³	C.V. percent'
	Volume *(cubic feet)*					
Bole wood	13.1	−5.802	0.98071	0.994	**1.24***	9.5
Bole bark	1.2	−7.185	0.85923	0.847	0.62	53.2
Total bole	14.3	−5.591	0.96572	0.996	**1.12***	7.9
	Green weight *(pounds)*					
Bole wood	708	−1.834	0.98331	0.989	**91***	12.9
Bole bark	78	−3.295	0.89339	0.829	45	58.3
Total bole	786	−1.627	0.97083	0.992	**86***	11.0
	Dry weight *(pounds)*					
Bole wood	393	−2.415	0.98301	0.986	58	14.7
Bole bark	48	−4.030	0.91937	0.816	30	62.2
Total bole	441	−2.231	0.97398	0.992	**49***	11.2

'Volumes and weights of trees from a l-foot stump to the tree tip, using $\text{Ln}(Y) = b_0 + b_1 \text{Ln}(D^2 \cdot D_{1/3} \cdot H)$; D = dbh, H = total tree height, $D_{1/3}$ = bole diameter outside bark at 1/3H.

²Fit index = $1.0 - [\Sigma(Y - \hat{Y})^2 / \Sigma(Y - \bar{Y})^2]$, using untransformed values.

³$\hat{S}_e = [\Sigma(Y - \hat{Y})^2 / (n - 2)]^{1/2}$, using untransformed values.

'Coefficient of variation = $100\ S_e / \bar{Y}$.

*Significantly more precise by the F test than D^2H model; a = 0.05.

Table *C-Regression statistics for predicting sugarbeny bole volumes* and *weights using three bole diameter measurements and* total *height'*

Component	Average Y	b_0	b_1	Fit index²	$\hat{S}_e$³	C.V. percent"
			Volume *(cubic feet)*			
Bole wood	13.1	-6.513	1.00617	0.996	1.00*	7.7
Bole bark	1.2	-7.812	0.88195	0.852	0.61	52.3
Total bole	14.3	6.292	0.99084	0.999	0.64*	4.5
			Green weight *(pounds)*			
Bole wood	708	-2.547	1.00883	0.991	83'	11.8
Bole bark	78	-3.946	0.91693	0.835	45	57.3
Total bole	786	2.331	0.99606	0.995	71*	9.0
			Dry weight *(pounds)*			
Bole wood	393	-3.128	1.00857	0.988	53+	13.6
Bole bark	48	-4.701	0.94369	0.821	30	61.3
Total bole	441	2.938	0.99936	0.995	40*	9.1

'Volumes and weights of trees from a l-foot stump to the tree tip, using $Ln(Y) = b_0 + b$, $Ln[(D \cdot D_{1/3} + D^2_{1/4})H]$; D = dbh, H = total tree height, $D_{1/3}$ and $D_{1/4}$ = bole diameters outside bark at $\frac{1}{2}H$ and $\frac{1}{4}H$, respectively.

²Fit index = $1.0 - [\Sigma(Y - Y)^2 / \Sigma(Y - \bar{Y})^2]$, using untransformed values.

³$\hat{S}_e = [\Sigma(Y - \hat{Y})^2 / (n - 2)]^{1/2}$, using untransformed values.

'Coefficient of variation = $100\, S_e / \bar{Y}$.

+ Significantly more precise by the F test than $D \cdot D_{1/3} \cdot H$ model; $\alpha = 0.05$.

*Significantly more precise by the F test than D^2H model; a = 0.05.

Table *I.-Local volume and weight equations for sugarberry'*

Component	Average Y	b_0	b_1	Fit index'	$\hat{S}_e$³	C.V. percent'
			Volume *(cubic feet)*			
Bole wood	13.1	-3.179	1.23777	0.934	4.18*	31.9
Bole bark	1.2	-4.904	1.08668	0.880	0.56+	47.1
Total bole	14.3	-3.011	1.21917	0.950	3.95*	27.7
Total tree, excluding leaves	21.1	-2.819	1.24272	0.949	6.08	28.8
			Green weight *(pounds)*			
Bole wood	708	0.796	1.24113	0.919	249*	35.2
Bole bark	78	-0.916	1.12891	0.861	41+	52.6
Total bole	786	0.967	1.22559	0.939	241*	30.7
Total tree, excluding leaves	1158	1.159	1.24723	0.946	344*	29.7
			Dry weight *(pounds)*			
Bole wood	393	0.217	1.24031	0.909	146*	37.1
Bole bark	48	1.591	1.16320	0.849	27+	56.2
Total bole	441	0.373	1.22941	0.934	140*	31.7
Total tree, excluding leaves	652	0.566	1.25157	0.941	202*	30.9

'Volumes and weights of trees from a l-foot stump to the tree tip, using $Ln(Y) = b_0 + b_1 Ln(D^2)$; D = dbh.

²Fit index = $1.0 - [\Sigma(Y - \hat{Y})^2 / \Sigma(Y - \bar{Y})^2]$, using untransformed values.

³$S_e = [\Sigma(Y - \hat{Y})^2 / (n - 2)]^{1/2}$, using untransformed values.

"Coefficient of variation = $100\, S_e / \bar{Y}$.

+ Significantly more precise by the F test than D^2H model; $\alpha = 0.005$.

*Significantly less precise by the F test than D^2H model; a = 0.05.

Table ***K-Statistics for estimating confidence bounds for sugarberry predictions for the bole and total tree***

Independent variable = X	n	Mean of X	Corrected sum of squares for X^1	$S_{y \cdot x}$ Standard error of estimate for tree components			
		Bole predictions			Wood	Bark	Total
$Ln(D^2)$	121	3.556	354.483	Volume	0.1915	0.3029	0.1775
				Green weight	0.2053	0.3616	0.1983
				Dry weight	0.2178	0.3408	0.2017
$Ln(D^2H)$	121	7.422	600.271	Volume	0.1306	0.3188	0.1255
				Green weight	0.1548	0.3690	0.1560
				Dry weight	0.1617	0.3644	0.1574
$Ln(D \cdot D_{1/3} \cdot H)$	121	7.148	568.328	Volume	0.0847	0.2889	0.0716
				Green weight	0.1143	0.3396	0.1119
				Dry weight	0.1227	0.3315	0.1116
$Ln[(D \cdot D_{1/2} + D^2_{1/4})H]$	121	7.672	540.282	Volume	0.0643	0.2791	0.0423
				Green weight	0.1004	0.3315	0.0964
				Dry weight	0.1079	0.3215	0.0929
		Total tree predictions					Total tree
$Ln(D^2)$	115	3.491	344.521	Volume			0.1540
				Green weight			0.1774
				Dry weight			0.1786
$Ln(D^2H)$	115	7.339	584.102	Volume			0.1555
				Green weight			0.1800
				Dry weight			0.1799

$^1\Sigma(X - \bar{X})^2$ in base e logarithmic units.

APPENDIX

Examples Using the Equations

In this section examples are presented to illustrate use of the equations. The following tabulation gives data used to illustrate equation use:

D= 21.7 in.
H = 75.0 ft.
$D_{¼}$ = 15.5 in.
$D_{⅓}$ = 14.8 in.
$D_{½}$ = 11.5 in.

Bole wood volume (V) is calculated using $X = D^2H$ and the parameter estimates from table 1 as follows:

$Ln(V) = b_0 + b_1 Ln(D^2H)$
$= -5.862 + 0.95323$ Ln (21.7 x 21.7 x 75.0)
$= -5.862 + 0.95323$ Ln (35316.75)
$= -5.862 + 0.95323$ (10.472)
$= -5.862 + 9.982$
Ln(V) = 4.120
$V = e^{4.120}$; bole wood volume = 61.6 ft^3.

To calculate total green bole weight (W) using $X = D \cdot D_{⅓} \cdot H$ and the parameter estimates from table 5:

$Ln(W) = b_0 + b_1$ Ln $(D \cdot D_{⅓} \cdot H)$
$= -1.627 + 0.97083$ Ln (21.7 x 14.8 x 75.0)
$= 1.627 + 0.97083$ Ln (24087.00)
$= -1.627 + 0.97083$ (10.089)
$= -1.627 + 9.795$
Ln(W) = 8.168
$W = e^{8.168}$; total bole green weight = 3526 lb.

To calculate bole dry weight (W) using $X = [(D \cdot D_{½} + D^2_{¼})H]$ and the parameter estimates from table 6:

$Ln(W) = b_0 + b_1$ Ln $[(D \cdot D_{½} + D^2_{¼})H]$
$= -2.938 + 0.99936$ Ln [(21.7 x 11.5 + 15.5 x 15.5) x 75.01
$= -2.938 + 0.99936$ Ln [(249.55 + 240.25) x 75.01
$= -2.938 + 0.99936$ Ln [489.80 x 75.01
$= -2.938 + 0.99936$ Ln [36735.00]
$= -2.938 + 0.99936$ (10.511)
$= -2.938 + 10.504$
Ln(W) = 7.566
$W = e^{7.566}$; total bole dry weight = 1931 lb.

Merchantable bole estimates to, say, an 8-inch top are calculated using equation 3 to estimate the merchantable portion of the bole and then multiplying that proportion (R8) by the predicted bole estimate of interest. Letting DI = 8.0, X = [(21.7 - 8.0)/21.7], or X = 0.631, and from (3):

$R8 = [1.0 + EXP(1.58529 + 1.83111(0.631) - 51.10565(0.631)^2 + 91.90861(0.631)^3 - 54.30496(0.631)^4)]^{-1}$
$= [1.0 + EXP(1.58529 + 1.83111(0.631) - 51.10565(0.39816) + 91.90861(0.25124) - 54.30496(0.15853))]^{-1}$
$= [1.0 + EXP(1.58529 + 1.15543 - 20.34823 + 23.09112 - 8.60897)]^{-1}$
$= [1.0 + EXP(-3.12536)]^{-1}$
$= [1.0 + 0.04392]^{-1}$
$= [1.04392]^{-1}$
R8 = 0.958.

Then bole wood volume to an 8-inch top (V8) can be calculated:

V8 = (R8)(predicted total bole wood volume)
= (0.958)(61.6)
= 59.0 ft^3.

Of course, total bole volumes or weights can be calculated using any one of the three sets of parameter estimates given in tables 1, 5, or 6. Then any of these total bole calculations can be used with the estimate of merchantable proportion to calculate merchantable bole values. The choice of which set of equations to use is left to the user, who must balance inventory precision against inventory cost.

☆ U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE: 1984-769-089:36

Schlaegel, Bryce E. Sugarberry volume and weight tables. Res. Pap. SO-205 New Orleans, LA: U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Southern Forest Experiment Station; 1984. 13 p.

A sample of 121 trees from the Mississippi Delta is used to construct volume and weight tables for sugarberry.

Additional keywords: *Celtis laevigata,* merchantable bole estimates, biomass.