

**AN ALGORITHM FOR A LANDSCAPE LEVEL  
MODEL OF MAST PRODUCTION**

---

**A Dissertation  
presented to  
the Faculty of the Graduate School  
University of Missouri-Columbia**

---

**In Partial Fulfillment  
of the Requirements for the Degree  
Doctor of Philosophy**

---

**by**

**NEAL H. SULLIVAN**

**Dr. David R. Larsen, Dissertation Supervisor**

**MAY 2001**

The undersigned, appointed by the Dean of the Graduate School, have examined the dissertation entitled

**AN ALGORITHM FOR A LANDSCAPE LEVEL  
MODEL OF MAST PRODUCTION**

presented by Neal H. Sullivan

a candidate for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy

and hereby certify that in their opinion it is worthy of acceptance.

---

David R. Larsen

---

Stephen G. Pallardy

---

Robert H. Cecich

---

Joseph E. Cavanaugh

---

Stephen R. Shifley

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to thank my committee, Dave Larsen, Bob Cecich, Steve Shifley, Steve Pallardy, and Joe Cavanaugh for their review of this document and for enduring my meandering journey before arriving at the modeling approach presented here. This model has been and future versions of the model will be improved greatly by their comments.

Funding for the research conveyed in this document was provided by the Central Hardwoods Ecology and Silviculture Unit of the North Central Research Station, USDA Forest Service. Since this research is, in essence, a synthesis of research done by a large number of researchers, I cannot adequately acknowledge all of the assistance I have received; but I do thank all whom I have cited in this document. Additional analysis was conducted using data provided by the USDA Forest Service, Forest Inventory and Analysis Unit in St. Paul, Minnesota and the Missouri Department of Conservation. I was aided in the little amount of field-work conducted for this project by Sara Cawthon, Bob Cecich and Michelle Boone.

My experience working with the people here in Columbia has been completely enjoyable. I cannot imagine a more supportive, friendly, and welcoming environment. So, I thank you all: Frank Thompson, Steve Shifley, Bob Cecich, Jim Lootens, Bill Dijak, Ed Loewenstein, Paul Johnson, Marilyn Magruder, Dianne Brooks, Dan Dey, Dirk Burhans, Laura Brookshire, Jerry Van Sambeek, and Felix Ponder. I would like also to thank my extended family which is comprised of the families that, I was born into, that I married into, and friends both near and far away. Knowing that there are people that care about you is valuable beyond measure.

I came to Columbia to be with my wife, Michelle Boone; thus, I would not be here today both literally and figuratively if it were not for her. Her companionship and love have inspired me to complete this project. A little while after we met, Michelle wrote a poem that began with the line "*We met in the tops of trees*", we did, and that is where we'll be.

# AN ALGORITHM FOR A LANDSCAPE LEVEL MODEL OF MAST PRODUCTION

Neal H. Sullivan

Dr. David R. Larsen, Dissertation Supervisor

## ABSTRACT

Masting is the reproductive habit inherent to some tree species where populations produce large seed crops in some years and small seed crops in others. This dissertation addresses two areas of oak mast production: i) formulating an approach to modeling mast production at a landscape scale and ii) evaluating the impact on tree growth when trees allocate resources to mast production. The model of mast production operates upon the predictions of forest structure and composition over large areas and long time-spans generated by the landscape model LANDIS. Forest inventory data (of local and national origin) are used to characterize the predicted size structure and species composition of oak subgenera based on stand age and ecological land type. This information is used to predict the potential mast production based on a diameter-acorn production relationship and assumed probabilities of inherent tree-level variability in mast production. Estimates of potential mast production are further stochastically modified to incorporate annual variation due to hypothesized: i) climatic conditions (freezing temperatures, humidity, and the temperature regime) during critical phases of flowering and acorn development, ii) random mast-limiting events (hail, insects, wind, and drought), and iii) phenological differences in acorn development between the red and white oak groups (*Erythrobalanus* and *Lepidobalanus*). Sensitivity analysis suggests that estimates of the proportion of trees in each subgenus strongly influenced estimates of mast production. Estimates of mast production were less

sensitive to the modeled diameter-age relationship and tree-density estimation. The model was tested on a 3,216 ha landscape southern Missouri. The masting model generates predictions that are within one order of magnitude of values observed in other studies (50 to 500 kg ha<sup>-1</sup>) and comparisons of differences in mast production among ecological land types also conform to results from other studies. Due to the high degree of variability associated with the age-diameter relationship, a better description of the relationship would improve the model.

Intensive measurement of changes in diameter on *in situ* branches and correlated acorn production provided the most reliable indicator of the hypothesized tradeoff between mast production and vegetative growth. More data and more intensive data would be required to quantify the trade-off between acorn production and the subsequent year shoot growth.

## LIST OF TABLES

### Section I: Introduction and Literature Review

|   |    |
|---|----|
| Table I.1 The abundance of oaks greater than 1 inch in diameter in Missouri.....  | 17 |
| Table I.2 Frequency of trees in common species groups in Missouri.....  | 20 |
| Table I.3 Distribution of species on MOFEP sites.....   | 23 |
| Table I.4a Distribution of oaks among physiographic land classes. ....  | 25 |
| Table I.4b Distribution of oaks among FIA physiographic land classes.....   | 26 |
| Table I.5 Distribution of FIA timberland plots among physiographic land .....   | 29 |
| Table I.6 Distribution of oaks on FIA timberland plots among aspect classes.....  | 31 |
| Table I.6b Distribution of oaks among aspect classes. ....  | 32 |
| Table I.7 The percentage of flowers abscising (falling) during stages of development<br>for a two year study in Kentucky (Williamson 1966)..... | 43 |

### Section II: Parameterization of the Spatial Model

|   |    |
|---|----|
| Table II.1 Listing and description of Landis output files utilized in the masting<br>module. ....                     | 66 |
| Table II.2 The Stata variables generated from Landis output and landscape<br>description files.....                   | 68 |
| Table II.3. A partial listing of programming code for the spatial model of masting.....                               | 77 |
| Table II.4. Presence and co-presence of the oak subgenera on simulated 900 m <sup>2</sup> FIA<br>and MOFEP plots..... | 85 |
| Table II.5. Average number of oak trees per estimated 30 X 30 m cell.....   | 90 |
| Table II.6. Average number of trees per cell by canopy position for MOFEP plots.....                                  | 91 |

|   |     |
|---|-----|
| Table II.7. Age-TPC relationship from statewide FIA and MOFEP summaries.....  | 95  |
| Table II.8 Conversions between LANDIS and MOFEP Land Types .....  | 96  |
| Table II.9. Average acorn production among MOFEP land types.....  | 98  |
| Table II.10. Number of trees per cell on MOFEP plots by Landis Land Type.....   | 99  |
| Table II.11. Simulated relationship between age and diameter .....  | 106 |
| Table II.12. MOFEP land type and tree diameter.....   | 111 |
| Table II.13 : Proportion of trees that are oaks by county .....   | 113 |
| Table II.14 The proportion of trees that are oaks by region. ....   | 115 |
| Table II.15 Age class and oak subgenera ratio .....   | 123 |
| Table II.16. MOFEP land type and oak subgenera ratio.....   | 124 |
| Table II.17 Subgenera growth rate adjustment factors .....  | 126 |
| Table II.18 Variation in the number of acorns produced among trees and years.....                                       | 130 |
| Table II.19 Randomly assigned inherent production scale factors.....  | 134 |
| Table II.20 Number of days with minimum temperature below 30 F.....   | 138 |
| Table II.21 Rankings of favorable or unfavorable climate conditions for recording<br>stations throughout Missouri ..... | 139 |

**Section III: Implementing the Spatial Model**

|   |     |
|---|-----|
| Table III.1 Mast production index for the even-aged management alternative..... | 167 |
| Table III.2 Summary of the influence of Landis land type .....                  | 173 |
| Table III.3 Base and sensitivity analysis coefficients .....                    | 182 |
| Table III.4 Results of parameter sensitivity testing .....                      | 186 |
| Table III.5 Cell mast production index by management regime and land type.....  | 203 |
| Table III.6 Cell mast production index by management regime and age.....        | 205 |

|             |   |     |
|-------------|---|-----|
| Table III.7 | ANOVA statistics for the variation in the cell mass production index among land types and the age of dominants for the even-aged management scenario... | 207 |
| Table III.8 | ANOVA statistics the variation in the cell mass production index among land types and the age of dominants for the uneven-aged management scenario..... | 209 |
| Table III.9 | Parameters for altering inherent production levels.....   | 214 |

**Section IV: The Model of Annual Variability**

|            |   |     |
|------------|---|-----|
| Table IV.1 | Example temporal model code of annual variation.....          | 220 |
| Table IV.2 | Rankings of favorable or unfavorable climate conditions ..... | 229 |
| Table IV.3 | Parameters used to generate scale factors .....               | 236 |
| Table IV.4 | Scale factors and mast production for an example .....        | 246 |

**Section V: Allocation of resources to masting**

|           |  |     |
|-----------|--|-----|
| Table V.1 | Variation in acorn number for 21 trees .....           | 258 |
| Table V.2 | Variation in acorn production index for 21 trees ..... | 259 |
| Table V.3 | Summary of <i>in situ</i> branch measurements .....    | 263 |
| Table V.4 | Summary statistics of shoot growth .....               | 265 |

**Section VI: Discussion of conclusions**

|            |  |     |
|------------|--|-----|
| Table VI.1 | Conversion factors among units of mast production..... | 281 |
|------------|--|-----|

## LIST OF FIGURES

### Section I: Introduction and Literature Review

|  |    |
|--|----|
| Figure I.1 Acorn production as a function of diameter .....  | 10 |
| Figure I.2 Sequence of flower and acorn development .....  | 15 |
| Figure I.3. Proportion oak component of each diameter class in Missouri .....                        | 21 |
| Figure I.4. Distribution of <i>Quercus alba</i> and <i>Q. velutina</i> in Missouri .....             | 27 |
| Figure I. 5. Distribution of FIA sample plots (1989) among aspect classes.....                       | 28 |
| Figure I.6 Distribution of FIA oak trees among aspect classes .....                                  | 33 |
| Figure I.7 Distribution of <i>Q. stellata</i> and <i>Q. marilandica</i> in Missouri .....            | 34 |
| Figure I.8 Distribution of <i>Q. coccinea</i> and <i>Q. rubra</i> in Missouri .....                  | 38 |
| Figure I.9 Distribution of <i>Q. muehlenbergii</i> and <i>Q. imbricaria</i> in Missouri .....        | 40 |
| Figure I.10 Distribution of <i>Q. palustris</i> and <i>Q. falcata</i> in Missouri .....              | 41 |
| Figure I.11. Acorn production as a function of site quality .....                                    | 45 |
| Figure I.12 The percentage of trees producing acorns for <i>Q. alba</i> and <i>Q. stellata</i> ..... | 47 |
| Figure I.13 <i>Quercus alba</i> acorn production by diameter class .....                             | 49 |
| Figure I.14 Annual acorn production for four forest types in Arkansas. ....                          | 50 |
| Figure I.15 A thinning experiment in Massachusetts to increase acorn production .....                | 52 |
| Figure I.16 A thinning experiment in Pennsylvania to increase acorn production .....                 | 53 |
| Figure I.17 Variation in diameter distributions for four cohorts .....                               | 54 |
| Figure I.18 The relationship between FIA stand age and diameter for for all species ....             | 56 |

Figure I.19 The relationship between FIA stand age and diameter for oaks ..... 57

**Section II: Parameters for the Spatial Model**

Figure II.1 Schematic of the masting module LANDIS connection. .... 62

Figure II.2 Test-case landscape location in Missouri. .... 64

Figure II.3 Flow chart of spatial mast production model..... 75

Figure II.4 Species combinations from LANDIS output ..... 86

Figure II.5 Gingrich diagram of stand stocking ..... 88

Figure II.6 Number of canopy position oak trees per simulated FIA cell..... 92

Figure II.7 Number of canopy position oak trees per simulated MOFEP cell..... 93

Figure II.8 Acorn production (kg ha<sup>-1</sup>) for MOFEP hard mast plots..... 100

Figure II.9 Diameter-age relationship for MOFEP site index trees. .... 101

Figure II.10 Diameter-age class relationship for FIA data. .... 102

Figure II.11 Age-Diameter relationship for MOFEP Site index trees ..... 104

Figure II.12 Predicted diameter distributions for two age classes ..... 108

Figure II.13 Differences in tree diameter for Landis land types..... 109

Figure II.14 Proportion of trees on plots that are oaks ..... 110

Figure II.15 Oaks and non-oaks per MOFEP plots and land type ..... 116

Figure II.16 MOFEP Mast production and the red oak component. .... 117

Figure II.17 By region, fraction of oaks that are in the red oak group ..... 118

Figure II.18 Distribution of oak species across all MOFEP plots. .... 120

Figure II.19 Acorn production by species and diameter. .... 121

Figure II. 20 Modeled relationship between tree diameter and acorn production ..... 128

|  |     |
|--|-----|
| Figure II.21 Measured acorn production index for 21 trees .....        | 132 |
| Figure II.22 Minimum temperature by climate station .....              | 140 |
| Figure II.23 Average minimum daily temperatures across Missouri .....  | 141 |
| Figure II.24 Average daily minimum temperatures across Missouri .....  | 143 |
| Figure II.25 Airborne pollen and daily minimum relative humidity ..... | 144 |
| Figure II.26 Average daily minimum relative humidity in Missouri.....  | 146 |

### **Section III: Implementing the Spatial Model**

|  |     |
|--|-----|
| Figure III.1 Mast production model for sites in southern Missouri .....                | 165 |
| Figure III.2 Frequency of the number of trees per .....                                | 168 |
| Figure III.3 The variation in age diameter, age class and species groups.....          | 171 |
| Figure III.4. MOFEP diameter distributions and model estimates .....                   | 174 |
| Figure III.5 Land type influence on subgenus ratio.....                                | 176 |
| Figure III.6 Mast production index per tree for the 30th year iteration.....           | 179 |
| Figure III.7 Mast production index per tree for the 90th year iteration.....           | 180 |
| Figure III.8 Test case land type and stand boundaries .....                            | 194 |
| Figure III.9 Age by stand for year 30 for the even-aged simulation. ....               | 196 |
| Figure III.9 Age by stand for year 90 for the even-aged simulation. ....               | 197 |
| Figure III.11 Mast index for the 90th year iteration under even-aged management. ....  | 200 |
| Figure III.12 Mast index for the 90th year iteration under uneven-aged management..... | 201 |
| Figure III.13 Percentage change for even-aged management .....                         | 202 |
| Figure III.14 Mast index reducing the number of low mast producers.....                | 212 |

Figure III.15 Difference in the mast index after reducing low mast producers..... 213

**Section IV: The Model of Annual Variability**

Figure IV.1 The algorithm for adding annual variability in mast production ..... 219

Figure IV.2 The difference in temperature among topographic positions..... 230

Figure IV.3 Daytime relative humidity recorded at two elevations..... 233

Figure IV. 4 Topographic position and relative humidity at two low elevations  
in North Carolina..... 234

Figure IV.5 Influence of climate factors on mast index. .... 237

Figure IV.6 Temperature regime during flowering and previous mast production ..... 239

Figure IV.7 Five examples of 10-year model simulations..... 242

Figure IV.8 Oak flower survival among years for central Missouri..... 243

Figure IV.9 The mean stand mast index for a 10-year model simulation ..... 244

Figure IV.10 Landscape of the mast index for a 10-year model simulation (yr 1-5) ..... 251

Figure IV.11 Landscape of the mast index for a 10-year model simulation (yr 6-10) ..... 252

**Section V: Allocation of resources to masting**

Figure V.1 Variation in acorn production among 21 trees ..... 260

Figure V.2 The relationship between acorn production and change in  
cross-sectional area of branches ..... 269

Figure V.3 *Quercus alba* shoot growth and mast index by year ..... 271

Figure V.4 *Quercus velutina* shoot growth and mast index by year ..... 272

Figure V.5 *Quercus alba* radial increment and mast index by year ..... 274

Figure V.6 *Quercus velutina* radial increment and mast index by year ..... 275

**Section VI: Discussion of conclusions**

Figure VI.1 Influence of changing climate on scaling factors..... 284

Figure VI.2 Effect of hypothesized changing climate on mast production..... 285

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

|   |      |
|---|------|
| <b>Acknowledgements</b> .....                                   | ii   |
| <b>Abstract</b> .....   | iii  |
| <b>List of Tables</b> .....                                     | v    |
| <b>List of Figures</b> .....                                    | viii |
| <b>Section I: Introduction and Literature Review</b>            |      |
| Introduction.....   | 1    |
| The nature of masting.....                                      | 2    |
| The scope and scale of this research.....                       | 11   |
| The Sequence of Acorn Development.....                          | 12   |
| Missouri Factors for this Study.....                            | 16   |
| Oak Species in Missouri.....                                    | 19   |
| Previous studies of acorn production.....                       | 39   |
| Conclusions.....  | 55   |
| <b>Section II: Probability and Quantity of Acorn Production</b> |      |
| Introduction.....   | 60   |
| The landscape model: Landis.....                                | 60   |
| Masting module implementation: Stata.....                       | 67   |
| Summary of approach.....  | 69   |
| Spatial vs.Temporal variability.....                            | 71   |
| Synthesis and the Spatial Model .....                           | 72   |
| Spatial Relationships in the Mast Model.....                    | 76   |
| Organization of description.....                                | 76   |
| Annual Variability.....   | 135  |
| Temporal variability: Sources of data.....                      | 135  |

|  |     |
|--|-----|
| <b>Section III: The Spatial Component of the Masting Model</b>                 |     |
| Introduction.....  | 162 |
| Model Performance.....   | 164 |
| Sensitivity Analysis.....  | 181 |
| Management Effects.....  | 192 |
| Conclusions.....   | 211 |
| <b>Section IV: The Annual Variability Component of the Masting Model</b>       |     |
| Introduction.....  | 218 |
| Methods: Model Development.....  | 227 |
| Model Performance.....   | 241 |
| Conclusions.....   | 250 |
| <b>Section V: The Trade-off Between Vegetative Growth and Acorn Production</b> |     |
| Introduction.....  | 255 |
| Methods.....   | 257 |
| Results and Discussion.....  | 262 |
| Conclusions.....   | 276 |
| Section VI: Discussion of conclusions and implications.....                    | 278 |
| Literature Cited.....  | 287 |
| Vita.....  | 293 |