

## REGENERATING EUCALYPTUS CAMALDULENSIS THROUGH COPPICE - AN ECONOMICAL METHOD

Zafar Iqbal<sup>1</sup>

### Abstract

The Common method for regenerating *Eucalyptus camaldulensis* is quite expensive, laborious and lengthy. Keeping this in view, the present study was conducted on 12 years old plantation using R.C.B. design with five replications. The results are quite encouraging and suggest that *Eucalyptus camaldulensis* can be raised successfully through coppice. Growth of coppice shoots was about 2-3 times more than the crop of seed origin. Volume production was not affected by the number of shoots retained or removed. However, reduction in number of shoots would be required to obtain bigger sized wood in relatively short rotation.

### Introduction

*Eucalyptus camaldulensis*, a native of Australia, has been planted on large scale under varying edaphic and climatic conditions in Pakistan. As such it has been planted in irrigated plantations of the Punjab and other provinces. It is now being grown by farmers under various social forestry programmes. This species has also been proved fairly successful in waterlogged and saline areas.

Because of its rapid growth, *Eucalyptus camaldulensis* is generally worked on short rotations and its regeneration is, therefore, repeated at short intervals. The common method for raising this species is expensive, laborious and time consuming, hence it becomes very important to find out some economical method for its regeneration. Keeping this in view, the present study was carried out to see the possibility of regenerating *Eucalyptus camaldulensis* through coppice.

### Review of Literature

Sheikh (1982) indicated that more the stems per hectare the greater is the

---

<sup>1</sup> CF/Additional Director (Seed), Punjab Forestry Research Institute, Faisalabad.



volume yield in the early stages of *Eucalyptus camaldulensis*. Maximum yield of 95 m<sup>3</sup>/ha was obtained by planting *Eucalyptus camaldulensis* at 1.5 x 15 m spacing. Rathinem and Surendran (1982) observed that coppice potential of *Eucalyptus tereticomis* depends largely upon its vigour, reproductivity and stool longevity. They concluded that larger the diameter of the stool larger the number of clusters developing from it.

Siddiqui (1984) reported that *Eucalyptus camaldulensis* is a principal species of all afforestation programmes in the country especially of arid and semi-arid areas. Hills and Brown (1984) revealed that *Eucalyptus camaldulensis* is widely afforested in arid and semi-arid areas because of its rapid growth on poor sites, ability to coppice readily, ability to tolerate periodic waterlogging, salinity and its multifarious uses. They further observed that most *Eucalyptus* plantations outside Australia are regenerated several times by coppice. The low *Eucalyptus* forests are best managed by the coppice system.

## Materials and Methods

In order to observe the coppicing capacity of *Eucalyptus camaldulensis*, an experiment was conducted on 12 years old plantation of *Eucalyptus camaldulensis* in Cpt. No.23 of Bahawalpur plantation over an area of 4 acres. Trees were felled with axe during April, 1990. The height of stumps were kept 6" above ground level. Diameter of stumps were recorded after felling which ranged from 4" to 10".

The new crop (tubed plants) was planted after extraction of muddies at 5x5 feet spacing following randomized complete block design (RCBD) with five replications. The first coppice shoot appeared in the last week of April, 1990 after seven months of coppicing of the stumps, the coppice shoots were reduced artificially to the required treatments. Following is the detail of treatments in each replication:

- T<sub>0</sub> = New planting (tubed plants).
- T<sub>1</sub> = One coppice shoot retained.
- T<sub>2</sub> = Two coppice shoots retained.
- T<sub>3</sub> = Three coppice shoots retained.
- T<sub>4</sub> = Four coppice shoots retained.



Equal number of plants (187) were retained in each experimental unit (plot) having size of 50 x 90 feet. Since there were five replications and five treatments in each replication the total number of plants were, therefore, 4675. The five treatments in each replication were allotted randomly according to procedure described by Steel and Torrie (1980).

Various silvicultural operations like weeding, irrigation etc. were carried out according to the requirement of crop. Every experimental tree was numbered and marked to retain its identity for repeated measurement of diameter and height. Data regarding height and diameter were recorded during December every year. Volume calculation was made with the help of local volume table.

Analysis of variance (ANOVA) was performed on diameter growth, height growth and total Volume production for each parameter separately. The F-ratio was used to indicate significant differences among treatments. LSD (least significant difference) test was applied to determine significant differences among treatments applied.

## Results and Discussion

### Diameter Growth

Analysis of variance (Table 1) indicated that diameter growth among treatments was significantly different at the five percent and one percent levels of confidence. The means for average diameter growth for all the treatments are presented in Table 2. Maximum diameter growth was attained by  $T_1$  (one shoot) and it was significantly different from all other treatments including control i.e. planting tubed plants. Similarly, diameter growth was significantly higher in  $T_2$  (two shoots) than  $T_3$  (three shoots),  $T_4$  (four shoots), however, remained at par regarding diameter growth but significantly different from other treatments. It is worth to mention that direct planting of tubed plants ( $T_0$ ) showed less diameter development than all the coppice treatments.

Results indicated that more the number of coppice shoots, lower is the diameter growth as weaker shoots are suppressed due to limited supply of light, nutrients and other environmental factors and take more time to attain same size. Lower average diameter in tubed plants as compared to shoots of coppice origin can be attributed to more developed and well established root system that take nutrients and water in a better way in the latter.



Table 1. Analysis of variance for diameter growth of *Eucalyptus camaldulensis* in coppice and non-coppice treatments.

| SOV          | DF | SS   | MS  | F-VALUE           |
|--------------|----|------|-----|-------------------|
| Treatments   | 4  | 17.3 | 4.3 | 21.5**            |
| Replications | 4  | 2.7  | 0.7 | 3.6 <sup>NS</sup> |
| Error        | 16 | 3.9  | 0.2 | -                 |
| Total        | 24 | 23.9 | -   | -                 |

NS : Non-significant

\*\* : Significant at 1% level

Table 2. Average Diameter Growth (inches) in each treatment.

| Treatment means | T0         | T1         | T2         | T3         | T4          |
|-----------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|-------------|
|                 | 2.9<br>(d) | 5.3<br>(a) | 4.2<br>(b) | 3.5<br>(c) | 3.3<br>(d)* |

\* Means followed by different letters differ significantly at 5% significance level according to L.S.D. test.

## Height growth

The results of variance for height growth given in Table 3 revealed that height was significantly different among treatments. Means for height growth when separated by the L.S.D test at the five percent level of significance (Table 4) showed that significantly more height was attained by T<sub>1</sub> (one shoot) as compared to other treatments. There was, however, no significant difference among other coppice treatments (T<sub>2</sub>, T<sub>3</sub> and T<sub>4</sub>) regarding height growth. Significantly reduced height was attained by directly planted tubed plants (T<sub>0</sub>).

As a general rule height growth decreased with number of coppice shoots retained but it was significantly reduced if the coppice shoots are retained more than one. Average height, however, statistically remained same irrespective of number of shoots retained beyond one coppice shoot. There was less reduction in height as compared to diameter growth mainly due to the reason that diameter growth is more influenced, by local environmental conditions (Champion *et al.*, 1965). More height attained by the coppice origin shoots may be due to their established root system as already mentioned earlier.



Table 3. Analysis of variance for height growth of *Eucalyptus camaldulensis* under coppice and non-coppice treatments.

| SOV          | DF | SS     | MS    | F-value           |
|--------------|----|--------|-------|-------------------|
| Treatments   | 4  | 1079.8 | 269.9 | 29.3**            |
| Replications | 4  | 118.8  | 29.7  | 3.2 <sup>NS</sup> |
| Error        | 16 | 146.8  | 9.2   |                   |

NS = Non-significant

\*\* Significant at 1% level.

Table 4. Average height growth (feet) of *Eucalyptus camaldulensis* in each treatment.

| Treatment means | T0          | T1          | T2          | T3          | T4           |
|-----------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|--------------|
|                 | 16.0<br>(c) | 36.2<br>(a) | 30.2<br>(b) | 26.8<br>(b) | 26.6<br>(b)* |

\* Means followed by different letters differ significantly at 5% significance level according to L. S.D. test.

### Volume production

Result of analysis of variance (Table 5) of the volume production exhibited highly significant difference among treatments. Means for volume production tested by the LSD at the five percent (Table 6) showed that there was no significant difference among coppice origin shoots inspite of variation in diameter and height growth. This suggests that more wood production could be obtained by fewer number shoots. Tubed plants (T0) produced significantly less volume as compared to all coppice origin treatments. Less volume production in case of tubed plants can be rightly attributed to lesser diameter and height growth and resultantly less volume production. It can be, therefore, inferred that if the objective of raising *Eucalyptus camaldulensis* is to attain large sized wood in a short rotation, it can be raised through coppice by retaining only one shoot. However, if the aim is to obtain total volume production (firewood) irrespective of size of end product per unit time, *Eucalyptus camaldulensis* can be raised

through coppice by retaining all available shoots. This will cut-down the cost of establishment without affecting the total volume production.

Table 5. Analysis of variance for volume production of *Eucalyptus camaldulensis* under coppice and non-coppice treatments

| SOV          | DF | SS    | MS    | F-value            |
|--------------|----|-------|-------|--------------------|
| Treatments   | 4  | 28.74 | 7.185 | 6.86**             |
| Replications | 4  | 12.61 | 3.153 | 0.33 <sup>NS</sup> |
| Error        | 16 | 16.77 | 1.048 |                    |

NS = Non-significant

\*\* Significant at 1 % level.

Table 6. Average volume production (Cft) in each treatment

| Treatment means | T0          | T1          | T2          | T3          | T4          |
|-----------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
|                 | 0.71<br>(b) | 3.17<br>(a) | 3.69<br>(a) | 3.12<br>(a) | 3.37<br>(a) |

\* Means followed by different letters differ significantly at 5 % significance level according to L.S.D. test.

## Conclusions

- Eucalyptus camaldulensis* can be raised successfully through coppice and it is more economical as compared to tube planting.
- Growth of coppice shoots is almost 2-3 times more than crop of seed origin (new planting).
- Volume production is not affected by the number of shoots retained or removed despite of variation in diameter and height growth. Reduction in number of shoots will however be required to obtained plants of bigger size in a relatively short span of time.



## References

- Champion, H.G., S.K. Seth and G.M. Khattak. 1965. Manual of Silviculture for Pakistan, Sukkar, Pakistan.
- Hillis, W.E. and A.C.G. Brown. 1984. *Eucalyptus* for wood production, CSIRO/Academic press Common Wealth Scientific and Industrial Research, N.Y., USA.
- Rathinem, H. and C. Surendran. 1982. The influence of stool on coppice growth in *E. tereticornis*. Jour. of For. 5(2): 92-94.
- Sheikh, M.I. 1982. *Eucalyptus* in Pakistan. Pakistan Forest Institute, Peshawar.
- Siddiqui, K.M. J.A. Khan and S.M. Yasin. 1984. *Eucalyptus*-its growth, properties and utilization. Bulletin No. 4. Forestry Products Research Division PFI, Peshawar.
- Steel, R.G.D. and J.H. Torrie. 1980. Principles and Procedures of Statistics A Biometrical Approach. 2nd Edition MS. McGraw Hill Co. N.Y., USA.