

Treatment	1982 DBH	1983 DBH	1984 DBH	1982 Height	1983 Height	1984 Height	1982 D <sup>2</sup> x H	1983 D <sup>2</sup> x H
C Total # =	250.0	250.0	250.0	250.0	250.0	250.0	250.0	250.0
C Total Sum =	229.8	353.1	500.6	2041.0	2511.6	3240.0	2677.9	6937.0
C Total Avg =	0.9	1.4	2.0	8.2	9.7	13.0	10.7	27.7
L Total # =	244.0	205.0	204.0	247.0	205.0	204.0	247.0	206.0
L Total Sum =	232.6	303.7	430.6	2014.6	2090.7	2542.1	3406.5	7019.5
L Total Avg =	1.0	1.5	2.1	8.1	10.1	12.5	14.3	34.7
M Total # =	248.0	173.0	170.0	248.0	173.0	170.0	248.0	173.0
M Total Sum	229.2	236.6	321.2	2009.1	1676.4	2073.7	2619.3	4210.7
M Total Avg	1.0	2.1	2.8	12.2	14.7	18.3	16.9	36.0

One needs to be careful when interpreting these results. The control plots started with more measuremer controls an advantage that carried trough the study. The control plots had no mortality recorded from tip to these numbers, but in reality, if they do survive (and I suspect most will die from hardwood competition to be harvested if the stand is clearcut for pulp in 15-20 years. If the stand is actively managed on a longer and left in the first release cut. Thus to put the treatments on an even footing, all stunted trees that died cause should be deleted from the analysis. Even better would be to delete all stunted trees (<0.5 in DBH or analysis.

1984 D<sup>2</sup>x H

250.0

16701.7

66.7

204.0

15705.5

77.3

170.0

9397.2

84.5

at trees in 1982 which gave the  
moth so the stunted trees added  
), they will not be large enough  
rotation, they will likely be felled  
during the study from whatever  
r < 4.5 ft high in 10/82) from the