

## Restoration versus wood utilization - a potential conflict of interest in dealing with bush thickened areas in the Northern Cape

G.N. Smit, G. Janse van Rensburg & F. Deacon

Department of Animal, Wildlife and Grassland Sciences,  
University of the Free State, P.O. Box 339,  
Bloemfontein 9300



## INTRODUCTION



Many farms in the savanna areas of the Northern Cape suffer from bush thickening

At the same time there is a growing interest in the utilization of wood from indigenous trees as a source of firewood and biofuel

A proposal was subsequently formulated by a group of farmers and a mining company to utilize wood from problem woody species (mainly *Acacia mellifera*), harvested on farms within a 20 km radius of the mine



## STUDY AREA



Study conducted at Ulco, near Delportshoop, Northern Cape

Two vegetation units represented: SVk6 Schmidtsdrift Thornveld (largest area) & SVk7 Ghaap Plateau Vaalbosveld (Mucina & Rutherford 2006)

Mean seasonal rainfall - 400 mm

Surface limestone common and soils are generally shallow and well drained

Dominant tree species: *Acacia mellifera* (SVk6) and *Tarchonanthus camphoratus* (SVk7)



## RATIONALE



### The Ulco cement mine



## RATIONALE



### Interest of the mine

**Operational cost:** Reliant on coal from Mpumalange transported by road - want to replace 20% of their coal with wood chips

**Carbon credits:** wood chips represent a biofuel that may reduce carbon emissions during combustion compared to coal



## RATIONALE



### The surrounding commercial farms (cattle & game)



**RATIONALE**

**Interest of commercial farmers**

**Resolve bush thickening on their farms:** Bush thickening reduces the grazing capacity of the natural veld and threaten the viability of the farms as economic units

**Cover costs and enhance cash flow:** An income from the wood can cover costs of the bush control measures and can also enhance the short-term cash flow of the farms




**OBJECTIVES**

- (i) Quantify the wood resource on several farms within a 20 km radius of the mine,
- (ii) Provide guidelines for the most appropriate approach to the wood harvesting / restoration of thickened areas



**PROCEDURE**

Twenty sites on five farms surrounding the Ulco mine selected for the study

At each site a belt transect of 100x2.5m (250m<sup>2</sup>) was laid out in such a way as to best represent the woody vegetation of that site

The dimensions of all rooted, live woody plants were measured

Dry mass estimates of the leaves and wood were calculated using the newly developed BECVOL 3-model

**PROCEDURE**

Summary of values calculated with the new BECVOL 3-model:

- Tree density (plants per hectare)
- Evapotranspiration Tree Equivalents (ETTE) per ha
- Leaf dry DM/ha (total, up to 1.5 m, up to 2.0 m, up to 5.0 m)
- Shoots <5.0 mm DM/ha (total, up to 1.5 m, up to 2.0 m, up to 5.0 m)
- Stems >5.0 - 20.0 mm DM/ha
- Wood >20.0 mm DM/ha

**RESULTS**

| Plant Variable   | <i>Acacia mellifera</i> | <i>Searsia lancea</i> | <i>Grewia flava</i> | Total  |
|--|-------------------------|-----------------------|---------------------|--------|
| • Tree density (plants/ha)                               | 400                     | 80                    | 160                 | 640    |
| • Evapotranspiration tree equivalents per ha (ETTE/ha)   | 6 982                   | 2 964                 | 393                 | 10 339 |
| • Leaf dry mass (kg/ha)                                  | 1 655                   | 657                   | 77                  | 2 390  |
| • Shoot dry mass - shoots <0.5 cm (kg/ha)                | 2 632                   | 1 252                 | 115                 | 4 000  |
| • Stem dry mass - stems >0.5-20 cm in diameter (kg/ha)   | 6 690                   | 3 408                 | 222                 | 10 319 |
| • Wood dry mass - wood >20 cm in diameter (kg/ha)        | 29 262                  | 20 761                | 168                 | 50 191 |
| • Total wood dry mass (all fractions) (kg/ha)            | 38 584                  | 25 421                | 505                 | 64 510 |
| • Total tree dry mass - leaves and wood combined (kg/ha) | 40 239                  | 24 764                | 582                 | 66 900 |

**RESULTS**

The total wood dry mass (all fractions) of the 20 plots varied from a low 3 562 kg ha<sup>-1</sup> to a high of 438 884 kg ha<sup>-1</sup> with an average of 67 450 kg ha<sup>-1</sup>





## RESULTS



On average the wood >20 cm in diameter made up **79.8 %** of the total wood mass, while the stems >0.5-20 cm and shoots <0.5 cm made up **13.4** and **6.8 %** of the total wood mass, respectively

Should the trees be harvested during the summer months when the trees have their full leaf carriage, the leaves would add another **2.7 %** to the total tree dry mass

From the data it is clear that a high wood mass per hectare is without exception related to the presence of **very large trees**

Wood mass per hectare increased **exponentially** with an increase in the number of very large trees, while plots with a predominance of small to medium sized trees - even at very high densities - yielded a much lower wood mass



## DISCUSSION



### Restoration vs. Wood harvesting

#### Restoration

- Selective thinning
- Retain the large trees
- Treat harvested trees with an arboricide - prevent coppice

#### Maximum wood harvest

- Total harvest of all plants
- Harvest the large trees (large trees yield the highest mass)
- Allow coppice growth (plants can be harvested again in time)



## DISCUSSION



## DISCUSSION



## DISCUSSION



## DISCUSSION





Recommendation

Best solution a compromise during which as many as possible trees are harvested, while still retaining the benefits of some remaining trees

Trees should be selectively harvested, starting with the smallest plants and progressively moving to larger plants until a set target has been reached

Apply the general rule of thumb to retain a maximum tree leaf biomass equal to 10x the average annual rainfall = **4 000 ETTE/ha**

The stumps of harvested trees must be treated with an ecologically safe arboricide to prevent regrowth without risk to the remaining trees

Example



| Plant Variable   | <i>Acacia mellifera</i> | <i>Searsia lancea</i> | <i>Grewia flava</i> | Total         |
|--|-------------------------|-----------------------|---------------------|---------------|
| • Tree density (plants/ha)                               | 400                     | 80                    | 160                 | 640           |
| • Evapotranspiration tree equivalents per ha (ETTE/ha)   | 6 982                   | 2 964                 | 393                 | 10 339        |
| • Leaf dry mass (kg/ha)                                  | 1 655                   | 657                   | 77                  | 2 390         |
| • Shoot dry mass - shoots <0.5 cm (kg/ha)                | 2 632                   | 1 252                 | 115                 | 4 000         |
| • Stem dry mass - stems >0.5-20 cm in diameter (kg/ha)   | 6 690                   | 3 408                 | 222                 | 10 319        |
| • Wood dry mass - wood >20 cm in diameter (kg/ha)        | 29 262                  | 20 761                | 168                 | 50 191        |
| • Total wood dry mass (all fractions) (kg/ha)            | 38 584                  | 25 421                | 505                 | 64 510        |
| • Total tree dry mass - leaves and wood combined (kg/ha) | 40 239                  | 24 764                | 582                 | <b>66 900</b> |

Example

The site is relatively open with *A. mellifera* the dominant species and a few distinctive large *Searsia lancea* trees. Total tree DM is **66 400 kg** - trees of the designated group up to **3.8 m** can be harvested to achieve the targeted **4 000 ETTE/ha**. This will render a total wood harvest of **15 100 kg** dry wood per hectare



Mean equivalent ETTE-values of woody plants in 6 height classes

| Height class (m) | Mean ETTE-value - All plants | Mean ETTE-value - <i>A. mellifera</i> |
|------------------|------------------------------|---------------------------------------|
| 0 - 1.0          | 0.73                         | 0.90                                  |
| >1.0 - 2.0       | 1.94                         | 2.56                                  |
| >2.0 - 3.0       | 5.94                         | 6.64                                  |
| >3.0 - 4.0       | 14.07                        | 15.69                                 |
| >4.0 - 5.0       | 28.83                        | 31.34                                 |
| >5.0             | 48.80                        | 49.92                                 |



## CONCLUSIONS



The fact that the highest wood yields reside in large trees, presents a potential conflict of interest

It is thus a matter of weighing short-term benefits (cash flow and income generation) up against long-term benefits (ecological stability and rangeland restoration)

It is thus important that priorities are clearly identified prior to the harvesting operation

The best solution is probably a compromise between wood harvesting and retaining some trees (preferably the larger trees)

