$$2.75 \ (\times 10^3) \frac{kg}{m\,MPa\,S} = .00275 \frac{kg}{m\,MPa\,S}$$

$$\left(.00275 \frac{kg}{m\,MPa\,s}\right)\left(309.6 \ cm^2\right)\left(\frac{m^2}{10^4 \ cm^2}\right)$$

$$= 8.514 \times 10^{5}$$

$$= 85.14 \times 10^{-6}$$

$$= \boxed{86 \ (\times 10^{-6}) \frac{kg\,m}{MPa\,s}}$$

units I am using

vs. in McClenahan, value is

$$78 \ (\times 10^{-3}) \frac{kg\,m}{MPa\,S}$$

I assume the 86 vs. 78 is because you did calculations on raw values and then took the mean, and I used leaf area and Huber value in Table 3.

variable	data file	McClenahan.	Macinnis-Ng 2004
Sapwood specific conductivity	$58\ \frac{kg}{m \cdot MPa \cdot S}$ (B. integrifolia)	$5.88\ \frac{kg}{m \cdot MPa \cdot S}$ Used this	$5880\ \frac{mg}{cm \cdot MPa \cdot S}$ $\Rightarrow \left(\frac{mg}{cm}\right)\left(\frac{10^2 cm}{m}\right)\left(\frac{kg}{10^6 mg}\right)$ $\rightarrow \frac{1}{10^4}$ $= 0.588\ \frac{kg}{m \cdot MPa \cdot S}$
leaf specific conductivity	$2.75\ \frac{kg}{m \cdot MPa \cdot S}$	$2.75 = (\times 10^3)\ \frac{kg}{m \cdot MPa \cdot S}$ used this	
hydraulic conductivity ~~unsure what use [illegible]~~	$780\ \frac{kg \cdot m}{MPa \cdot S}$ ~~[illegible]~~ ~~[illegible]~~ $= 780{,}000000\ (\times 10^6)\ \frac{kg\ m}{MPa\ S}$	$78\ (\times 10^3)\ \frac{kg\ m}{MPa \cdot S}$ $= 78{,}000\ (\times 10^6)\ \frac{kg \cdot m}{MPa \cdot S}$	see 2nd image; range in AusTraits is $1\text{–}100\ (\times 10^6)\ \frac{kg \cdot m}{MPa \cdot S}$
	Eucalyptus macrorhyncha	(	2016 paper)
sapwood specific conductivity	$2.98\ \frac{kg}{m \cdot MPa \cdot S}$	plausible, except this should equal	$\frac{\text{leaf specific cond}}{\text{huber value}}$, which $= 29.8$
leaf specific conductivity	$0.00736\ \frac{kg}{m \cdot MPa \cdot S}$ $\cong 73.6\ (\times 10^4)\ \frac{kg}{m\,MPa\,S}$	✓	
hydraulic conductivity	$1.102\ \frac{kg \cdot m}{MPa \cdot S}$	assuming $1.102\ (\times 10^6)\ \frac{kg\ m}{MPa\ S}$	but maybe also 10x bigger