

Alternative Ponderosa Pine Diameter Growth

Greg Johnson and David Marshall

2026-01-19

Data

We extracted and processed Forest Inventory and Analysis (FIA) data from 14 states listed in the native range of Ponderosa Pine in the Silvics of North America.¹

After subsetting the data to censor observations with missing data, limiting the species to Ponderosa Pine (FIA species code 122), and remeasurement intervals ≥ 5 years we get the observations in Table 1.

Table 1: Ponderosa Pine Growth Observations by State

State	Observations
AZ	9614
CA	8941
CO	4224
ID	1981
MT	4841
ND	36
NE	1505
NM	4997
NV	33
OR	36093
SD	9925
UT	732
WA	6489
WY	1317

¹Burns, Russell M., and Barbara H. Honkala, tech. coords. 1990. Silvics of North America: 1. Conifers; 2. Hardwoods. Agriculture Handbook 654. U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Washington, DC. vol.2, 877 p.

Alternative Model Formulation

An alternative to the ORGANON diameter growth equation² which reduces parameter count while retaining key features of the original model is shown below. The key change is the term with a ratio of a transformation of diameter at breast height (dbh) squared to crown length. Since β_1 is expected to be negative, this tends to slow growth as more basal area accumulates in the tree while moderating that decline by the amount of productive crown capacity as measured by crown length. Basal area in larger trees (**bal**) serves as the inter-tree competition factor, and site index (**si**) as the inherent productivity scaling factor.

Site index is flawed for a number of reasons:

1. It is not consistently obtained for each plot due to missing Ponderosa Pine site trees,
2. It is estimated using a number of different and not necessarily compatible **si** equations, and
3. The available **si** equations do not all use the same base age.

In the data set **si** is derived from 25 different site index equations for 31 species. Ponderosa Pine site index comprises 80% of the observations. There are 3 base ages used. Preliminary graphical analysis revealed that base age was most correlated with residual bias. Thus in the following, we fit two equations: one where **SIBASE** and **SISP** are treated as a random effects in a mixed model framework, and a second leaving site index out.

$$\Delta dbh = e^{(\beta_0 + \beta_1 \log(\frac{(dbh+1)^2}{(cr*ht+1)^{\beta_4}}) + \beta_2 \frac{bal^{\beta_5}}{dbh+2.7} + \beta_3 \log(si_{s,b} + 4.5))} \quad (1)$$

and

$$\Delta dbh = e^{(\beta_0 + \beta_1 \log(\frac{(dbh+1)^2}{(cr*ht+1)^{\beta_4}}) + \beta_2 \frac{bal^{\beta_5}}{dbh+2.7})} \quad (2)$$

where:

- **dbh** = diameter at breast height (inches),
- **bal** = basal area per acre in larger trees (*feet*²/*ac*),
- **cr** = crown ratio (fraction of total height),
- **ht** = total height (feet), and
- **si_{s,b}** = site index (feet) for species **s** and base age **b**.
- $\beta_0 - \beta_5$ are parameters to be estimated.

²Hann, D.W., Marshall, D.D., and Hanus, M.L. 2006. Reanalysis of the SMC-ORGANON equations for diameter-growth rate, height-growth rate, and mortality rate of Ponderosa Pine. Forest Research Laboratory Research Contribution 49.

Nonlinear regression was used with an integrated fitting approach such that individual observations can have differing remeasurement intervals. The error to be minimized is ending dbh. Since this effectively minimizes diameter growth it can weight observations with longer remeasurement intervals more heavily. The effect of this needs to be evaluated, but putting more emphasis on longer periods may be beneficial.

The fit statistics for Equation 1 are:

Nonlinear mixed-effects model fit by maximum likelihood

Model: endDIA ~ est_dg(B0, B1, B2, B3, B4, B5, startDIA, startBAL, endBAL,

```
Data: pp_subset %>% mutate(SIINT = interaction(as.factor(pp_subset$SIBASE),
```

AIC BIC logLik

290722.2 290797.5 -145353.1

Random effects:

Formula: B3 ~ 1 | SIINT

B3 Residual

StdDev: 0.07393882 1.200779

Fixed effects: B0 + B1 + B2 + B3 + B4 + B5 ~ 1

Value	Std.Error	DF	t-value	p-value
-------	-----------	----	---------	---------

B0 -5.308588 0.08171080 90718 -64.96801 0

B1 -1.101697 0.01130919 90718 -97.41608 0

B2 -0.174059 0.01549898 90718 -11.23035 0

B3 1.039123 0.03780961 90718 27.48303 0

B4 1.369188 0.01012419 90718 135.23919 0

B5 0.610714 0.01697746 90718 35.97201 0

Correlation:

B0 B1 B2 B3 B4

B1 -0.125

B2 -0.392 0.356

B3 -0.384 0.009 0.004

B4 -0.345 -0.062 0.430 -0.106

B5 -0.368 0.304 0.989 0.013 0.373

Standardized Within-Group Residuals:

Min	Q1	Med	Q3	Max
-66.30272161	-0.27342453	-0.02141984	0.28765311	19.07109873

Number of Observations: 90728

Number of Groups: 5

\$SIINT

B3
 50.FALSE 0.07688851
 80.FALSE 0.04397941
 100.FALSE -0.07395164
 50.TRUE 0.05537836
 100.TRUE -0.10229465


Residual Standard Error: 1.20077940391048 on 90718 degrees of freedom, AIC: 290722.2



and for Equation 2:



	Coef.	Std. error	t-stat.	p
B0	-1.4852902	0.0508652	-29.20052	0
B1	-1.2468203	0.0123443	-101.00386	0
B2	-0.2013161	0.0187025	-10.76413	0
B4	1.4962747	0.0092124	162.42032	0
B5	0.5724456	0.0176056	32.51501	0

Residual Standard Error: 1.22133686610336 on 90723 degrees of freedom, AIC: 293763.3


Residual Analysis for Equation 1











Alternative by si Species (outliers removed)




Alternative (outliers removed)















Residual Analysis for Equation 2











Alternative No Site Index by si Species (outliers removed)



Alternative No Site Index (outliers removed)











Table 3: Independent Variables for One Inch dbh Trees

Variable	N	Mean	Std. Dev.	Min	Pctl. 25	Pctl. 75	Max
ba	203	95	45	0.41	63	123	251
bal	203	94	45	0	62	122	251
ht	203	8.5	1.8	6	7	10	15
cr	203	0.47	0.22	0.05	0.3	0.64	0.95
si	203	65	28	21	40	89	132

Discussion


Removing `si` degrades the fit significantly. There is a small bias for some states for both equations. The dubious `si` term mitigates some of the bias (expected since it is acting as a localization variable).

There do not appear to be residual trends with latitude and longitude, however, the no site index equations residual map hints at a trend of over prediction for larger longitude (eastward).

Interestingly, for the no `si` equation, there is a trend of under-prediction for higher `ba`. This will need to be investigated in further equation development.

Equation Behavior for Very Small Trees

Equation 1 Predictions for Trees with One Inch dbh Trees



Equation 2 Predictions for Trees with One Inch dbh Trees

