# EFFICIENCY OF BLANKET AND SELECTIVE CLIMBER CUTTING AT DERAMAKOT FOREST RESERVE, SABAH

# **YEONG KOK LOONG**

# THESIS SUBMITTED IN FULFILLMENT FOR THE DEGREE OF MASTER OF SCIENCE

# SCHOOL OF INTERNATIONAL TROPICAL FORESTRY UNIVERSITI MALAYSIA SABAH 2009

### **UNIVERSITI MALAYSIA SABAH**

### **BORANG PENGESAHAN STATUS TESIS**

### JUDUL: EFFICIENCY OF BLANKET AND SELECTIVE CLIMBER CUTTING AT DERAMAKOT FOREST RESERVE, SABAH

### IJAZAH: SARJANA SAINS

### SESI PENGAJIAN: 2007-2009

Saya, YEONG KOK LOONG mengaku membenarkan tesis sarjana ini disimpan di perpustakaan Universiti Malaysia Sabah dengan syarat-syarat kegunaan seperti berikut:

- 1. Tesis ini adalah hak milik Universiti Malaysia Sabah.
- 2. Perpustakaan Universiti Malaysia Sabah dibenarkan membuat salinan tesis ini untuk tujuan pengajian sahaja.
- 3. Perpustakaan Universiti Malaysia Sabah dibenarkan membuat salinan tesis ini sebagai bahan pertukaran antara institusi pengajian tinggi.
- 4. TIDAK TERHAD.



Disahkan oleh

UNIVERSITI MALAYSIA SABAH

PENULIS: YEONG KOK LOONG

TANDATANGAN PUSTAKAWAN

Alamat: Sekolah Perhuutanan Tropika Antarabangsa Universiti Malaysia Sabah Beg Berkunci 2073 88999 Kota Kinabalu Sabah

PENYELIA: PROF. MADYA DR. JOHN TAY

Tarikh: 15 Januari 2010

## DECLARATION

I hereby declare that the materials in this thesis are my own except for quotations, excerpts, equations, summaries and references, which have been dully acknowledged.

24 NOVEMBER 2009

eno Yeopg Kok Loong

PF2006-8637



### CERTIFICATION

- NAME : YEONG KOK LOONG
- MATRIC NO. : **PF2006-8637**

TITLE : EFFICIENCY OF BLANKET AND SELECTIVE CLIMBER CUTTING AT DERAMAKOT FOREST RESERVE, SABAH

- DEGREE : MASTER OF SCIENCE
- VIVA DATE : 24 NOVEMBER 2009

### **DECLARED BY**

1. SUPERVISOR ASSOC, PROF, DR, JOHN TAY



#### ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

First and foremost, I would like to express my gratitude to my academic supervisor, Assoc. Prof. Dr. John Tay, who has advised and guided me with patience throughout my study. During the thesis-writing, he had provided me with ideas, suggestions and encouragement. This thesis would not have been completed without him.

I am grateful to the Universiti Malaysia Sabah for awarding me a scholarship in this undertaking, which had enlightened my financial burden. This would not have been possible without the support of Assoc. Prof. Dr. Mahmud Sudin, the Dean of School of International Tropical Forestry (SITF). I also benefited from his advice and encouragement. I also wish to thank Mr. David Kungin and Mr. Seliman Rajion who are laboratory assistants of SITF for their kind assistance in arranging field materials and equipments.

This thesis would not have been possible without the permission from Datuk Sam Mannan, Director of Forestry Department. His kindness had enlightened my financial burden to pay for the accommodation and transport charges at DFR.

In the fieldwork, I had been aided for about a year by the staffs of the SFD at DFR, Sabah. I would like to express my sincerest gratitudes to Mr. Subari Suparlan, District Forest Officer and Mr. Peter Lagan, Assistant District Forest Officer for their support in organizing field assistants, accommodation, and transport. I am indebted to Mr. Markus Salutan, Head of Silvicuture Unit, and his staffs, Mr. Julaili Mulkiaman, Mr. Omarali Mansor, Mr. Juprin Jalil, Mr. Zulkefly Matusim, Mr. Hazlyine Jali, Mr. Mohd Ady Irawan Sokidang, Mr. Hamza Juing and Mr. Benedict Anduaus in assisting me throughout the fieldworks.

I wish to thank Dr. Robert Ong, Head of Silviculture section, Forest Reseach Centre (FRC), Sandakan, for providing me relevant information on the silviculture history in DFR, Sabah. Mr. John Sugau, Head of Herbarium section, FRC, and his staffs Mr. Postar@Jaiwit Mion and Mr. Leopold Madania had kindly assisted me in identifying some of the climber's species.

During the writing of this thesis, I had the rare opportunity to meet and discuss some of the climber cutting issues with Prof. Dr. Francis E. Putz who is the 'guru' of tropical climber ecology during a statistical course at Maliau Basin, Sabah made possibly by my academic supervisor. The discussion had benefited me in many aspects including statistical analysis. I wish to acknowledge the contribution of Prof. Francis E. Putz sincerely.

Most importantly, I wish to thank my parents, Mr. Yeong Wong Fatt and Madam Lau Beng Suan for standing by me through the difficult times and for everything they had provided me. I wish to thank also my entire extended family particularly my siblings for their loving and caring for me.

Yeong Kok Loong 24 November 2009

#### Abstract

## Efficiency of Blanket and Selective Blanket Climber Cutting in Deramakot Forest Reserve, Sabah

The efficiency of blanket (BCC) and selective climber cutting (SCC) in terms of time and cost, regenerative capacity of cut climbers and growth rate of Potential Crop Trees (PCTs;  $5 \le 30$  cm DBH) in Deramakot Forest Reserve, Sabah (DFR) was investigated in this thesis. This study was conducted in Compartment 60 and 61 of DFR which were representative of the logged forests in Sabah. The experimental design for this study was a uni-factorial randomized complete block design (RCBD) that comprised of three 50x50m plots in a Block with ten replicates. The climber density (> 1 cm DBH) in the study site was enumerated only in the Control. Climbers (> 1 cm DBH) were not enumerated in the BCC and SCC but assumed to be similar with the Control. In BCC and SCC, only climbers on tress greater than 30 cm DBH were enumerated. The density of climbers greater than 1 cm DBH in DFR was 404±235 stems ha<sup>-1</sup>, belonging to 46 species in 34 genera and 24 families. Climber densities on trees greater than 30 cm DBH in BCC, SCC and Control were 159±142 (SD), 164±100 and 117±64 stems ha<sup>-1</sup>, respectively. All climbers were removed in BCC while only climbers on trees greater than 30cm DBH were removed in SCC. Climbers were intact in the Control. The time taken to cut climbers in BCC [45.73±17.92 (SD) minutes ha<sup>-1</sup>] was 52% longer than SCC [29.99±7.72 minutes ha<sup>-1</sup>; Paired t-test; N= 10; t=2.293, p=0.048]. The number of coppiced climber stumps, after cutting between BCC (8%) and SCC (5%) after 6 months was not significant (Pearson Chi-Square; N=10;  $\chi^2$ =1.667, df=1, p=0.197). The Relative Growth Rate (RGR) of PCTs in BCC was 0.057±0.02 (SD) cm month<sup>-1</sup>, SCC was  $0.043\pm0.017$  cm month<sup>-1</sup> and Control was  $0.036\pm0.012$  cm month<sup>-1</sup>. A significant difference in RGR was found between BCC and Control (Tukev's HSD; p=0.032) but none between BCC and SCC (Tukey's HSD; p=0.183). Given that SCC was as efficient as BCC treatment, SCC should be adopted in DFR, Sabah.

**Keywords:** climber cutting, blanket and selective climber cutting, Deramakot Forest Reserve, Sabah

#### Abstrak

Keefisienan pemotongan akar secara menyeluruh (BCC) dan terpilih (SCC) berasaskan masa dan kos, pertumbuhan semula pepanjat dan kadar pertumbuhan relative (RGR) pokok-pokok tebangan akhir (PCT; 5≤30 cm DBH) di Hutan Simpan Deramakot, Sabah (DFR) telah dikaji dalam tesis ini. Kompartment 60 dan 61 dipilih sebagai tapak kajian di DFR sebab kedua-dua kawasan ini adalah setanding dengan hutan-hutan yang pernah dibalak di Sabah. Rekabentuk kajian ini adalah berbentuk pemblokan menyeluruh secara rawak (RCBD). Kepadatan pepanjat (> 1 cm DBH) di kawasan kajian ini hanya dicerap di Kawalan sahaja. Pepanjat (> 1 cm DBH) tidak dicerap di BCC dan SCC kerana kedua-dua kawasan ini dianggap memperoleh kepadatan pepaniat yang serupa dengan Kawalan, Di BCC dan SCC, hanya pepanjat pada pokok lebih daripada 30 cm DBH dicerap. Dalam rekabentuk ini terdapat tiga plot 50x50m dalam satu Blok dengan 10 replikasi. Di Kawalan, terdapat 404±235 pepanjat ha<sup>-1</sup> yang lebih daripada 1cm DBH dan terdiri daripada 46 spesis, 34 genera dan 24 famili. Kepadatan pepanjat pada pokok lebih daripada 30cm DBH di BCC, SCC dan Kawalan ialah 159±142 (SD), 164±100 and 117±64 pepanjat ha<sup>-1</sup>. Di BCC, semua pepanjat adalah dipotong manakala hanya pepanjat yang berada pada pokok lebih daripada 30cm dipotong di SCC. Di Kawalan, tiada pepanjat yang dipotong. Masa yang diperlukan untuk BCC ialah  $[\bar{x}=45.73\pm17.92]$ (SD) minit  $ha^{-1}$  iaitu 52% lebih panjang berbanding SCC [ $\bar{x}$ =29.99±7.72 minit  $ha^{-1}$ ; T-test; t=2.293, p=0.048]. Pertumbuhan semula pangkal pepanjat akibat BCC (8%) didapati tiada perbezaan nyata dengan SCC (5%) selepas enam bulan (Pearson Chi-Square; N=10;  $\gamma^2=1.667$ , df=1, p=0.197). Kadar pertumbuhan relatif (RGR) bagi PCTs di BCC, SCC dan Kawalan ialah 0.057±0.02 (SD) cm sebulan 0.043±0.017 cm sebulan dan 0.036±0.012 cm sebulan. Terdapat perbezaan yang nyata di antara BCC dan Kawalan (Tukey's HSD; p=0.032) tetapi bukan di antara BCC dan SCC (Tukey's HSD; p=0.183). Didapati bahawa keefisienan SCC adalah setanding dengan BCC Jesteru itu, SCC adalah disyorkan di DFR, Sabah.

**Kata kunci:** pemotongan akar, pemotongan akar secara menyeluruh dan terpilih, Hutan Simpan Deramakot, Sabah

## **TABLE OF CONTENT**

				Page
TITLE				1
DECLARATION				ii
CERTIFICATO	N			iii
ACKNOWLEDG	EME	Т		iv
ABSTRACT				v
ABSTRAK				vi
LIST OF TABLE	ES			x
LIST OF FIGUE	RES			xi
LIST OF ABBR	EVIA	TIONS		xii
LIST OF SYMB	OLS			xiv
LIST OF APPE	NDIX			xv
CHAPTER 1: I	NTRO		ION	1
P1	.1	Introdu	action	1
1	.2 <sup>4</sup> B	Objecti	ve UNIVERSITI MALAYSIA SABAH	3
1	3	Justific	ation	3
1	4	Hypoth	neses	5
CHAPTER 2: L	ITER	ATURE	REVIEW	7
2	2.1	Distrib	ution of climbers	7
		2.1.1	Geographic location	7
		2.1.2	Influence of abiotic factors	8
		2.1.3	Climbers response to disturbances	9
		2.1.4	Influence of biotic factors	11
2	2	Climbir	ng mechanism of climbers	12

	2.3	Climber	r anatomy and physiology	15
	2.4	Climber	r cutting	16
		2.4.1	The benefits of climber cutting	17
		2.4.2	Time studies and cost of climber cutting	20
	2.5	Climber	r census	21
		2.5.1	Difficulties including climbers in census	21
		2.5.2	Measurement protocol	23
	2.6	Plot sha	ape and design	28
		2.6.1	Plot configuration	28
		2.6.2	Experimental configuration	29
CHAPTER 3:	METH	ODOLO	GY	31
	3.1	Study s		31
		3.1.1	Physical geography	34
		3.1.2	Silviculture in Deramakot Forest Reserve	35
	3.2	Experin	nental design RSITI MALAYSIA SABAH	36
	3.3	Plot est	ablishment and census	39
	3.4	Tools, e	equipments and materials	39
	3.5	Plot tre	atments and measurements	40
		3.5.1	Climber abundance and regeneration	40
		3.5.2	Time and cost of climber cutting	40
		3.5.3	Growth performance of potential crop trees	42
	3.6	Data ar	nalysis	42
CHAPTER 4:	RESU	LTS		43
	4.1	Pre-trea	atment condition	43
		4.1.1	Climber distribution	43

	4.1.2	Trees distribution	48	
	4.1.3	Potential Crop Trees (PCTs)	51	
	4.1.4	Trees with climbers	52	
	4.2 Post-tr	reatment effects	55	
	4.2.1	Climber cutting	55	
	4.2.2	Climber regeneration	59	
	4.2.3	Potential crop trees growth response	62	
CHAPTER 5: DISCUSSION				
	5.1 Pre-tre	eatment condition	67	
	5.1.1	Climber density and diversity	67	
	5.1.2	Association of climbers with trees	68	
	5.2 Post-tr	reatment effects	69	
	5.2.1	Climber cutting	69	
	5.2.2	Climber regeneration	72	
	5.2.3	Growth of potential crop trees	73	
CHAPTER 6:	CONCLUSIO	Ν	75	
REFERENCES			78	
APPENDIX			88	

## LIST OF TABLES

	Р	age
Table 2.1:	Association of climbers with trees	13
Table 2.2:	Summary of climber cutting studies	18
Table 2.3:	Summary of previous studies on climbers	24
Table 3.1:	Costs of silviculture treatment in Deramakot Forest Reserve (DFR) from 1996 to 2008	37
Table 3.2:	List of tools, equipments and materials used in the study	39
Table 4.1:	Climber density greater than 1 cm DBH in Control plots and plots in the sample area of 1 ha	44
Table 4.2:	List of 10 most common climbers (in terms of density) in Deramakot Forest Reserve, Sabah	46
Table 4.3:	Kruskal-Wallis test between BCC, SCC and Control for ten most Common trees	51
Table 4.4:	Kruskal-Wallis test between BCC, SCC and Control by tree diameter classes	54
Table 4.5:	Pearson chi-square test for climbers between BCC and SCC by diameter classes	57
Table 4.6:	Basis of calculation for calculating SCC cost by scenarios	60
Table 4.7:	Number of resprouted cut climbers over a 6-months period for BCC and SCC	62
Table 4.8:	Kruskal-Wallis test for mean RGR between BCC, SCC and Control by tree diameter class	66

# LIST OF FIGURES

P	а	n	ρ
	u	У	C

Figure 2.1:	Point of measurement on climber stems	26
Figure 2.2:	Enhanced point of measurement on climber stems	27
Figure 3.1:	Location map of study site in Deramakot Forest Reserve	32
Figure 3.2:	Location map of study blocks in Compartment 60 and 61	33
Figure 3.3:	Mean of 5-years precipitation by month in DFR	34
Figure 3.4:	Experimental design for comparing effects of climber cutting between blanket and selective removals	38
Figure 4.1:	Number of climber species by families	45
Figure 4.2:	Mean density of climbers on trees greater than 30 cm DBH by diameter class and treatments	47
Figure 4.3:	Tree densities greater than 5 cm DBH in BCC, SCC and Control	48
Figure 4.4:	Tree genus according to the 13 most diverse tree families	49
Figure 4.5:	Mean tree density of ten most common trees in BCC, SCC and Control	50
Figure 4.6:	Mean number of potential crop trees 5≤30 cm DBH by diameter Classes and treatments	52
Figure 4.7:	Mean density of trees with and without climbers and percentage of climber laden trees by treatment plot and diameter classes	53
Figure 4.8:	Mean density of trees with and without climbers and percentage of trees with climbers by tree families and treatments	55
Figure 4.9:	Mean number of cut and uncut climbers and percentage of cut climbers by diameter class and treatments	56
Figure 4.10:	Climber cutting time by treatments and blocks	57
Figure 4.11:	Relationship between slope and time of climber cutting in BCC and SCC	58
Figure 4.12:	Number and percentage of dead, survival and cut climber stumps by treatments and period of census	61

Figure 4.13:	Mean diameter growth of trees greater than 5 to 30 cm DBH by treatments and time passage	63
Figure 4.14:	Mean diameter growth of PCTs in Control (A), BCC (B) and SCC (C) over time	64
Figure 4.15:	Mean relative growth rate (RGR) between BCC, SCC and Control by tree diameter classes	65



# LIST OF ABBREVIATION

		Analysis of variance
ANOVA	-	Analysis of Variance
AMSL	-	Above mean sea level
ASL	-	Above sea level
BCC	-	Blanket Climber Cutting
CL	-	Conventional Logging
DBH	-	Diameter at breast height
DFR		Deramakot Forest Reserve
FSC	-	Forestry Stewardship Council
ITTO	-	International Tropical Timber Organization
MC&I		Malaysian Criteria and Indicators
MGS	-	Minimum Girth System
MMUS	- 1	Modified Malayan Uniform System
PCT	-	Potential crop tree
POM	-	Point of measurement
RCBD	-	Randomised complete block design
RIFS	-	Regeneration and Improvement Felling System
RIL	-	Reduced Impact Logging
RM	-	Ringgit Malaysia
SCC		Selective Climber Cutting
SD	-	Standard deviation
SFD	- 10	Sabah Forestry Department
SPSS		Statistical Package for the Social Sciences
SUS		Stratified Uniform System
		United States
Z		
		UNIVERSITI MALAYSIA SABAH

# LIST OF SYMBOLS

\$	-	Dollar
%	-	Percentage
<	-	Less than
>	-	Greater than
$\leq$	2	Smaller than or equal to
$\geq$	-	Greater than or equal to
0	<u>ن</u>	Degree
1	-	Minute
"	-	Second
x	-	Mean
±	-	More-or-less
С	-	Celsius
cm	(#C	Centimetre
$d^{-1}$	-	Evapotranspiration
e.q.	-	For example
ha	-	Hectare
ha <sup>-1</sup>	-	Per hectare
hour <sup>-1</sup>	-	Per hour
i.e.	-	That is to say or in other words
Km		Kilometre
m	A M	Metre
mm		Millimetre
m <sup>2</sup>		Square metre
m <sup>3</sup>	-	Cubic metre
Mg	- 0	Megagram
t	-	Tonne
	$\$ % < > < $\geq \geq \circ$ , " $\bar{x} \pm C$ cm d <sup>-1</sup> e.g. ha ha <sup>-1</sup> hour <sup>-1</sup> i.e. Km mm m <sup>2</sup> m <sup>3</sup> Mg t	$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$

# LIST OF APPENDIX

	F	age
Appendix A:	Climber (> 1cm DBH) by family, species and plot in Deramakot Forest Reserve, Sabah	87
Appendix B:	Climber density on trees greater than 30 cm DBH by diameter Class, block and treatment	89
Appendix C:	Tree density by diameter class, block and treatment	90
Appendix D:	Tree density by genus, block and treatment	92
Appendix E:	Tree density (with and without climbers) by diameter class, block and treatment	96
Appendix F:	Tree density (with and without climbers) by genus, block and treatment	98
Appendix G:	Number of cut and uncut climbers by diameter class, block and treatment	103
Appendix H:	Potential crop trees (PCTs) diameter growth by treatment	104
Appendix I:	Trees laden with climbers in Deramakot Forest Reserve, Sabah	105
Appendix J:	Group members and tools of climber cutting treatments	106
Appendix K:	Photos of climber cutting procedures and outcomes	107

#### **CHAPTER 1**

#### INTRODUCTION

### **1.1 Introduction**

Climbers are plants that grow and climb over other plants to reach forest canopy for sunlight. The herbaceous climbers are known as vines, and the woody climbers are known as lianas (Bongers *et al.*, 2002; Parren *et al.*, 2003; Putz, 2006; Gerwing *et al.*, 2006 and Schnitzer *et al.*, 2007). Climbers are very conspicuous and contribute substantially to the diversity and structure in tropical forests (Putz, 1984; Putz and Chai, 1987; DeWalt *et al.* 2000; Nabe-Nielsen, 2001; Schnitzer and Bongers, 2002 and Phillips *et al.*, 2005). Climbers typically represent about 10–25% of the woody species density and diversity in tropical forests (Muthuramkumar and Parthasarathy, 2001; Nabe-Nielsen, 2001 and Schnitzer and Bongers, 2002). They can also achieve as high as 44% of the species in some forests (Pérez-Salicrup *et al.*, 2001a).

Climbers play an important role in the forest ecosystem. They represent about 5% to 14% of the total aboveground forest biomass and of significance as a carbon sink (Putz, 1983 and Gerwing & Farias, 2000). Climbers' biomass tend to increase after disturbances due to natural treefall, logging and hurricane occurrence (Babweteera *et al.*, 2000; Schnitzer *et al.*, 2000; Schnitzer and Carson, 2001; Schnitzer and Bongers, 2002; Caballé and Martin, 2001; Schnitzer *et al.*, 2004). In one study conducted in Central Amazon, climber's biomass had increased by 7% within 100 m of the fragmented forest edge following disturbance (Laurance *et al.*, 2001).

Climbers also provide essential food and pathways for arboreal vertebrates and invertebrates (Putz, 1984; Putz, 1985; Putz and Chai, 1987; DeWalt *et al.* 2000; Nabe-Nielsen, 2001; Schnitzer and Bongers, 2002 and Phillips *et al.*, 2005). Emmons and Gentry (1983) reported that primates favoured climbers for food and used them more frequently when the forests had high abundance of climbers. Moreover, high diversity and density of climbers can provide many inter-crown bridges for the arboreal vertebrates e.g. prehensile tailed vertebrates in the Neotropics and gliding vertebrates in Asia to travel across canopy (Emmons and Gentry, 1983 and Dudley and DeVries, 1990). Climbers may also serve as host for canopy insects such as ants, homopterans, and beetles (Odegaard, 2000). Blüthgen and Fiedler (2002) found that climbers from the Leguminosae family play a role in housing homopterans and weaver ants in the Australia's rain forest canopy.

Foresters, however, see climbers as nuisance because they complicate harvesting operation by intertwining and interconnecting crowns and stems of surrounding trees. The presence of climbers on harvest trees also increased felling damages and canopy gaps during timber extraction (Putz, 1984; Appanah and Putz, 1984; Putz, 1985; Putz and Chai 1987 and Pérez-Salicrup *et al.*, 2001b). Climbers which attach to fallen trees could resprout and reinvade the forest rapidly due to their unique stem cells and climbing mechanisms (Putz, 1983, 1984 and 2006; Ewers *et al.*, 1990; Ewers and Fisher, 1991; Pinard and Putz, 1994; DeWalt *et al.*, 2000 and Schnitzer and Bongers, 2002). In addition, climbers impede tree growth, regeneration and productivity by competing with trees for water, nutrients and, light (Stevens, 1987; Pérez-Salicrup and Barker, 2000; Pérez-Salicrup, 2001; Gerwing, 2001 and Grauel and Putz, 2004).

As a measure to reduce incidental damages during timber harvesting, it is common practice to remove all climbers 6 to 12 months prior felling opreation (Fox, 1968; Liew, 1973a; Chai and Urdarbe, 1977; Appanah and Putz, 1984; Cedergen, 1996; Vidal *et al.*, 1997; Pérez-Salicrup and Barker, 2000; Pérez-Salicrup, 2001; Pérez-Salicrup *et al.*, 2001b; Gerwing and Uhl, 2002; Gerwing and Vidal, 2002; Alvira *et al.*, 2004; Schnitzer *et al.*, 2004; Grauel and Putz, 2004). In doing so, felling damages were reduced by approximately 30-50% (Fox, 1968; Appanah and Putz, 1984; Liew, 1973a and Cedergren, 1996). In performing pre-harvest climber cutting, climber densities could be reduced by 9-55% and remain low for years (Appanah and Putz, 1984; Vidal *et al.*, 1997; Parren and Bongers, 2001; Gerwing and Vidal, 2002; Gerwing and Uhl, 2002 and Alvira *et al.*, 2004). This treatment was intended to improve tree growth where climber-cut trees showed growth rates

2

Moreover, high diversity and density of climbers can provide many inter-crown bridges for the arboreal vertebrates e.g. prehensile tailed vertebrates in the Neotropics and gliding vertebrates in Asia to travel across canopy (Emmons and Gentry, 1983 and Dudley and DeVries, 1990). Climbers may also serve as host for canopy insects such as ants, homopterans, and beetles (Odegaard, 2000). Blüthgen and Fiedler (2002) found that climbers from the Leguminosae family play a role in housing homopterans and weaver ants in the Australia's rain forest canopy.

Foresters, however, see climbers as nuisance because they complicate harvesting operation by intertwining and interconnecting crowns and stems of surrounding trees. The presence of climbers on harvest trees also increased felling damages and canopy gaps during timber extraction (Putz, 1984; Appanah and Putz, 1984; Putz, 1985; Putz and Chai 1987 and Pérez-Salicrup *et al.*, 2001b). Climbers which attach to fallen trees could resprout and reinvade the forest rapidly due to their unique stem cells and climbing mechanisms (Putz, 1983, 1984 and 2006; Ewers *et al.*, 1990; Ewers and Fisher, 1991; Pinard and Putz, 1994; DeWalt *et al.*, 2000 and Schnitzer and Bongers, 2002). In addition, climbers impede tree growth, regeneration and productivity by competing with trees for water, nutrients and, light (Stevens, 1987; Pérez-Salicrup and Barker, 2000; Pérez-Salicrup, 2001; Gerwing, 2001 and Grauel and Putz, 2004).

As a measure to reduce incidental damages during timber harvesting, it is common practice to remove all climbers 6 to 12 months prior felling opreation (Fox, 1968; Liew, 1973a; Chai and Urdarbe, 1977; Appanah and Putz, 1984; Cedergen, 1996; Vidal *et al.*, 1997; Pérez-Salicrup and Barker, 2000; Pérez-Salicrup, 2001; Pérez-Salicrup *et al.*, 2001b; Gerwing and Uhl, 2002; Gerwing and Vidal, 2002; Alvira *et al.*, 2004; Schnitzer *et al.*, 2004; Grauel and Putz, 2004). In doing so, felling damages were reduced by approximately 30-50% (Fox, 1968; Appanah and Putz, 1984; Liew, 1973a and Cedergren, 1996). In performing pre-harvest climber cutting, climber densities could be reduced by 9-55% and remain low for years (Appanah and Putz, 1984; Vidal *et al.*, 1997; Parren and Bongers, 2001; Gerwing and Vidal, 2002; Gerwing and Uhl, 2002 and Alvira *et al.*, 2004). This treatment was intended to improve tree growth where climber-cut trees showed growth rates

2

of about 50% compared with climber-uncut trees (Pérez-Salicrup and Barker, 2000; Grauel and Putz, 2003 and Forshed *et al.*, 2008).

Although climber cutting can reduce harvesting damage, the cost of implementing climber cutting is expensive (Liew, 1973a; Appanah and Putz, 1984; Vidal *et al.*, 1997; Gerwing, 2001; Pérez-Salicrup *et al.*, 2001b; Parren and Bongers, 2001). For instance, the cost of climber cutting was reported to be US\$6.50 ha<sup>-1</sup> in low climber density (248 stems ha<sup>-1</sup>) and increased to US\$28 ha<sup>-1</sup> in high climber density area (1612 stems ha<sup>-1</sup>). In view of the high cost, there is reluctance to implement blanket climber cutting (Liew, 1973a). In order to overcome this problem, partial or selective climber cutting has been recommended as alternative to blanket climber cutting (Liew, 1973a; Cedergen, 1996; Pérez-Salicrup *et al.*, 2001a; Bongers *et al.*, 2002; Schnitzer and Bongers, 2002; Grauel and Putz, 2004; and Gerwing, 2006).

In consideration of all the above issues, this study is aimed at investigating the efficiency of selective climber cutting against the standard practice of blanket removal of climbers in tropical forest.

# 1.2 Objective UNIVERSITI MALAYSIA SAB

The specific objectives of this research are to investigate;

- a. the time and cost involved in blanket and selective climber cutting
- b. the regenerative capacity of cut climbers (number of resprouting climbers);
- c. the growth rate of Potential Crop Trees (PCT) (i.e. 5≤30 cm DBH) after removing climbers.

### 1.3 Justification

Total removal of climbers or blanket climber cutting in production forests is unnecessary because it could disrupt forest functioning, ecosystem and biodiversity as well as expensive to do. Hence, eliminating climbers selectively was investigated in this thesis. This modification is in line with Principle 21 of the International Tropical Timber Organization's (ITTO) guidelines for Sustainable Management of Natural Tropical Forest, which stressed that harvesting operations should accommodate silvicultural concept that promotes residual stand and natural regeneration growth without disrupting the environment (ITTO, 1992).

Climbers are undeniably possessing vital ecological roles in the tropical forests. Out of ten woody species in the forests, three to four of them were climbers (Muthuramkumar and Parthasarathy, 2001; Nabe-Nielsen, 2001; Schnitzer and Bongers, 2002; Putz, 2006 and Senbeta *et al.*, 2005). This number, however, is likely to change when climbers were removed entirely. In Bolivia, for example, liana density was reduced to 95% or 130 stems ha<sup>-1</sup> immediately after cutting (Pérez-Salicrup *et al.*, 2001a). Similarly, a reduction of 55% or 130 stems ha<sup>-1</sup> was reported following climber cutting (Gerwing and Vidal, 2002). Hence, in performing blanket climber cutting, more than half of the climbers in the forest were eliminated.

Total removals of climbers also affect the functioning of the forests with respect to transpiration and carbon sequestration. Climbers are known to have high rates of water flux and transpiration because of their slender stems embedded with long and wide vessels (Putz, 1983; Ewers *et al.*, 1990 and Ewers and Fisher, 1991). Hence, if climbers were totally removed, forest transpiration would reduce by approximately 9-12% of the total transpiration i.e. 5.4 mm d<sup>-1</sup> (Restom and Nepstad, 2001). In terms of forest carbon stock, blanket climber cutting would diminish the stock by 23 t ha<sup>-1</sup> (Gerwing and Farias, 2000). If only 20% of the total climber stems were removed, this would only retain 0.08 mm d<sup>-1</sup> of forest transpiration and 4.6 t ha<sup>-1</sup> of carbon stock.

Climbers are sources of medicine and food for people and wildlife. They also provided habitat and intercrown pathways for the arboreal animals and insects (Emmons and Gentry, 1983; Dudley and DeVries, 1990; Woon and Lau, 1994; Blüthgen and Fiedler, 2002 and Bongers *et al.*, 2002). Total elimination of climbers will diminish these sources and may lead to migration or mortality of arboreal animals and insects. On the other hand, locals or villagers might utilize other forms of vegetations or wildlife as food and medicine that may lead to extinction in the forest due to scarcity of required climbers. As a consequence, these cases may upset the biodiversity value and ecosystem of the forest.

4

The cost of climber cutting in the tropical countries was expensive ranging from US\$1 ha<sup>-1</sup> to US\$15 ha<sup>-1</sup> (Liew, 1973a; Vidal *et al.*, 1997; Parren and Bongers, 2001; Gerwing, 2001; Pérez-Salicrup *et al.*, 2001b; Pérez-Salicrup, 2001 and Grauel and Putz, 2004). To reduce the cost of climber cutting, one option would be to cut only climbers that are attach to harvestable trees (Liew, 1973a; Cedergen, 1996; Pérez-Salicrup, 2001; Pérez-Salicrup *et al.*, 2001b; Schnitzer and Bongers, 2002; Grauel and Putz, 2004; Putz, 2006; Gerwing, 2006). In doing so, it had been reported that it could save 73% of the cost (Liew, 1973a).

Climbers should be eliminated particularly prior to logging because it had been proven to reduce harvesting damage and promote timber growth. However, they should be eliminated selectively as they possessed vital roles in the forest. Study regarding selective removal of climbers is still limited, and this study is intended to narrow this information gap. The efficiency of climber cutting is measure by time taken, regeneration of climbers and tree growth response between treatments.

### 1.4 Hypotheses

It is hypothesized that adopting selective climber cutting would be as effective as blanket climber cutting in terms of climbers' mortality and cost leading to a higher growth of Potential Crop Trees (PCT). The hypotheses for this study are formulated as follows:

#### a. Hypothesis 1

- $H_{0}$  = There is no significant difference in the cost between blanket and selective climber cutting.
- $H_{A=}$  There is a significant difference in the cost between blanket and selective climber cutting.
- b. Hypothesis 2
  - $H_0$  = There is no significant difference in climbers' regeneration between blanket and selective climber cutting.
  - $H_{A=}$  There is a significant difference in climbers' regeneration between blanket and selective treatment climber cutting.

### c. Hypothesis 3

- $H_0 =$  There is no significant difference in the growth rate of PCTs between blanket and selective climber cutting.
- $H_{A=}$  There is a significant difference in the growth rate of PCTs between blanket and selective climber cutting.

The above null hypotheses are accepted if the calculated statistics are greater than the 5% significance level (p>0.05). On the contrary, the above alternate hypotheses were to be accepted if the calculated statistics are lower than the 5% significance level (p<0.05).



### **CHAPTER 2**

### LITERATURE REVIEW

#### 2.1 Distribution of Climbers

Climbers constitute approximately a quarter of the woody species density and diversity in tropical forest (Muthuramkumar and Parthasarathy, 2001; Nabe-Nielsen, 2001 and Schnitzer and Bongers, 2002). In Sabah, climber density can range from 189 to 1348 stems ha<sup>-1</sup> with species richness ranging from 40 to 104 species (Cedergren, 1996; Campbell and Newberry, 1993 and DeWalt *et al.*, 2006). Climber density and species richness, generally, are influenced by geographic locality (e.g. latitudinal and altitudinal gradient), abiotic factors (e.g. total rainfall and seasonality of rainfall and soil fertility), biotic factors (e.g. host-tree architecture) and disturbances.

## 2.1.1 Geographic Location

Geographic location plays an important role in species richness, density and distribution of tropical climber species. Generally, climbers are not suited to high latitudes and elevation (Balfour and Bond, 1993; Schnitzer and Bongers, 2002; Parthasarathy *et al.*, 2004; Molina-Freaner *et al.*, 2004; Schnitzer, 2005 and Jiménez-Castillo *et al.*, 2007). Cold climate would induce cold embolism to the climbers and terminated their vascular system (Ewers, 1985; Sperry *et al.*, 1987; Ewers *et al.*, 1997 and Schnitzer, 2005). Consequently, this condition constrained their growth and eventually destroys them when freezing prolonged (Ewers *et al.*, 1997; Fisher *et al.*, 1997 and Schnitzer, 2005).

Climbers tend to be high in abundance and diverse at areas close to the equator (Schnitzer and Bongers, 2002, Molina-Freaner *et al.*, 2004 and Schnitzer, 2005). Jiménez-Castillo *et al.* (2007) reported that the number of climbers increases from 1% to 17% when latitude decreases from 36° to 20°. Climber species richness presented the same trend increasing from 10% to 25% from temperate to lowland tropical zones (Schnitzer and Bongers, 2002). Hence,