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ABSTRACT

We compared the understory communities (herbs, shrubs, and tree seedlings and saplings) of old-growth and second-growth eastern hemlock forests (*Tsuga canadensis*) in western Massachusetts, USA. Second-growth hemlock forests originated following clearcut logging in the late 1800s and were 108 to 136 years old at the time of sampling. Old-growth hemlock forests contained total ground cover of herbaceous and shrub species that was approximately 4 times greater than in second growth forests (4.02 ± 0.41 versus 1.06 ± 0.47 %/m²) and supported greater overall species richness and diversity. In addition, seedling and sapling densities were greater in old-growth stands compared to second-growth stands and the composition of these layers was positively correlated with overstory species composition (Mantel tests, $r > 0.26$, $P < 0.05$) highlighting the strong positive neighborhood effects in these systems. Ordination of study site understory species composition identified a strong gradient in community composition from second-growth to old-growth stands. Vector overlays of environmental and forest structural variables indicated that these gradients were related to differences in overstory tree density, nitrogen availability, and coarse woody debris characteristics among hemlock stands. These relationships suggest that differences in resource availability (e.g., light, moisture, and nutrients) and microhabitat heterogeneity between old-growth and second-growth stands were likely driving these compositional patterns. Interestingly, several common forest understory plants, including *Aralia nudicaulis*, *Dryopteris intermedia*, and *Viburnum alnifolium*, were significant indicator species for old-growth hemlock stands, highlighting the lasting legacy of past land use on the reestablishment and growth of these common species within second-growth areas. The return of old-growth understory conditions to these second-growth areas will largely be
dependent on disturbance and self-thinning mediated changes in overstory structure, resource availability, and microhabitat heterogeneity.
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1. Introduction

The understory layer is a critical component of forest ecosystems typically supporting the vast majority of total ecosystem floristic diversity (Halpern and Spies 1995, Gilliam and Roberts 2003) and providing habitat elements to associated wildlife species (Carey and Johnson 1995). These communities also play a central role in the dynamics and functioning of forest ecosystems by influencing long-term successional patterns (Philips and Murdy 1995, Abrams and Downs 1990, Oliver and Larson 1996, McCarthy et al. 2001, Royo and Carson 2005, Nyland et al. 2006) and contributing to forest nutrient cycles (Chapin 1983, Zak et al. 1990, Anderson and Eickmeier 2000, Chastain et al. 2006). Due to the recognized ecological importance of forest understory plants, considerable effort has been devoted to determining the impacts of land-use practices on the structure and diversity of these communities (Whitney and Foster 1988, Matlack 1994, Motzkin et al. 1996, Bellemare et al. 2002, Eberhardt et al. 2003, Goslee et al. 2005; Fraterringo et al. 2006, see also Ecological Applications Special Feature Vol. 5, 1995). This work has demonstrated the importance of past land use in shaping contemporary patterns of understory vegetation and has indicated that distinct community assemblages may characterize various stages of forest succession.

Understory communities in old-growth forest ecosystems are often quite distinct relative to forests originating following agricultural clearing or forest harvesting (Whitney and Foster...
1988, Matlack 1994, Qian et al 1997, Goebel et al. 1999). Although the diversity of understory
plants may be low in some old-growth systems (Metzger and Shultz 1984, Scheller and
Mladenoff 2002), other studies have indicated that certain taxa may be more abundant or
restricted to these forests (Whitney and Foster 1988, Matlack 1994, Halpern and Spies 1995,
Moola and Vasseur 2004). The affinity of certain species to old-growth forests has been
attributed to several factors, including reproductive characteristics of the plants (Peterken and
Game 1984, Matlack 1994, Meier et al. 1995), and characteristics of the environment in old-
growth forests, including favorable substrates (e.g., coarse woody debris, pit and mound
topography) and microclimatic conditions (e.g., deeply shaded microsites), that are typically less
common or absent from second-growth systems (Harmon and Franklin 1989, Peterson and
Campbell 1993, Chen et al. 1995, McGee and Kimmerer 2002). As a result of the reproductive
limitations and unique microhabitat requirements of some old-growth plant species, the
conservation of old-growth forest ecosystems may be of critical importance for the maintenance
of viable populations of certain plant species, particularly in landscapes highly fragmented by a
history of intensive land use (Meier et al. 1995). In addition, the maintenance of late-
successional understory plant communities is becoming an increasingly common forest
management objective creating a greater need for an understanding of the environmental
conditions promoting the abundance of these species (Alaback 1984, Bailey et al. 1998, Lindh
and Muir 2004).

Old-growth forests are extremely scarce on the landscapes of southern New England
constituting roughly 0.1% of the forested land base of states such as Massachusetts (D’Amato et
al. 2006). Numerous studies in this region have demonstrated differences in understory
community composition between secondary and primary forests (i.e., forests originating
following agricultural clearing versus logging exclusively, Motzkin et al. 1996, Donahue et al. 2000, Bellemare et al. 2002); however, our understanding of the compositional differences that may exist between old-growth and primary forests is fairly limited (but see Whitney and Foster 1988, Cooper-Ellis 1998). This study compares the understory vegetation of the few remaining old-growth forests in western Massachusetts with adjacent second-growth forests that originated following logging in the late 19th Century, but were never cleared for agricultural purposes.

Many of the old-growth forests in western Massachusetts are surrounded by compositionally similar second-growth stands providing the opportunity to investigate the influence of differing past land-use on the understory communities of forests with similar overstory species composition and edaphic and landscape settings. In addition, the majority of these old-growth forests are dominated by eastern hemlock (*Tsuga canadensis*), a species currently threatened by the introduced hemlock woolly adelgid (*Adelges tsugae*, HWA, Orwig and Foster 1998).

Although none of these forests are currently infested by HWA, this introduced pest is within 3 km of several old-growth stands (C. Burnham, unpublished data). As a result, studies characterizing the floristic composition of the understory layer prior to HWA infestation will serve as an important baseline for monitoring the response of these ecosystems to this novel disturbance (Small et al. 2005; Eschtruth et al. 2006, Cleavitt et al. 2008). Similarly, the regeneration dynamics and floristic diversity of hemlock-dominated old-growth stands throughout the range of this species have been dramatically influenced by herbivory stemming from overabundant white-tail deer (*Odocoileus virginianus*) populations (Anderson and Loucks 1979, Frelitch and Lorimer 1985, Alverson et al. 1988, Mladenoff and Stearns 1993, Rooney and Dress 1997, Long et al. 1998, Weckel et al. 2006). The lack of similar high populations within our study region provides an important opportunity to assess the structure and composition of
systems currently unaffected by this conservation and management issue facing hemlock forests in many other regions of North America (Rooney et al. 2000).

2. Materials and Methods

2.1. Study area

Sampling was conducted in 16 old-growth and 8 second-growth hemlock forests in the Berkshire Hills and Taconic Mountains of western Massachusetts (Table 1). This area has a humid, continental climate with average annual levels of precipitation ranging from 116.2 to 129.5 cm and mean monthly temperatures from -7.7° C in January to 22.2° C in July (NCDC 2006). Study areas were located on steep slopes (range: 25–41°) and ranged in elevation from 305-685 m.a.s.l. Soils in these areas are predominantly well-drained sandy loam soils formed from weathered gneiss, schist, and phyllite (Zen et al. 1983, Scanu 1988).

Old-growth and second-growth status was assigned based on extensive analysis of historical and dendroecological evidence collected from these areas (D’Amato et al. 2006). Based on these analyses, old-growth areas were classified as sites lacking any evidence of past land-use and containing at least five old (> 225 years old) canopy trees per hectare (cf. McGee et al. 1999). In contrast, early state documents indicated that several second-growth areas adjacent to old-growth areas were clear-cut harvested in the 1870s-1900s (Avery and Slack 1926; D’Amato and Orwig 2008). In addition, dendroecological analyses of second-growth areas confirmed that all second-growth sites were clear-cut harvested between the 1870s-1900s as dramatic release and recruitment pulses were observed in these stands during these decades (D’Amato 2007). In contrast to second-growth stands found in other mountainous regions of New England, there was little evidence that these areas were burned following clear-cut
harvesting (c.f. Goodale and Aber 2001) Care was taken in the selection of second-growth sites to ensure that the environmental settings (e.g., elevation, topographic position, slope steepness, and aspect) were as similar to those of the old-growth hemlock stands as possible.

2.2. Vegetation sampling

Vegetation sampling plots were part of a larger study examining the structure and disturbance dynamics of old-growth and second-growth forests in western Massachusetts (D’Amato and Orwig 2008, D’Amato et al. 2008). Depending on stand size, 3-5 0.04-ha plots were established along transects orientated through the central portion of each study area and permanently marked. Percent cover of all vascular herbaceous plants, shrubs, and tree seedlings were estimated by species in eight 1-m² sub-plots randomly located within each 0.04-ha sampling plot during May and June 2004. Seedling densities were also determined in these sub-plots. A complete census of herbaceous and shrub species was made in each 0.04-ha sampling plot to generate master species lists. This census was repeated in the late summer to ensure species emerging following the initial vegetation sampling were accounted for. No additional species were identified during these late summer censuses. Species and diameter at breast height (DBH) was recorded for every tree (stems ≥ 1.37 m tall and ≥ 10 cm DBH) rooted within the 0.04-ha plots. In addition, all saplings (stems ≥ 1.37 m tall and ≤ 10 cm DBH) were tallied by species. Measurements of forest floor environmental characteristics, including coarse woody debris abundance, soil pH, and nitrogen availability determined from mixed-bed cation and anion resin bags were also made within each 0.04 ha plot. Methods used for sampling CWD and soil characteristics are summarized in D’Amato et al. (2008) and D’Amato (2007). Species nomenclature follows Gleason and Cronquist (1990).
2.3. Statistical analyses

Percent cover of herbs and shrubs and seedling and sapling densities were averaged for each study area and compared between old-growth and second-growth forests using Wilcoxon rank-sum tests. In addition, average species richness (number of species in study area, S), diversity (Shannon-Wiener index, $H'$), and evenness ($E$, Pielou 1969) of understory herbs and shrubs were compared between old-growth and second-growth forests using the same procedure. Multivariate tests for differences in the composition of understory vegetation (herbs, shrubs, and seedlings) between old-growth and second-growth forests were conducted using multi-response permutation procedures (MRPP) in PC-ORD version 4.28 (McCune and Mefford 1999). MRPP is a non-parametric, randomization-based multivariate test of differences between groups that compares the plots within a priori groups to a random allocation of plots (McCune and Grace 2002). Sørensen distances were used to calculate average within-group distances for MRPP. Indicator species analysis (Dufrene and Legendre 1997) was used to describe how well certain understory species differentiated between old-growth and second-growth forests.

Non-metric multidimensional scaling (NMS; McCune and Grace 2002) was used to examine patterns in understory community composition within and among old-growth and second-growth forests. As was the case for MRPP, NMS used Sørensen distances to calculate a distance matrix for the 24 study areas. To reduce noise in the data set, species with fewer than 3 occurrences were removed from the data matrices (McCune and Grace 2002). The “slow-and-thorough” autopilot mode of NMS in PC-ORD was used to generate solutions. This procedure determines the optimal ordination solution by stepping down in dimensionality from a six-axis to one-axis solution using 40 runs performed on real data followed by 50 Monte Carlo runs using random data (McCune and Mefford 1999). Optimal dimensionality was based on the number of
dimensions with the lowest stress (i.e., smallest departure from monotonicity in the relationship between distance in the original space and distance in the reduced ordination space, McCune and Grace 2002). For this study, the minimum stress configuration included 3 axes; however, the two axes accounting for the most variability in the original data set are presented. The relationship between understory community composition and environmental and forest structural characteristics, including inorganic N availability, forest floor C:N ratio, abundance of coarse woody debris, and overstory tree density, were explored using the bi-plot function in PC-ORD (McCune and Mefford 1999). Ordinations were rigidly rotated to place the environmental or forest structural variable with the highest correlation with understory community composition on the first axis. Average percent cover of herbs, shrubs, and seedlings were used for MRPP and NMS. Relationships between species abundance and NMS axis scores were explored using Kendall’s tau statistic (SAS version 9.1, SAS Institute Inc. 2004).

Matrix correlation was used to evaluate the degree of association between various strata (e.g., herbs and shrubs, seedlings, saplings, overstory trees) within hemlock stands using Mantel tests in PC-ORD (McCune and Mefford 1999). These tests calculate the correlation between two dissimilarity matrices, which were derived using Sørensen distances in this study. We were particularly interested in the influence of the overstory tree community on the composition of the understory, seedling and sapling layers (i.e., neighborhood effects sensu Frelich and Reich 1995). Therefore, an overstory tree community dissimilarity matrix was correlated against the understory, seedling, and sapling layer matrices. Similarly, the seedling and sapling dissimilarity matrices were correlated against each other to examine the degree of association between these two strata. Probability levels for the Mantel tests were calculated using 1000 Monte Carlo randomizations (McCune and Mefford 1999) and the overstory matrix was based on importance
values for overstory species in each stand. Significance levels were set at $\alpha = 0.05$ for all analyses and experiment-wide probability levels were protected by a sequential Bonferroni procedure (Rice 1989).

3. Results

3.1. Diversity and cover of understory herbs and shrubs

A total of 47 understory herb and shrub species was identified across the 24 hemlock stands examined in this study (Table 2). Of the species identified, 29 occurred only in old-growth hemlock stands; no species were restricted to second-growth hemlock stands (Table 2). No non-native species were found in either old-growth or second-growth stands (Table 2). Importantly, the greater number of species found within old-growth forests may be an artifact of the sampling design, as there were twice as many old-growth study areas as second-growth. Nonetheless, compared with second-growth stands, old-growth forests had approximately 4 times the amount of total ground cover of herbaceous and shrub species ($4.02 \pm 0.41$ versus $1.06 \pm 0.47 \% / m^2$) and supported greater overall species richness and diversity (Table 3). In contrast, evenness of herb and shrub species was greater in second-growth stands due in large part to the lower species richness in these systems (Table 3).

3.2. Tree seedlings and saplings

Densities of seedlings and saplings were greater in old-growth stands compared to second-growth stands (Table 4). *Acer pensylvanicum*, *Tsuga canadensis*, and *Betula* spp. (*B. lenta* and *B. alleghaniensis* combined) generally had the highest seedling densities in both old-growth and second-growth forests, and *A. pensylvanicum* was the only species that occurred in
all stands (Table 4). Most seedling species were found in both old-growth and second-growth forests; however, *Pinus strobus* and *Acer saccharum* only occurred as seedlings in old-growth stands. Seedling densities varied considerably between old-growth and second-growth forests as *Tsuga canadensis*, *Picea rubens*, and *Betula* spp. had higher densities in old-growth stands while *Acer rubrum* had higher densities in second-growth stands (Table 4). Overall, the composition of the seedling layer was positively associated with the composition of the overstory layer (Mantel test, $r = 0.27$, $P < 0.05$), suggesting the successful establishment of overstory species within the understory layer of these stands.

*Tsuga canadensis* had the highest sapling density across old-growth and second-growth stands and was the only species found in the sapling layer of all hemlock stands investigated (Table 4). *A. penslyvanicum* and *Fagus grandifolia* were generally more abundant in old-growth versus second-growth stands (Table 4). Several species occurring as seedlings within a given forest type were not observed as saplings (Table 4). For example, *Pinus strobus* and *Betula papyrifera* saplings were not observed in old-growth stands despite the presence of these species in the seedling layer and in the overstory (Table 4). Likewise, saplings of *B. papyrifera* and *Quercus rubra* were not found in second-growth stands despite their presence in the seedling layer of these systems. Nonetheless, composition of the sapling layer among hemlock stands was positively correlated with the composition of the seedling layer (Mantel test, $r = 0.29$, $P < 0.05$). In addition, there was a positive correlation between the composition of the sapling layer and the composition of the overstory layer (Mantel test, $r = 0.30$, respectively, $P < 0.05$). Conversely, sapling densities were negatively correlated with density of overstory trees (Kendall’s tau = -0.53, $P < 0.05$).
3.3. Understory layer composition

Understory communities differed between old-growth and second-growth stands (Multi-
response permutation procedures {MRPP}; A=0.03, P < 0.05); however, the small effect size
(A=0.03) derived from MRPP suggested that there was also a wide range of variation in
understory community composition within old-growth and second-growth stands, respectively
(McCune and Grace 2002). This was illustrated by the broad distribution of points for each of
these stand types in the ordination of understory vegetation (Figure 1), which explained 65.2 %
of the variation in the raw data (NMS ordination, final stress = 12.35, final instability = 0.00001).
Most of the variation in understory vegetation among stands was explained by Axis 1 (30.4%),
which represented a gradient from sites with low overstory tree densities and high NH$_4$N
availability in the negative portion of Axis 1 to higher density sites with lower levels of available
NH$_4$N in the positive portion (Figure 1). Correlations of species with this axis indicated that
there was greater abundance of the fern species, Polypodium virginianum ($\tau$ = -0.55) and
Dryopteris intermedia ($\tau$ = -0.52), within old-growth study sites located in the negative portion
of Axis 1 (Figure 1, Table 5).

The distribution of study areas along Axis 2, which explained 27.8 % of the variation,
generally ranged from sites with a smaller proportion of the total downed coarse woody debris
(CWD) pools in decay class IV (highly decayed, cf. Fraver et al. 2002) to sites with higher
proportions of this deadwood type (Figure 1). Study sites with downed woody debris pools
containing a higher proportion of wood in advanced stages of decay tended to have greater
amounts of Kalmia latifolia and Tsuga canadensis in the understory as there was a significant
positive correlation between the abundance of these species and Axis 2 (Table 5). Importantly,
average volumes of decay class IV downed CWD were more than 9 times greater in old-growth
stands compared to second-growth stands (21.3 ± 7.7 vs. 2.2 ± 0.9 m$^3$/ha in old-growth and second-growth stands, respectively). Furthermore, total volumes of downed CWD were four times as high in the old-growth stands examined in this study (D’Amato et al. 2008).

Despite the wide range of variation in understory community composition within both old-growth and second-growth stands (based on MRPP), Indicator Species Analysis identified four species indicative of the understory layer in old-growth hemlock forests relative to second-growth stands: *Dryopteris intermedia*, *Viburnum alnifolium*, *Aralia nudicaulis*, and *Tsuga canadensis* (Figure 2). Several other species, including *Lycopodium lucidulum*, *Polypodium virginianum*, and *Polystichum acrostichoides*, were also more common in old-growth stands (Figure 2). In contrast, only *Acer rubrum* seedlings were more common in second-growth stands (Figure 2). There was no significant relationship between the composition of understory herbs and shrubs and the composition of overstory trees among hemlock stands (Mantel test, $r = 0.02$, $P = 0.37$).

4. Discussion

This study indicates that, despite compositional similarities in overstory trees, differences exist between the understory communities characterizing old-growth and second-growth hemlock forests in western Massachusetts. In particular, old-growth forests had higher species richness and diversity, as well as a greater abundance of understory herbs and shrubs, and tree seedlings and saplings compared to second-growth forests. The observed importance of overstory tree density, nitrogen availability, and coarse woody debris characteristics in explaining the variation in understory composition among hemlock stands suggests that
differences in resource availability (e.g., light, moisture, and nutrients) and microhabitat heterogeneity between old-growth and second-growth stands were likely driving these patterns.

4.1. Diversity and Abundance of Understory Herbs and Shrubs

Overstory tree density strongly influences patterns of understory species richness and abundance (Alaback 1982, Peet and Christensen 1988, Oliver and Larson 1996). Several studies have demonstrated that lower levels of species richness and abundance characterize dense, closed canopy forests within the stem exclusion phase of development (sensu Oliver 1981, Alaback 1982, Halpern 1988, Schoonmaker and McKee 1988, Eycott et al. 2006, Jules et al. 2008), whereas richness and abundance often increase as forests mature and self-thinning and gap-scale disturbances create and maintain canopy openings (Davison and Forman 1982, Alaback and Hermain 1988 Eycott et al. 2006). In this study, the second-growth stands we examined were primarily in the stem exclusion phase of development, and the low sapling densities and understory plant abundance and richness observed in these systems were likely a reflection of the lower levels of resource availability (e.g., light, nutrients) in the understory layer during this stage of stand development (Klinka et al. 1996, Oliver and Larson 1996). In contrast, the structure of the old-growth areas had been primarily influenced by more than three centuries of small to moderate gap-scale disturbances (D’Amato and Orwig 2008) resulting in stands characterized by lower tree densities, larger trees, multi-layered canopies, and an abundance of downed coarse woody debris and canopy gaps (D’Amato et al. 2008). Presumably, the diversity of microhabitats and greater levels of resource availability associated with these structural attributes (Alaback 1982, Oian et al. 1997, D’Amato 2007) and disturbance processes (Beatty 1984, Moore and Vankat 1986, Peterson et al. 1990, Reader and Bricker 1992) resulted in a
greater abundance and richness of understory plants within old-growth stands compared to dense
second-growth stands.

Overall, the composition and abundance of understory plants among hemlock stands in
this study were similar to those reported elsewhere for second-growth (Rogers 1980, Eschtruth et
al. 2006) and old-growth hemlock forests (Whitney and Foster 1988). While the old-growth
stands in this study had a greater abundance of understory herb and shrubs compared to second-
growth, these values were much lower than those reported for other forest types in the region
(e.g., Rogers 1980, Gilliam et al. 1995). The sparse nature of understory vegetation within these
systems is likely a reflection of the low levels of nutrient and light availability, as well as higher
forest floor and soil acidity levels typically characterizing hemlock-dominated forests relative to
other forest types such as northern hardwood forests (Rogers 1980, Mladenoff 1987, Canham et
al. 1994, Lovett et al. 2004). Although these understory conditions limit the abundance of
understory herbs and shrubs, they tend to favor the establishment of conspecific regeneration
within hemlock-dominated stands (i.e., positive overstory-understory neighborhood effects,
Frelich and Reich 1995). These positive neighborhood effects between overstory trees and
understory regeneration were illustrated by the strong, positive associations in Mantel tests
conducted between overstory composition and the composition of the seedling and sapling layers
within the hemlock stands examined in this study. Correspondingly, management approaches
aimed at restoring old-growth characteristics to existing second-growth hemlock systems should
rely on selection systems that not only emulate the gap-scale disturbance regimes historically
characterizing these systems (c.f. D’Amato and Orwig 2008) but also maintain the understory
conditions favoring long-term hemlock establishment and recruitment (Brissette and Kenefic
2000).
Several species were more abundant in old-growth than second-growth hemlock
understories, including *Aralia nudicaulis*, *Dryopteris intermedia*, and *Viburnum alnifolium*.
Several other studies examining the composition of old-growth, primary, and secondary forests
in the northeastern United States have also indicated that these species were more abundant in
old-growth and primary forest ecosystems (Nichols 1913, Egler 1940, Whitney and Foster 1988,
Motzkin et al. 1999, Singleton et al. 2001). For example, the occurrence of *A. nudicaulis* and *V.
*alnifolium* was much greater in old-growth white pine-hemlock forests as compared to secondary
white pine-hemlock forests in central New England (Whitney and Foster 1988). These patterns
were attributed to the sensitivity of these species to competitive displacement and microclimatic
changes following forest harvesting, as well as to the dispersal and colonization limitations of *V.
alnifolium* (Whitney and Foster 1988, Motzkin et al. 1999). In contrast, the lack of suitable
microhabitats in secondary forests was suggested as a possible explanation for the greater
frequency of *Dryopteris intermedia* in primary forests compared to post-agricultural forests in
central New York (Singleton et al. 2001). Although we did not directly examine dispersal rates
or microhabitat associations in this study, it is likely that these mechanisms (e.g., dispersal
limitations, lack of suitable microhabitats, Meier et al. 1995) were influencing the differences in
abundance of these species between old-growth and second-growth hemlock forests. In
particular, *A. nudicaulis* and *V. alnifolium* spread primarily by vegetative means (Edwards 1984,
Nyland et al. 2006) and this reliance on clonal spread may have limited their ability to re-
colonize second-growth areas following harvesting (cf. Meier et al. 1995). Likewise, the lower
abundance of suitable microhabitats observed among second-growth hemlock stands (e.g.,
decayed logs, McGee 2001, D’Amato et al. 2008) may have contributed to the lower abundance
of *D. intermedia* in these systems. An additional possible explanation for the absence or lower
abundance of these species in second-growth areas is that these species were never present in these stands prior to harvesting. Despite this consideration, the historical ubiquity of these plant species throughout these landscapes makes this explanation highly unlikely (Egler 1940). Due to affinity of these species to old-growth and primary forests found in this and other studies in the region, the abundance of these species might serve as useful indicators for evaluating the success of management strategies aimed at restoring old-growth characteristics to second-growth hemlock systems.

4.2. Composition and Abundance of Tree seedlings and Saplings

The high densities of Tsuga canadensis and Acer pensylvanicum seedlings observed in old-growth and second-growth stands in this study were consistent with the findings of other studies quantifying seedling densities in hemlock-dominated forests (e.g., Rogers 1980, Yorks et al. 2000, Kizlinski et al. 2002) and was likely due to the ability of both these species to survive in the low light levels and acidic soils characterizing these ecosystems (Hibbs 1979, Burns and Honkala 1990, Lei and Lechowicz 1990, Kobe et al. 1995). In contrast, the prolific seed production and seed banking abilities of the mid-tolerant species, Betula lenta and B. alleghaniensis, likely contributed to the abundance of these seedlings among hemlock study areas as these species often dominate the seed banks of hemlock-dominated forests (Castovsky and Bazzaz 2000, Yorks et al. 2000, Sullivan and Ellison 2006). While these species may germinate under low light conditions, their survival in these stands is dependent on canopy gaps that increase light availability in the forest understory (Carlton and Bazzaz 1998, Orwig and Foster 1998, Webster and Lorimer 2005). This was demonstrated by the affinity of B. alleghaniensis and B. lenta saplings to recent canopy gaps within the hemlock stands we
sampled (A. W. D’Amato, personal observation), as well as by the tremendous increase of these
species observed in the sapling layer of hemlock forests defoliated by hemlock woolly adelgid
(Orwig and Foster 1998, Kizlinski et al. 2002, Stadler et al. 2005). Based on these findings from
infested stands in the region and the characteristics of the seedling layers in the present study, it
is highly likely that a similar increase in B. alleghaniensis and B. lenta will occur on these sites
when hemlock woolly adelgid reaches these areas.

Although there were compositional similarities in the seedling and sapling layers between
old-growth and second-growth hemlock stands (Table 4), densities of seedlings and saplings
were much greater in old-growth stands. The factors described as influencing the patterns for
understory herb and shrub abundance between old-growth and second-growth stands (e.g.,
greater diversity of microhabitats and resource availability in old-growth stands) also likely
contributed to the patterns in seedling and sapling densities. In particular, several studies have
demonstrated the importance of decaying logs on the forest floor as microhabitats for certain tree
species (Christy and Mack 1984, Harmon and Franklin 1989, Beach and Halpern 2001),
including T. canadensis and B. alleghaniensis (Mladenoff and Stearns 1993, Corinth 1995,
McGee 2001, Marx and Walters 2008). In this study, the abundance of highly decayed downed
wood (decay class III and IV combined, after Fraver et al. 2002) was almost five times greater in
old-growth forests compared to second-growth forests (56.2 vs. 11.6 m$^3$/ha). While we did not
specifically sample downed logs for seedling and sapling abundance, seedlings of T. canadensis
and Betula spp. were commonly observed on these substrates within our study areas (A.W.
D’Amato, personal observation, Figure 3). In addition, the association of T. canadensis with this
microhabitat was demonstrated by the positive correlation between proportion of highly decayed
downed coarse woody debris and T. canadensis abundance in the ordination of understory
community composition (Figure 1). Due to the importance of deadwood substrates in these
systems, the deliberate felling and retention of canopy trees in harvest gaps should be integrated
into management strategies aimed at restoring old-growth conditions to second-growth hemlock
stands. Importantly, including these provisions for CWD creation at each harvest entry will be
critical for ensuring that a diversity of decay classes are present in these stands over time (cf.
D’Amato and Catanzaro 2007).

Beyond differences in microhabitat and resource availability, it is likely that the greater
sapling densities in old-growth stands were also related to the differences in the nature of
disturbance in these systems as compared to second-growth stands. Both of these systems have
experienced small to moderate canopy disturbances over the past century (D’Amato and Orwig
2008); however, the size of canopy gaps created in old-growth stands is generally greater due to
the larger overstory trees in these stands (cf. Dahir and Lorimer 1996). As a result, these stands
contain understory light conditions more favorable for the recruitment of mid-tolerant and
tolerant species into the sapling layer. Moreover, the extreme shade tolerance of *T. canadensis*
allows it to persist under low light levels in the forest understory for extended periods of time,
often exceeding a century (Godman and Lancaster 1990, A.W. D’Amato, personal observation).
Therefore, some of the hemlock saplings within old-growth stands likely recruited prior to the
establishment of the second-growth areas examined, thus contributing to the greater abundance
of this species within old-growth areas. These patterns reinforce the suitability of selection
systems for increasing hemlock regeneration in second-growth systems and restoring canopy
complexity through the creation of well-developed sapling layers.

Interestingly, several compositional and structural components extirpated from the
understory layer of hemlock stands in other regions of the northeastern United States due to
overbrowsing by white-tail deer, including *Taxus canadensis* and abundant *T. canadensis* saplings (Frelich and Lorimer 1985, Alverson et al. 1988, Rooney and Dress 1997, Long et al. 1998, Weckel et al. 2006), were commonly documented in the old-growth and second-growth stands observed in this study. Due to the comparatively low deer densities in our study region (~10 per square mile, MassWildlife 2008), these results serve as an illustration of the dramatic effect white-tail deer is having on the structure and dynamics of eastern hemlock forests in other portions of this species’ range and represent a baseline for assessing how future increases in deer densities within western Massachusetts affect the conservation and management of these systems. Moreover, recent results highlighting the positive interactive effects of canopy disturbance due to hemlock woolly adelgid infestation and severity of deer browsing underscore the importance of simultaneously monitoring the impacts of these and other disturbance agents on the future plant community dynamics of these currently unaffected systems (Eschtruth and Battles 2008).

5. Conclusions

The understory communities in the old-growth hemlock stands examined in this study are distinctive from those in hemlock dominated stands originating following logging in the late 19th century. Understory vegetation characteristics within these old-growth stands, including species richness, herb and shrub cover, and seedling and sapling densities, are much greater than those observed within the understories of second-growth areas due in large part to the greater resource availability and microhabitat heterogeneity characterizing these systems. Notably, differences in composition, richness, and diversity between old-growth and second-growth hemlock stands resulted from either the absence or lower abundance of several common forest herbs and shrubs.
within second-growth stands and were not due to the presence of rare species in old-growth. Despite the lack of old-growth obligate understory species in these stands, the understory communities of these old-growth systems represent important habitat features on the landscape providing greater levels of forage and cover for a variety of wildlife relative to second-growth hemlock stands. The return of old-growth understory conditions to these second-growth areas will be largely dependent on disturbance and self-thinning mediated changes in overstory structure, resource availability, and microhabitat heterogeneity within these systems. As such, management strategies, including the use of gap-based silvicultural systems and the creation and retention of CWD, may serve as effective approaches for actively restoring these understory conditions to second-growth stands. Although hemlock woolly adelgid is not present at any hemlock stands examined in this study, our results suggest that the loss of hemlock from these areas will lead to the tremendous increases in *B. lenta* and *B. alleghaniensis* observed in infested hemlock forests in this region (Orwig and Foster 1998). More importantly, infestation of these areas will irreversibly alter the composition and structure of the few remaining old-growth forests in southern New England.
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Table 1. Physiographic and general stand characteristics of eastern hemlock study sites in western Massachusetts, USA. Canopy tree age and compositional data were collected as part of a larger study examining the disturbance dynamics of these systems (see D’Amato and Orwig 2008 for detailed methods).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Canopy Type</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Elevation</th>
<th>Slope</th>
<th>Aspect</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bash Bish Falls</td>
<td>OG</td>
<td>76.9</td>
<td>226 (277)</td>
<td>370-450</td>
<td>26°-46°</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black Brook</td>
<td>OG</td>
<td>79.4</td>
<td>210 (328)</td>
<td>470-520</td>
<td>23°-38°</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cold River A1</td>
<td>OG</td>
<td>52.7</td>
<td>229 (374)</td>
<td>390-480</td>
<td>36°-40°</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cold River A2</td>
<td>OG</td>
<td>61.6</td>
<td>246 (488)</td>
<td>400-490</td>
<td>33°-41°</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cold River B</td>
<td>OG</td>
<td>76.5</td>
<td>188 (333)</td>
<td>330-490</td>
<td>40°-42°</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cold River D</td>
<td>OG</td>
<td>71.2</td>
<td>216 (441)</td>
<td>350-390</td>
<td>20°-31°</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deer Hill</td>
<td>OG</td>
<td>81.4</td>
<td>182 (282)</td>
<td>550-580</td>
<td>33°-38°</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grinder Brook</td>
<td>OG</td>
<td>88.1</td>
<td>236 (333)</td>
<td>360-450</td>
<td>38°-43°</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hopper A</td>
<td>OG</td>
<td>63.8</td>
<td>196 (414)</td>
<td>580-700</td>
<td>26°-40°</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hopper B</td>
<td>OG</td>
<td>42.4</td>
<td>198 (329)</td>
<td>600-680</td>
<td>31°-35°</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manning Brook</td>
<td>OG</td>
<td>75.1</td>
<td>219 (352)</td>
<td>360-420</td>
<td>29°-35°</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mt. Everett</td>
<td>OG</td>
<td>67.0</td>
<td>237 (325)</td>
<td>470-530</td>
<td>31°-45°</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Money Brook</td>
<td>OG</td>
<td>77.9</td>
<td>206 (302)</td>
<td>600-660</td>
<td>24°-32°</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tower Brook</td>
<td>OG</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>177 (244)</td>
<td>450-470</td>
<td>33°-42°</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Todd Mt.</td>
<td>OG</td>
<td>76.8</td>
<td>209 (377)</td>
<td>450-470</td>
<td>28°-35°</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wheeler Brook</td>
<td>OG</td>
<td>73.1</td>
<td>206 (300)</td>
<td>330-370</td>
<td>19°-28°</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Table 1. (continued)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study site</th>
<th>Status&lt;sup&gt;1&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>hemlock&lt;sup&gt;2&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>age&lt;sup&gt;3&lt;/sup&gt; (yr)</th>
<th>(m)</th>
<th>(°)</th>
<th>(°)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bash Bish Falls</td>
<td>2G</td>
<td>70.0</td>
<td>115 (171)</td>
<td>380-430</td>
<td>26°-34°</td>
<td>325°-350°</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cold River A</td>
<td>2G</td>
<td>60.0</td>
<td>132 (182)</td>
<td>430-510</td>
<td>29°-36°</td>
<td>290°-303°</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cold River B</td>
<td>2G</td>
<td>69.8</td>
<td>108 (270)</td>
<td>340-380</td>
<td>31°-35°</td>
<td>255°-290°</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deer Hill</td>
<td>2G</td>
<td>52.5</td>
<td>113 (216)</td>
<td>500-540</td>
<td>35°-38°</td>
<td>350°-0°</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dunbar Brook</td>
<td>2G</td>
<td>72.6</td>
<td>136 (204)</td>
<td>380-410</td>
<td>27°-36°</td>
<td>45°-68°</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grinder Brook</td>
<td>2G</td>
<td>57.3</td>
<td>128 (151)</td>
<td>400-460</td>
<td>25°-46°</td>
<td>40°-70°</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Money Brook</td>
<td>2G</td>
<td>70.5</td>
<td>133 (201)</td>
<td>590-620</td>
<td>26°-34°</td>
<td>260°-290°</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trout Brook</td>
<td>2G</td>
<td>63.0</td>
<td>136 (323)</td>
<td>320-370</td>
<td>29°-32°</td>
<td>330°-340°</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>1</sup>OG = old growth, 2G = second-growth

<sup>2</sup>Importance value calculated as: ((Relative basal area) + (Relative Density))/2

<sup>3</sup>Value in parentheses represents age of oldest tree with complete increment core sample

---

Table 2. Herb, graminoid, shrub, fern, and club moss species identified in the understory of old-growth (OG) and second-growth (2G) hemlock forests in western Massachusetts. Species
occurrences are based on complete censuses of 0.04-ha plots within each study area (3-5 plots per site). Nomenclature follows Gleason and Cronquist (1991).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Species</th>
<th>OG</th>
<th>2G</th>
<th>Species</th>
<th>OG</th>
<th>2G</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Herbs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Herbs (cont.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actaea alba</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>Monotropa uniflora</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aralia nudicaulis.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Oxalis acetosella</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arisaema triphyllum.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>Polygonatum pubescens</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aster acuminatus.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Solidago flexicaulis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aster dumosus</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>Tiarella cordifolia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aster divericatus</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>Trientalis borealis</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chimaphila maculate.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Trillium erectum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Circaea alpina</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Trillium undulatum</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clintonia borealis</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>Viola rotundifolia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cypripedium acaule</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>Graminoids</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Epigaea repens</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Carex pensylvanica</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Galium spp.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Ferns</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gaultheria procumbens</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Adiantum pedatum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laportea canadensis</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>Dryopteris intermedia</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maianthemum canadense</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>Dryopteris marginalis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medeola virginiana</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>Polypodium virginianum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mitchella repens</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Thelypteris phegopteris</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2. (continued)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Shrubs</th>
<th>Club mosses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>Cornus alternifolia</em></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Hamamelis virginiana</em></td>
<td>X X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Kalmia latifolia</em></td>
<td>X X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Rhododendron canescens</em></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Rubus allegheniensis</em></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Rubus idaeus</em></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Sambucus racemosa</em></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Solidago flexicaulis</em></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Taxus canadensis</em></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Vaccinium angustifolium</em></td>
<td>X X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Viburnum acerifolium</em></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Viburnum alnifolium</em></td>
<td>X X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 3.** Mean cover and site-level species richness ($S$), diversity ($H'$), and evenness ($E$) of all herbaceous (herbs, ferns, graminoids, and club mosses) and shrub species in old-growth and
second-growth hemlock stands. Values are based on average cover and frequency of herb and shrub species across understory subplots within each study area (1 m², 24-40 per site). Standard errors are in parentheses and means with different letters are significantly different ($P < 0.05$, Wilcoxon rank-sum test).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Old-growth ($n = 16$)</th>
<th>Second-growth ($n = 8$)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Plant cover (%/m²)</td>
<td>4.02 (0.41)a</td>
<td>1.06 (0.47)b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richness ($S$)</td>
<td>13.56 (1.11)a</td>
<td>6.88 (0.83)b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diversity ($H'$)</td>
<td>2.12 (0.08)a</td>
<td>1.64 (0.11)b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evenness (E)</td>
<td>0.83 (0.01)a</td>
<td>0.88 (0.02)b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Species</td>
<td>Seedlings (#/ha)</td>
<td>Saplings (#/ha)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Acer pensylvanicum</em></td>
<td>13747 (417-7917)</td>
<td>165 (0-383)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Acer rubrum</em></td>
<td>1371 (0-7917)</td>
<td>2 (0-25)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Acer saccharum</em></td>
<td>677 (0-9167)</td>
<td>18 (0-300)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Betula alleghaniensis</em></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>41 (0-169)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Betula lenta</em></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>74 (0-442)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Betula spp</em>¹</td>
<td>5722 (0-27083)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Betula papyrifera</em></td>
<td>15 (0-250)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Fagus grandifolia</em></td>
<td>820 (0-3125)</td>
<td>119 (0-363)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Picea rubens</em></td>
<td>1169 (0-5313)</td>
<td>36 (0-275)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Pinus strobus</em></td>
<td>83 (0-500)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Quercus rubra</em></td>
<td>133 (0-1250)</td>
<td>1 (0-8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Tsuga canadensis</em></td>
<td>13760 (1250-51250)</td>
<td>354 (31-942)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong>²</td>
<td>38104 (5927)a</td>
<td>847 (83)a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Table 4. Average seedling and sapling densities (#/ha) in old-growth and second-growth hemlock forests. Ranges appear in parentheses for each species and standard errors are depicted for totals. Totals with different letters indicate significant differences between old-growth and second-growth stands (P < 0.05, Wilcoxon Rank-Sum test). Species-level values represent site-level averages, whereas totals represent averages across old-growth and second-growth stands, respectively.

1. Seedlings of *Betula alleghaniensis* and *B. lenta* were combined for estimates of seedling density.
Includes less common species not listed in table, *Fraxinus americana, Ostrya virginiana, Pinus resinosa, Sorbus americana, and Tilia americana.*

**Table 5.** Correlations (Kendall’s τ) between the average percent cover of understory herbs, shrubs, and tree seedlings within each study area (%/m²) and non-metric multidimensional scaling Axis 1 and 2. Species in bold have significant correlations with axes scores (*P* < 0.05 (Bonferroni-protected)).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Species</th>
<th>Axis 1</th>
<th>Axis 2</th>
<th>Species</th>
<th>Axis 1</th>
<th>Axis 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>Acer pensylvanicum</em></td>
<td>-0.17</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td><em>Mitchella repens</em></td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>-0.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Acer rubrum</em></td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td><em>Monotropa uniflora</em></td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Acer saccharum</em></td>
<td>-0.42</td>
<td>-0.08</td>
<td><em>Oxalis acetosella</em></td>
<td>-0.44</td>
<td>0.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Acer spicatum</em></td>
<td>-0.39</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td><em>Picea rubens</em></td>
<td>-0.30</td>
<td>0.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Aralia nudicaulis</em></td>
<td>-0.41</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td><em>Polystichum acrostichoides</em></td>
<td>-0.27</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Aster acuminatis</em></td>
<td>-0.48</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td><em>Polypodium virginianum</em></td>
<td><strong>-0.55</strong></td>
<td>0.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Betula spp.</em></td>
<td>-0.33</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td><em>Quercus rubra</em></td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>0.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Dryopteris intermedia</em></td>
<td><strong>-0.52</strong></td>
<td>-0.17</td>
<td><em>Taxus canadensis</em></td>
<td>-0.42</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Fagus grandifolia</em></td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>-0.23</td>
<td><em>Trientalis borealis</em></td>
<td>-0.37</td>
<td>0.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Kalmia latifolia</em></td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td><strong>0.56</strong></td>
<td><em>Trillium undulatum</em></td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Lycopodium lucidulum</em></td>
<td>-0.39</td>
<td>-0.11</td>
<td><em>Tsuga canadensis</em></td>
<td>-0.37</td>
<td><strong>0.50</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Maianthemum canadense</em></td>
<td>-0.18</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td><em>Viburnum alnifolium</em></td>
<td>-0.35</td>
<td>0.15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>