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Abstract

Historically, large areas of forest in Europe were managed as coppice woodland to produce wood-based fuel for the smelting industry. We hypothesized that this practice produced a legacy effect on current forest ecosystem properties. Specifically we hypothesized that the historical form of coppicing may have produced a legacy of elevated stocks of soil organic carbon (SOC), nutrients, and black carbon (BC) in soil as fire was routinely used in coppiced woodland to clear land. We further hypothesized that these changes in soil properties would result in increased biodiversity. To test these hypotheses, we sampled the surface soil (0-5, 5-10 and 10-20 cm) from a chronosequence of forest sites found in the Siegerland (Germany) that had been coppiced and burned 1, 2, 3.5, 6, 8, 11 and 17 years before present. Mature beech and spruce forests (i.e. >60 years) were also sampled as reference sites: to provide a hint of what might occur in the absence of human intervention. We measured stocks of SOC, BC, NO$_3$-N, P, K, Mg, as well as cation exchange and water
holding capacity, and we mapped plant composition to calculate species richness and evenness. The results showed that coppicing in combination with burning soil and litter improved soil nutrient availability, enhanced biodiversity and increased SOC stocks. The SOC stocks and biodiversity were increased by a factor of three relative to those in the mature beech and spruce forests. The present study shows that traditional coppicing practice may facilitate net C accrual rates of 20 t ha$^{-1}$ year$^{-1}$ and maintain high biodiversity, indicating that aspects of traditional practice could be applied in current forest management to foster biodiversity and to mitigate climate change.

Introduction

Forest landscapes in Europe have undergone major changes in the last centuries. Beside extensive clearance and deforestation, coppice management was widely practiced, mainly in afforested areas (Ellenberg, 1988). The aim was to produce woody biomass harvested at intervals of 15 to 35 years (Ellenberg, 1988, McGrath et al., 2015). Europe wide, up to 60% of total forest area has been under coppice management (i.e. coppice and coppice-with-standards; Stajic et al., 2009, McGrath et al., 2015). In Central and northwestern Europe the practice of coppicing was abandoned between the mid of the 19$^{th}$ and the mid 20$^{th}$ century due to a declining market for coppice products (McGrath et al., 2015). The percentage of the forest estate dedicated to fuel production via coppice declined most drastically after 1870 due to increased availability of coal (Banken et al., 2007, McGrath et al., 2015, Müllerová et al., 2015). However, 15% of European forests are still coppiced, and the technique is being reintroduced mainly to produce woody biomass for the growing bioenergy sector in Europe (Bruckman et al., 2011, Nerlich et al., 2012, McGrath et al., 2015). Also in Germany coppicing was a common forest management technique between the 17$^{th}$ and the 19$^{th}$ century.
In some regions, for instance the Siegerland, more than 50% of the total broadleaf forest was coppiced (Müller-Wille, 1980, Becker, 2002, Banken et al., 2007). Yet, little is known about the ecological legacy effects of past coppice management on current soil and vegetation properties. Understanding any potential legacy effects of traditional coppice management, might, for example, provide clues as to how we can optimize current forest management to maximize ecosystem service provision from intensively managed forest and woodlands.

Traditionally coppiced forests were used to cultivate woody perennials and agricultural crops and/or fodder plants: a type of agro-forestry (Nerlich et al., 2012). The main aim of the coppice system developed in the Middle Ages was to produce fuel wood and charcoal for the local smelting industry (Nerlich et al., 2012, McGrath et al., 2015). Coppice re-growth, was harvested regularly, every ~20 years (Nerlich et al., 2012). After the harvesting of woody biomass from these coppiced woodlands the soils were generally hoed and burnt to clear litter and woody debris, which local farmers did to cultivate crops for at least one season on these recently cleared and burnt woodlands (i.e. "Haubergwirtschaft"; Banken et al., 2007, Nerlich et al., 2012). The soils were prepared for cultivation of buckwheat (Fagopyrum esculentum Moench) or rye (Secale cereale L.) by hoeing and burning. The burning eliminated weeds as well as leaf litter and supplied ash that contained nutrients to soil, which facilitated at least one crop rotation (Nerlich et al., 2012). Immediately after this coppicing and burning secondary succession began (van der Werf, 1991, Banken et al., 2007). Little is yet known about the relationships between plant successional changes of the coppiced and burned woodlands (Banken et al., 2007) to carbon accrual rates and the changes to soil nutrient status (Pregitzer & Euskirchen, 2004, Seedre & Chen, 2010) and other changes in soil properties. It is likely that past coppice management has left a legacy on current soil and vegetation properties.
properties (Banken et al., 2007). Likely, burning also introduced black carbon (BC) into the soil, which is resistant to microbial degradation (Preston & Schmidt, 2006).

In general, fire affects soil biological, chemical and physical properties (Certini, 2005, Forbes et al., 2006, Preston & Schmidt, 2006). The burning events cause an immediate loss and chemical transformation (i.e. polymerization and poly-condensation) of organic matter (Johnson & Curtis, 2001, Wolf et al., 2013). Therefore, soils of fire prone ecosystems are usually enriched with ash and BC (e.g. charcoal, pyrogenic C; Neary et al., 1999, Forbes et al., 2006), which affects, for instance, the cycling of nutrients (Certini, 2005), as well as post-burn plant successions (Zackrisson et al., 1996, DeLuca et al., 2006, Gundale & DeLuca, 2007). Whether this enrichment of soil with BC favored the subsequent accumulation of soil organic carbon (SOC) is uncertain, but it is possible because BC can induce a priming effect that leads to higher or lower levels of SOC accumulation (Hamer et al., 2004, Wardle et al., 2008, Borchard et al., 2014, Glisczynski et al., 2016).

We hypothesized that coppice management combined with the use of fire to control understory re-growth would produce a legacy effect in European Forests (McGrath et al., 2015). Specifically we hypothesized that this largely abandoned management practice would leave a legacy of elevated stocks of total SOC, BC and nutrients, as well as higher plant biodiversity. To test these hypotheses, we measured non-pyrolyzed SOC, BC, and soil nutrient stocks and also plant diversity and evenness across an age chronosequence of coppiced woodland in the open-air museum “Historischer Hauberg Fellinghausen” in the Siegerland, Germany. In this open air museum a traditional coppice management unit is still in use and maintained (Becker, 2002, Banken et al., 2007, Mullerová et al., 2015). In this coppice management system a small number of trees (i.e. <10% coverage ha⁻¹) are used as a
seed source (i.e. standards) and cut less frequently, and weed re-growth is controlled with fire after harvest of the coppiced biomass to prepare soil for crop cultivation. This type of coppicing creates a mosaic pattern of plots across the landscape with vegetation at different stages of plant succession (Banken et al., 2007, Müllerová et al., 2015).

Materials and Methods

Study areas

In this study we investigated chemical soil properties and plant communities across a time series (i.e. chronosequence) of coppice age. The same dependent variables were measured in adjacent forests that are not actively managed as a type of experimental control. The sites comprised post-burn coppice systems in seven age classes (i.e. 7 sites that differed in time since coppicing and burning; i.e. 1, 2, 3.5, 6, 8, 11 and 17 years post coppice). Additionally, we sampled spruce forests that established on abandoned coppice areas and also mature spruce and beech forests (stand ages greater than 60 years) to compare coppicing with local forest ecosystems and to assess long-term effects on soil properties (Table 1). At each sampling location botanical surveys where undertaken to re-assess and update the data base of Banken et al. (2007). Distance between studied coppice plots at the open-air museum “Historischer Hauberg Fellinghausen” was <500m, their distance to spruce forests was <6 km and to beech forests <10 km. The coppice and forest sites were located in the mountainous Siegerland (Germany) near the town of Kreuztal (Table 1).

In the Siegerland, Cambisols have formed on lime-free sediments, which vary in their clay content, hydrology (e.g. gleyic and stagnic properties) and in the abundance of rock fragments (e.g. skeletic). For this study we minimized soil related variability by selecting plots that occur only on skeletic dystric Cambisols and by restricting sampling to sites on
similar landforms (i.e. middle slopes). In addition we tried to minimize variations in soil texture to the main texture class: loam, though we had to accept variations within this texture class (i.e. coppice: silt loam; abandoned coppice: loam, spruce forest: silt loam; beech forest: sandy clay loam). The climate is temperate with mean annual temperature of 7.7°C and mean annual precipitation of 1075 mm per annum (Banken et al., 2007).

Sampling and analyses

The open-air museum “Historischer Hauberg Fellinghausen” is managed as a complete unit of 24 ha (Banken et al., 2007). Management of the open air museum has produced a mosaic across the landscape of woodland plots in various stages of recovery post coppice harvest. Hence, measurements from plots across the complete coppice management unit of the “Historischer Hauberg Fellinghausen” were collected in a space for time substitution to constrain the effects of time (i.e. stand ages; Table 1) since last harvest/burn on soil properties and plant biodiversity (see also below, section 2.3). At each of the 17 sampling sites (0.5ha), 5 soil pits were dug. In each pit 250 grams of soil sample was taken from 0-5 cm, 5-10 cm and at 10-20 cm depth (Table 1). For each sample site the five soil samples from each depth increment (0-5, 5-10 and 10-20) were combined to produce a composite sample for each site*depth increment prior to chemical analysis to control for within plot variability. To measure soil bulk density additional soil samples were collected: At all 17 sampling sites and for all 3 soil depths we collected 5 replicate soil samples using 100 cm$^3$ cores.

The composite soil samples used for chemical analysis were mixed, dried at 40°C to a constant weight and subsequently sieved to <2 mm. Total contents of SOC and nitrogen (N) were analysed by combustion using a C/N analyzer (NA 2000, Fisons Instruments, UK). The soils studied here showed pH values <6.5, thus, a correction of total C for calcareous C
Contents of aromatic C (i.e. BC) were measured using the benzene polycarboxyl acid (BPCA) method as described by Brodowski et al. (2005) and Klappenberg et al. (2016). As suggested by Brodowski et al. (2005), total BC contents were obtained by multiplying the BPCA yield with the conversion factor of 2.27. Here, we present SOC data that were corrected for measured BC content (SOC = total SOC – BC). Concentrations of plant-available potassium (K) and phosphorous (P) in soil were measured using the CAL-method (0.05 mol L\(^{-1}\) Ca-lactate, 0.05 mol L\(^{-1}\) Ca-acetate, acetic acid, pH 4.1, 1:20 w/v) (VDLUFA, 1991) and those of magnesium (Mg) and nitrate-nitrogen (NO\(_3\)-N) after extraction with 0.01 M CaCl\(_2\). Soil pH values were measured after equilibration in 0.01 M CaCl\(_2\) for 2 h. The potential cation exchange capacity (CEC) was determined following the Mehlich 100 method at pH 7.0 (Mehlich, 1942). To assess how much water can be stored in plant-available form, we assessed the water holding capacity (WHC) as soil weight after 30 minutes of immersion in water minus the respective weight after 2 hours of drainage (modified after Öhlinger, 1996). The 100cm\(^3\) samples were dried at 105°C to constant weight and then used to determine dry soil bulk density (\(\rho_b\)), which was corrected for coarse fragments >2mm (Schrumpf et al., 2011).

Carbon and nutrient stocks were determined for each soil depth layer (0-5, 5-10 and 10-20 cm) and summarized for each sampling site using Eq. 1:

\[
stock_X = \sum_{j=1}^{n} (X_b \cdot \rho_b) \cdot Z
\]

Eq. 1

where \(stock_X\) represents stocks (SOC, BC, N [t ha\(^{-1}\)]; nutrients [kg ha\(^{-1}\)]; water holding capacity [Ml ha\(^{-1}\)]; CEC [kmol\(_c\) ha\(^{-1}\)] and acidity [kmol\(_H^+\) ha\(^{-1}\)]), \(j\) represents soil depths layers (1, 2, 3), \(X_b\) are concentrations (SOC, N [g kg\(^{-1}\)]; nutrients [mg kg\(^{-1}\)]; water holding capacity [l kg\(^{-1}\)]; CEC [cmol\(_c\) kg\(^{-1}\)]), \(\rho_b\) is the bulk density corrected for coarse fragments (t m\(^{-3}\)), \(Z\) is the thickness of each soil layer (m) and \(n\) is the number of soil depth layers. Ideally for
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comparing different management strategies and their impact on soil nutrient stocks mass of the relevant surface layers needs to be accounted (e.g. hoeing lowers bulk density and increases the thickness of Ah horizon). In this study we compare hoed and non-hoed soils, thus, we used Eq. 2 to standardise soil mass across sites prior to mass adjusted stock calculations (Ellert & Bettany, 1995):

$$Z_{add} = \frac{(M_{equiv} - M_{surf}) \times 0.0001 \text{hm}^2}{\rho_{b\ subsurf}}$$  \hspace{1cm} \text{Eq. 2}

where $Z_{add}$ represents additional thickness of subsurface layer to attain equivalent soil mass (m), $M_{equiv}$ is mass of heaviest horizon (t ha$^{-1}$), $M_{surf}$ represents soil mass in surface layers (t ha$^{-1}$) and $\rho_{b\ subsurf}$ is the bulk density of subsurface layer (t m$^{-3}$). Identical soil mass was calculated by adding soil mass in the surface layer (0-10) plus the soil mass stored in an additional (and variable) layer ($Z_{add}$) of the respective subsurface (10-20cm) layer to attain an equivalent soil mass for all sampled sites (Ellert & Bettany, 1995).

**Botanical assessments and estimation of biomass-C**

The plant communities, their richness and evenness of the sampling sites were surveyed in triplicate. Three 100m$^2$ subplots in each 0.5 hectare sampling site were selected at the same elevation and the distance between subplots was always <20 m. To assess variability in species composition between sites representing different stand ages and stand management strategies (i.e. time since harvest and burning of understory regrowth; Tab. 1), detailed plant surveys were performed following a stratified systematic sampling design (i.e. square-triangle grid). This means that we restricted plant analyses to same elevation and degree of soil development within the study area.
The vegetation types were classified after Schubert et al. (2001) using Juice 7.0 software (Tichy & Chytry, 2006) after surveying three representative areas of 100 m² of each coppice age class and forest type (Dierschke, 1994, Tremp, 2005) for their bryophytes (Frahm & Frey, 2004) and vascular plants (Aichele & Schwegler, 1998, Schulz, 2004, Rothmaler, 2005, Rothmaler, 2007). To determine coverage and abundance of plant species the Londo scale was used (Londo, 1976) that allowed multivariate statistical analyses (Leyer & Wesche, 2007). To determine species diversity we calculated both species richness (i.e. number of species per 100 m²) and species evenness (i.e. relative abundance of different species). To compute species evenness ($E$) we used Eq. 3:

$$E = D / R$$

Eq. 3, where $D$ is the Simpson’s reciprocal index

$$D = 1 / \Sigma [a_i / A]^2$$

Eq. 4, that accounts for area covered by each species ($a_i$) related to total area covered by all species ($A$) and $R$ is the richness.

Litter was collected from a fixed area within sampling site using a frame (400 cm²) and dried at 60ºC to a constant weight to determine dry weight biomass. Dry biomass of the trees and coppiced branches (>150 cm) were calculated in accordance with Zianis et al. (2005) and for grasses and herbs (i.e. ground vegetation) following Bolte (1999). Zianis et al. (2005) and Bolte (1999) created empirical equations for aboveground biomass of coppiced trees based on diameter at breast height and coppice branch height. For the calculation of C stocks of living and dead biomass, we assumed a 50% C content for dry biomass (Joosten et al., 2004).
Data processing

We defined five different classes of land use, i.e., the non-coppiced beech and spruce forests, abandoned coppice, sites with recently coppiced (1-6 years ago) and sites coppiced a long time ago (8-17 years ago). This allowed us to test statistical differences in soil and vegetation properties among these 5 classes, with a non-parametric analyses of variance (i.e. Kruskall Wallis test) using Statistica software version 13 (StatSoft GmbH, Hamburg, Germany). In addition, we analyzed differences in soil chemistry and plant diversity using simple linear and non-linear regression to investigate the changes along the coppice’s chronosequence. To assess dependencies between soil properties we used pair wise Spearman correlation. Non-parametric methods were chosen instead of analysis of variance because data distribution was non-normal.

Results

Soil properties

Coppicing and controlling plant re-growth with fire affected soil properties markedly (Fig. 1). During the first decade after harvest and soil burning soil properties deviated strongly, with a gain in SOC after about 6 years, but thereafter approaching the SOC levels found in unaffected beech forests (Fig. 1a). The latter represents a type of baseline, which might be expected in an unmanaged woodland in this region (Banken et al., 2007).

Black carbon stocks in the coppice forestry systems followed a temporal trend similar to that of the other nutrients (e.g. SOC and total N), being elevated in the first years after a burning but declining thereafter (Fig. 1b). A new equilibrium of BC content was reached approximately 6 years after last fire treatment and remained in spruce forests established on land coppiced more than 100 years ago (Fig. 1b). There was even a tendency of declining BC
contents 8 years after burning, which rather is associated to varying charring efficiency during controlled burning or to site heterogeneity. However, the average BC stocks at coppiced sites (9.12+/−0.46 Mg ha⁻¹) were significantly larger than those in the adjacent native beech (3.48+/−0.37 Mg ha⁻¹) and spruce forests (3.65+/−0.70 Mg ha⁻¹), which burned less frequently or even never (Fig. 1b). Thus, burning altered the quality of SOM substantially (Fig 1b; BPCA-C panel; η²=60), as reflected by lower C/BC ratios (Kruskall Wallis test, P<0.05) for both recently coppiced forests (1 to 6 years ago: 5.26±0.43; 8 to 17 years ago: 5.26±0.43) and abandoned coppice (3.55±0.85) relative to beech (11.97±0.66) and spruce forests (15.39±0.85).

Soil properties across the coppice age class sites can be grouped into three main patterns. The majority of soil properties reached a maximum 6 years after disturbance. First, there were moderate increases (<40% of initial values) of SOC, BC, N, CEC and WHC (Fig. 1a, 1b, 1c, 1i and 1j). These changes were correlated: the changes in the values for BC, N, CEC and WHC correlated significantly (P<0.05) with those of SOC with R² values >0.8 (R²Spearman BC=0.94, R²Spearman N=0.91; R²Spearman WHC=0.87; R²Spearman CEC=0.95). Total N stocks were lower in abandoned coppiced sites than in those coppiced 1 to 6 years ago, yet, the C/N ratios were comparable across the coppice age classes (P>0.05 according to the Kruskall-Walls test; 1 to 6 years ago: 14.20±0.92; 8 to 17 years ago: 14.13±1.07; abandoned coppice: 15.96±1.84). In contrast, the stocks of P and K responded differently to those of SOC, exhibiting a substantial initial increase (relative increases from initial values >100 %, Fig. 1e and 1f). Moreover, and in contrast to available P and K, the availability of NO₃-N and acidity dramatically decreased within the first year after fire to minimum values measured in the second year after fire (Fig. 1d and 1h). Thereafter values increased to levels assessed shortly after fire within 6 years after harvest and soil burning (Fig. 1d and 1h). Thereafter, the
values decreased again to levels comparable to unmanaged beech forests (Fig. 1d and 1h). Both NO$_3$-N and acidity were positively correlated ($R^2_{\text{Spearman}}=0.59$; $P<0.05$) and thus formed the second group of correlated variables. The third pattern of response was found for Mg, which increased moderately within 17 years to levels found in beech forests (Fig. 1g).

**Coppice succession**

Coppicing induced a drastic loss of understory biomass, which was followed by one year of cropping and then secondary succession (Table 1, Fig. 2a). In the same way, coverage of overstorey, understory and ground cover varied across the coppice age classes due to increasing growth and biomass of the coppiced trees, which led to less coverage of early successional light-demanding herbs and grasses (i.e. the ground cover; Fig. 2a). Secondary succession started with a short herb stage (i.e. *Epilobio angustifolii-Digitalietum purpureae*), which was followed by a stage in which shrub-heath was abundant (i.e. *Frangulo-Rubetum plicati* and *Calluno-Sarrothamnetum*), a wood-heath stage (i.e. *Betulo pendulae-Quercetum roboris*) and a birch-and–oak coppice woodland (i.e. *Holco mollis-Quercetum*; Fig. 2, Table 1).

The botanical changes during secondary succession also resulted in a shift, even not significant, in species richness in the plots, which varied between 27±2 and 39±1 across the first decade of coppice re-growth. After 17 years of secondary succession, species diversity of coppice plots decreased to 22±1, similar to the values found in nearby unmanaged beech and spruce forests (Fig. 2b). Similarly, evenness in the coppice forestry plots was highest during the first decade post burn (i.e. ranging from 0.47±0.01 to 0.59±0.01) and declined, though not significantly, to 0.38±0.02 in plots 17 years post coppice harvest. Yet, the evenness was still larger than the evenness found in nearby unmanaged forests where values of 0.28±0.02 for spruce forests and 0.19±0.06 for beech forests were typical (Fig. 2b).
Carbon stocks

Total C stocks of the coppice forest system (i.e. above ground biomass plus total SOC) increased continuously across 17 years of re-growth (Fig. 3a), therewith also levelling out effects of heterogeneous BC inputs into the soils (Fig. 1b). The proportional increase in total C stock corresponded to an average annual net C accrual rate of 20 t ha⁻¹ year⁻¹ ($R^2=0.95$; $P<0.05$) during the 17-year re-growth period after burning. Already after 17 years the coppice system contained as much C as adjacent mature beech and spruce forests (Fig. 3a). The majority of C was present in the coppice re-growth (branches): after 17 years of growth there was finally less C stored in overstorey trees than in litter (Fig. 3a and 3b). Similarly, the contribution of different C pools to overall carbon storage changed due to re-growth patterns of tree branches after coppicing (Tab. 2; Fig. 2a & 3b). During first two years after coppicing, there was as much organic C stored in litter than in above ground biomass. Thereafter, it was mainly re-growth of the understory that increased C accumulation rate, and which finally elevated the proportion of C stored in above ground biomass. Across the coppice age classes, there was thus an increased allocation of C to understorey biomass (Fig. 2a and b), while possibly small losses of soil C (Fig. 1a and 1b) led to lower contributions of soil organic C to the overall carbon C stock of the entire system (Fig. 3b).

Discussion

Our results show that coppicing and soil burning alters soil properties and increases biodiversity (Neary et al., 1999, Certini, 2005, Müllerová et al., 2015). Harvesting re-grown branches from coppiced trees changes microclimatic conditions substantially and induces secondary succession (Chapin III et al., 2011), which is in line with a previous study by Banken et al. (2007). Also the early successional stages (i.e. short herb stage and shrub-heath stage) were more biodiverse than nearby unmanaged beech and spruce stands, which was
already mentioned by Swanson et al. (2010). Thus, maintaining the landscape as a mosaic in which forest plots are in varying degrees of recovery post coppicing may facilitate preservation of species and functional diversity (Banken et al., 2007, Liman et al., 2016), which is in line to findings for the Moravia region in the Czech Republic (Müllerová et al., 2015).

In addition, across the succession and re-growth period of <20 years, coppiced woodlands accumulated as much C as nearby unmanaged beech and spruce forest. Measured biomass C in beech and spruce forests was in typical ranges for these forest types (Dieter & Elsasser, 2002, Lecointe et al., 2006, Thuille & Schulze, 2006). However, the C storage in the studied (living museum) coppice stands was 3 to 5 times higher than for coppice stands described by Bruckman et al. (2011), but different stand densities, stump densities and number of branches per stump may explain differences. Even accounting for selective thinning performed to maintain long-lived trees our findings are reliable, because biomass C accumulation rates decline drastically after a stand age of about 20 years (Pregitzer & Euskirchen, 2004, Yang et al., 2011). Moreover, succession may further alter soil properties, e.g. enriching SOC and N-pools (Pérez & Moreno, 1998, Johnson & Curtis, 2001, Banken et al., 2007).

Coppicing alters soil moisture and temperature, which are important drivers for soil organic matter (SOM) decomposition (Neary et al., 1999). In addition fire events rapidly affect quantity and quality of nutrients (Certini, 2005). Obviously, agro-coppicing and using fire to control ground vegetation are the main drivers of markedly altered nutrient (i.e. K, Mg, NO₃-N, P) stocks. However, the dynamic changes that occur during secondary succession could vary between sites differing in their abiotic properties (e.g. soil type, hydrology). Here a fairly homogenous ecosystem was disturbed, which generally elevates availability of nutrients during the initial phase of secondary succession due to enhanced mineralization.
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Banken et al., 2007, Bolte et al., 2007). Notwithstanding that burning can increase BC stocks their increase is hypothesized to be limited due to burning conditions (i.e. temperature and duration) and soil processes (e.g. turbation, BC degradation) that control inputs or losses of BC at the different sites (Forbes et al., 2006, Czimczik & Masiello, 2007, Santín et al., 2013). However, shortly after coppicing and burning, the stocks of total SOC were elevated. This temporal gain in total SOC may be explained by two factors i) spatial heterogeneity within the forest ecosystems including heterogeneous input of BC or ii) enrichment (e.g. root and litter derived) and protection of SOC (e.g. formation of chemically resistant C and stabilization of easily degradable C due to sorption on BC) during coppicing (Kuzyakov & Domanski, 2000, Yang et al., 2011, Borchard et al., 2014). Studying temporal dynamics using a space-for-time substitution can be problematic due to spatial variability of the target property, e.g. total SOC. In this study spatial variability may explain larger C-stocks found in soils of patches with stand ages ≤6 years when compared to older stand ages. Nevertheless, the total SOC accrual clearly followed a temporal trend across the space for time chronosequence (Fig. 3), and the SOC stocks found were equal or even larger than those found in unmanaged beech forests, which is unusual for a disturbed forest system (Guo & Gifford, 2002). Consequently, we conclude that SOC enrichment was real, possibly promoted by eco-physiological processes (e.g. net primary productivity related to enrichment of SOC) in young coppice stand, and/or possibly favored by temporal increases in nutrient availability that resulted from ash input.

After harvest of coppice re-growth, soil was hoed, which incorporated litter and most upper topsoil into shallow soil layers that protected SOC during soil burning (Neary et al., 1999, Johnson & Curtis, 2001). However, any surplus of non-stabilized SOC should be prone to decomposition according to the soil’s specific C-saturation capacity (Six et al., 2002, Schmidt et al., 2011). Nevertheless, during early successions highly productive vegetation
communities covered plots, which may have facilitated a SOC enrichment by increased root derived C inputs (Guo & Gifford, 2002, Swanson et al., 2010, Yang et al., 2011). Moreover, compared to beech forest systems, the studied coppice forest management system increased BC stocks and thereby possibly elevated SOC storage capacity in the mineral soil (Borchard et al., 2014), even if other authors found that added BC could potentially also accelerate litter and SOC decomposition (Wardle et al., 2008).

Conclusion

Our case study shows that coppiced forests can have higher biodiversity and accumulate within <20 years as much C as mature beech and spruce forests. These observations imply that it is possible to manage forests to maximize both biodiversity and C sequestration across landscapes. The increased BC stocks provide a stable soil C compound, which apparently did not prime decomposition of SOC as found for ‘humus’ (i.e. litter; Wardle et al., 2008), but which stabilized SOC in the mineral soil, so that over the long term coppice management may promote the accumulation of soil C (Lehmann et al., 2008, Borchard et al., 2014). At present, managing understory re-growth by burning is unusual in Europe, but it is common practice in swidden cultivation in tropical regions (van Vliet et al., 2012). The maintenance of coppice forests still requires regular work in the forest and a market for coppice products (e.g. biofuel), but coppicing may be a viable strategy to maintain biodiverse C rich forests.
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Figure 1: Soil properties (i.e. soil organic carbon [SOC], black carbon [BC], total nitrogen [N], nitrate-nitrogen [NO3-N], phosphate-phosphorus [P], potassium [K], magnesium [Mg], acidity, cation exchange capacity [CEC] and water holding capacity [WHC]) and their change within 17 years after coppice harvest and burning of understorey re-growth (i.e. grey bars; with stand ages of 1, 2, 3.5, 6, 8, 11 and 17 years). The soil properties were compared to soil properties of beech forests (B), spruce forest (S), and spruce forest cultivated on formerly coppiced land (CS). Effect size of burning (coppice vs. non-coppiced forests) on soil properties is indicated by $\eta^2$-values that indicates how important (in percentage terms) burning is in explaining variations in the data sets. Small letters indicate significant differences between forest types (Kruskall Wallis test, $P<0.05$). SOC data are total SOC after correction for BC content.

Figure 2: Changing vegetation composition and plant community in a coppiced woodlands through time. Data are compared to vegetation surveyed in adjacent unmanaged beech forest (B), spruce forests (S), and spruce forest cultivated on formerly coppiced land (CS). Data are means ± the standard error (n=3). Solid, dashed and dotted lines indicate regression curves with the following coefficients of determination: $R^2_{\text{overstorey}}=0.71$ ($P=0.24$); $R^2_{\text{understorey}}=0.69$ ($P=0.09$); $R^2_{\text{ground}}=0.78$ ($P=0.05$); $R^2_{\text{diversity}}=0.77$ ($P=0.17$) and $R^2_{\text{evenness}}=0.72$ ($P=0.23$).

Figure 3: Absolute (Figure a) and relative C stocks (Figure b) and their change over 17 years after coppice harvest and burning in a coppice forest system. Relative C stocks were calculated by $(C_{\text{carbon pool}}/C_{\text{total carbon}})*100$. Carbon stocks were compared with adjacent mature beech forest (B), spruce forest (S), and spruce forest cultivated on formerly coppiced land (CS). Total carbon stocks are means ± the standard error (n = 3; see Table 1).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Forest type</th>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Location (UTM)</th>
<th>Vegetation</th>
<th>Stand age (years)</th>
<th>Stand origin</th>
<th>Stand management</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Coppice forest</td>
<td>C1</td>
<td>U32 427515, 5646316</td>
<td>Epilobio angustifolii-Digitalietum purpureae</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Coppice</td>
<td>Natural regeneration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C2</td>
<td>U32 427645, 5646177</td>
<td>Epilobio angustifolii-Digitalietum purpureae</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Coppice</td>
<td>Natural regeneration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C3</td>
<td>U32 427674, 5646137</td>
<td>Frangulo-Rubetum plicati</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>Coppice</td>
<td>Natural regeneration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C4</td>
<td>U32 427777, 5646061</td>
<td>Frangulo-Rubetum plicati</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Coppice</td>
<td>Natural regeneration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C5</td>
<td>U32 427672, 5646441</td>
<td>Calluno-Sarrothamnetum</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Coppice</td>
<td>Natural regeneration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C6</td>
<td>U32 427777, 5646254</td>
<td>Betulo pendulae-Quercetum roboris</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Coppice</td>
<td>Natural regeneration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C7</td>
<td>U32 427555, 5646834</td>
<td>Holco mollis-Quercetum</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>Coppice</td>
<td>Natural regeneration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coppice to spruce forest</td>
<td>CS1</td>
<td>U32 430418, 5647681</td>
<td>Dicranaceae-Spruce forest</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>Coppice</td>
<td>Thinned / single stem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CS2</td>
<td>U32 430857, 5648848</td>
<td>Dicranaceae-Spruce forest</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>Coppice</td>
<td>Thinned / single stem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CS3</td>
<td>U32 431223, 5648623</td>
<td>Dicranaceae-Spruce forest</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>Coppice</td>
<td>Thinned / single stem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spruce forest</td>
<td>S1</td>
<td>U32 431019, 5647147</td>
<td>Dicranaceae-Spruce forest</td>
<td>&gt;60</td>
<td>Spruce forest</td>
<td>Thinned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S2</td>
<td>U32 430962, 5647155</td>
<td>Dicranaceae-Spruce forest</td>
<td>&gt;60</td>
<td>Spruce forest</td>
<td>Thinned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S3</td>
<td>U32 431011, 5647111</td>
<td>Dicranaceae-Spruce forest</td>
<td>&gt;60</td>
<td>Spruce forest</td>
<td>Thinned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beech forest</td>
<td>B1</td>
<td>U32 429612, 5651532</td>
<td>Luzulo-Fagetum</td>
<td>&gt;60</td>
<td>Beech forest</td>
<td>Thinned / single stem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B2</td>
<td>U32 430576, 5652466</td>
<td>Luzulo-Fagetum</td>
<td>&gt;60</td>
<td>Beech forest</td>
<td>Thinned / single stem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B3</td>
<td>U32 430366, 5653275</td>
<td>Luzulo-Fagetum</td>
<td>&gt;60</td>
<td>Beech forest</td>
<td>Thinned / single stem</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2: Stand characteristics of studied coppice forests (C), spruce forest on formerly coppiced land (CS), spruce forest (S), and beech forest (B).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stand characteristics</th>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Coppice forest</th>
<th>Coppice to spruce forest</th>
<th>Spruce forest</th>
<th>Beech forest</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>C1</td>
<td>C2</td>
<td>C3</td>
<td>C4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overstorey</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stand density</td>
<td>no. ha⁻¹</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DBH</td>
<td>cm</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understorey</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stump density</td>
<td>no. ha⁻¹</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>366</td>
<td>333</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

† Geographic coordinate system: Universal Transverse Mercator (used receiver: GPS 72; Garmin Deutschland GmbH, Garching, Germany)
‡ Phytosociological classification (Schubert et al., 2001)
§ Stands at the open-air museum “Historischer Hauberg Fellinghausen”
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Branches per stump</th>
<th>no. stump⁻¹</th>
<th>25</th>
<th>20</th>
<th>14</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>-/-</th>
<th>-/-</th>
<th>-/-</th>
<th>-/-</th>
<th>-/-</th>
<th>-/-</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DBH</td>
<td>cm</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>-/-</td>
<td>-/-</td>
<td>-/-</td>
<td>-/-</td>
<td>-/-</td>
<td>-/-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stump density</td>
<td>no. ha⁻¹</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>1065</td>
<td>333</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>366</td>
<td>266</td>
<td>-/-</td>
<td>-/-</td>
<td>-/-</td>
<td>-/-</td>
<td>-/-</td>
<td>-/-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Branches per stump</td>
<td>no. stump⁻¹</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1 ‡</td>
<td>1 ‡</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-/-</td>
<td>-/-</td>
<td>-/-</td>
<td>-/-</td>
<td>-/-</td>
<td>-/-</td>
<td>-/-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DBH</td>
<td>cm</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>-/-</td>
<td>-/-</td>
<td>-/-</td>
<td>-/-</td>
<td>-/-</td>
<td>-/-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stump density</td>
<td>no. ha⁻¹</td>
<td>266</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>-/-</td>
<td>-/-</td>
<td>-/-</td>
<td>-/-</td>
<td>-/-</td>
<td>-/-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Branches per stump</td>
<td>no. stump⁻¹</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>-/-</td>
<td>-/-</td>
<td>-/-</td>
<td>-/-</td>
<td>-/-</td>
<td>-/-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DBH</td>
<td>cm</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>-/-</td>
<td>-/-</td>
<td>-/-</td>
<td>-/-</td>
<td>-/-</td>
<td>-/-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

† Banken et al. (2007), data shown as mean and their standard deviation

‡ Natural regeneration from seedlings

DBH diameter at breast height

n.a. not applicable – no tree in unit