ABSTRACT

Leaving buffer zones adjacent to waterways can effectively reduce the water quality concerns associated with timber harvesting. However, riparian areas are also some of the most productive sites and can yield high quality wood. The amount of unharvested timber left in SMZs (Streamside Management Zones) can represent a substantial opportunity cost to landowners. In this study we used computer simulation to integrate contemporary scientific data among disciplines to develop opportunity cost and ecological function protection tradeoffs that result from the implementation of alternative SMZ widths. We quantified the opportunity costs and ecological benefits of using different buffer zone widths. We used the principles of benefit/cost analysis to compare the results. Results suggest that benefit/cost ratios range from 5.89 to 1.49 depending on the buffer zone width, the species composition of the stand, and the logging technology used to harvest the timber. A literature review was used to score the ability of different buffers to protect riparian functions. Results show that to fully protect the riparian functions modeled, 45 meter buffers are needed. The study results should be of high interest to landowners, managers, loggers, land use planners, and other decision and policy makers who need to understand the opportunity costs and ecological benefits associated with implementing different widths of streamside management zones.
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INTRODUCTION

Streams, wetlands, and riparian areas are among our most valuable natural assets. From an ecological perspective, riparian zones are among the most productive wildlife habitats on the continent (Bisson and others 1987, Kentucky Department of Fish and Wildlife Resources 1990). In addition, riparian areas protect water quality and aquatic communities by reducing the amount of sediment entering the stream channel (Castelle and Johnson 2000), shading the stream channel from solar radiation (Brown and Krygier 1967), supplying organic material for food (Allan 1995), and contributing woody material that increases the hydraulic and structural complexity of the stream channel (Bisson and others 1987, Hilderbrand and others 1997). Removal of streamside vegetation during logging operations has been shown to increase the sediment load in the stream (Davies and Nelson 1994), increase water temperature (Brown and Krygier 1967), and change the food supply and condition of the habitat, altering the aquatic and riparian communities (Hawkins and others 1982, Hanowski and others 2002). Leaving buffer strips adjacent to waterways can effectively reduce the water quality concerns associated with timber harvesting.

Because of their ecological importance, the protection of riparian areas is a top priority for most state and federal conservation agencies (Blinn and others 2001). This goal is usually achieved by establishing streamside management zones (SMZs) adjacent to waterways and by adopting best management practices (BMPs), which are guidelines for locating haul roads, skid trails, log landings, and stream crossings. Recommendations for SMZs and BMPs vary among states (Huyler and LeDoux 1995, Shaffer and others 1998, Vasievich and Edgar 1998, Blinn and Kilgore 2001, Williams and others 2004) and are often voluntary. For example, a commonly suggested BMP includes no harvesting activities in 15–45m buffer strips adjacent to the waterway, sometimes with allowances for up to 50 percent removal of the volume of standing trees to leave an evenly spaced stand to protect the riparian function (LeDoux and others 1990, Phillips and others 2000).

Riparian areas also are some of the best sites for producing high quality wood products. The unharvested timber left in SMZs can represent a substantial opportunity cost to landowners (Shaffer and Aust 1993, Kilgore and Blinn 2003, LeDoux 2006). The opportunity costs are influenced by the species mix in the stand, by the logging technology used, the level of riparian protection desired (Peters and LeDoux 1984, LeDoux 2006), the stream network to be protected (Ice and others 2006), and the increasing proportion of isolated SMZ units within a watershed (Olsen and others 1987, University of Washington 1999). Simultaneous economic and environmental assessments have been reported addressing the consequences of alternative fuel management strategies (Mason and others 2003) and the layout and administration of fuel removal projects (Hauck and others 2005). Companion papers address the opportunity costs/capital recovery cost of managing for old growth forest conditions (LeDoux 2004), of alternative patch retention treatments (LeDoux and Whitman 2006), and of implementing streamside management guidelines in Eastern hardwoods (LeDoux 2006, Li et al 2006). In this study, we had two objectives:

1) to evaluate the opportunity costs of different SMZ protection options for two different stand types using four different logging technologies; and

2) to compare the opportunity costs with the ecological benefit of different SMZ widths using the principles of benefit/cost analysis.

The data and results summarized in this paper are borrowed heavily from LeDoux (2006) and LeDoux and Wilkerson (2006).

METHODS

Stand Data

The two 27.5-ha stands selected for this study were similar in age (120 years old), density, average diameter at breast height (d.b.h.), and volume. One stand represents a medium- to low- value species mix comprised predominately of yellow-poplar (*Liriodendron tulipifera* L.) with some red maple (*Acer rubrum* L.), black cherry (*Prunus serotina* Ehrh.), and sycamore (*Plantanus occidentalis* L.). This stand has 232 trees/ha, an average d.b.h. of 45.6cm, and a merchantable volume of 329m$^3$/ha. We refer to this stand as yellow-poplar or “YP.”

The second stand represents medium- to high-value mixed hardwood species comprised of yellow-poplar, American beech (*Fagus grandifolia* Ehrh.), shagbark hickory (*Carya ovata* (Mill.) K. Koch), black cherry, red maple,
cucumber tree (*Magnolia acuminata* L.), sugar maple (*Acer saccharum* Marsh.), red oak (*Quercus rubra* L.), white oak (*Quercus alba* L.), and eastern hemlock (*Tsuga canadensis* (L.) Carr.). This stand has 224 trees/ha, an average d.b.h. of 46.4 cm, and a merchantable volume of 341 m$^3$/ha. We refer to this stand as mixed hardwood or “MH.”

These stands were selected because of their similarities, availability of detailed tree measurements, and a relatively low and high value species mix level. These stands are typical of the eastern hardwood region of the United States. Both stands were subjected via computer simulation to the same even-aged silvicultural treatment, all merchantable timber was harvested.

**Logging Systems Evaluated**

Computer simulations of four logging systems were used in this study (Table 1). These logging systems were selected because we have robust time and motion study data for each and they represent contemporary methods being used by loggers to harvest eastern hardwood stands. Machine capacities were matched to the size of logs to be removed. Machine configurations are ranked by their per-unit operating cost, with the Ecologger I cable yarder being the most expensive and the Timbco 425 feller buncher with the Valmet forwarder being the least expensive. The per-unit operating cost for logging system combinations C and D are very similar, but reflect different on-the-ground operating conditions since logging technology D is mechanized.

**Models Used**

Two computer software models were used. The first model, ECOST (LeDoux 1985), estimated the stump-to-mill logging costs for the logging technology configurations (Table 1). ECOST is a computer program that can estimate the stump-to-mill costs of cable logging, conventional ground-based skidding, cut-to-length, feller-buncher applications, forwarding, and several small farm tractors for logging eastern hardwoods. Stand data were input into ECOST to develop simulated estimates of the stump-to-mill costs. The cost information within ECOST comes from time studies and simulations conducted over the years. The cost information is part of the model and is updated yearly. All costs are in 2005 U.S. dollars and reflect new equipment.

The second model, MANAGE-PC (LeDoux 1986) computer program, provides the volume yield and volume/product estimates. MANAGE-PC integrates harvesting technology, silvicultural treatments, market prices, and economics in a continuous manner over the life of the stand. The simulation is a combination of discrete and stochastic subroutines. Individual subroutines model harvesting activities, silvicultural treatments, growth and yield projections, market prices, and discounted present net worth (PNW) economic analysis. The model can be used to develop optimal economic management guidelines for eastern hardwoods. Stand data were entered into MANAGE-PC to provide volume/production yield estimates. The
Table 2. Delivered prices for sawlogs and fuelwood/pulpwood by species

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Species</th>
<th>Large(^a) sawlogs</th>
<th>Medium(^b) size sawlogs</th>
<th>Small(^c) sawlogs</th>
<th>Fuelwood(^d) / Pulpwood</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sugar maple</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Red maple</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sycamore</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American beech</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White oak</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yellow-poplar</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Red oak</td>
<td>238</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cucumber tree</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shagbark hickory</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hemlock</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black cherry</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{a}\)Minimum small-end diameter \(\geq 33.02 \text{ cm, length} \geq 3.05 \text{ m.}\)
\(^{b}\)Minimum small-end diameter \(\geq 27.44 \text{ cm, length} \geq 2.44 \text{ m.}\)
\(^{c}\)Minimum small-end diameter \(\geq 25.40 \text{ cm, length} \geq 2.44 \text{ m.}\)
\(^{d}\)Minimum small-end diameter \(\geq 10.16 \text{ cm that will not make large, medium, or small sawlogs.}\)

average delivered prices for sawlogs and pulpwood (Table 2) were obtained from forest products price bulletins (Ohio Agriculture Statistics Service 2007, Pennsylvania State University 2007, Tennessee Division of Forestry 2007, West Virginia University Division of Forestry 2007).

SMZ Protection Options

The stands were modeled identically and it was assumed they were bisected by a perennial stream (Fig. 1). Although riparian area cross-sections adjacent to streams can be quite variable, we assumed homogeneity of stand composition and consistent 20-25 percent sideslopes to simplify the simulations. The simulated harvesting plan removed timber from both sides of the stream to landings on truck haul roads located on both sides of the stream under the five SMZ treatment levels. SMZ protection options evaluated include:

1) no protection, harvest all 27.5ha without buffers;
2) unharvested 15m SMZ on both sides of the stream;
3) unharvested 30m SMZ on both sides of the stream;
4) unharvested 45m SMZ on both sides of the stream; and
5) a partially harvested 30m SMZ on both sides of the stream with approximately 50 percent of the timber volume removed from the SMZ.

Although commonly recommended riparian management zone guidelines call for partial volume removal (Blinn and Kilgore 2004), we wanted to evaluate the opportunity costs and ecological benefits for more restrictive treatments, such as options 3 and 4. For the no-protection option, we assumed that the operator could select where haul roads and skid trails would occur with no restrictions on soil distur-
We conducted a literature review to identify studies examining at least one of our five categories of riparian function. Studies with SMZ widths that did not correspond exactly to those used in our economic models were placed in the most logical category, while studies with large discrepancies in SMZ width or experimental design were excluded from this study. We found that few studies examined partial timber removal in SMZs (option 5 in this study) so this treatment was not evaluated for riparian protection. Research on the ecological assessment of SMZs does not exist in adequate quantities from a single region of the United States. To complete the analysis, we tried to focus on literature from the eastern United States, but as data was limited we included studies from other regions. The evaluation of SMZ protection was limited to no SMZ (option 1), and unharvested SMZs with widths of 15m, 30m, and 45m (options 2, 3, 4, respectively).

For each SMZ width (excluding the partial harvest treatment) we assessed the capacity of the SMZ to protect against post-harvest changes for each of the five categories of riparian function based on the following criterion: the SMZ does not protect the component resulting in large post-harvest changes (score = 0); SMZ results in moderate post-harvest changes (score = 1); SMZ results in small post-harvest changes (score = 2); or SMZ protects against measurable changes in the component (score = 3). Scores were determined by comparing the magnitude of change to other studies or other SMZ widths and the statistical significance/non-significance of post-harvest changes. Each SMZ width was given a numerical score (0-3) for each of the five categories of riparian function. An overall score for each SMZ width was calculated by summing the score of each category of riparian function. The overall scores had a minimum value of 0 and a maximum value of 15. The overall score was then converted into a percentage with 0 percent representing no protection of riparian functions.

Riparian Protection Score

The ecological functions of riparian zones are numerous and range from stabilizing near-stream soil (Castelle and Johnson 2000) to providing travel corridors for large terrestrial mammals (Klapproth and Johnson 2000). Quantifying the full range of physical and biological functions that occur within riparian areas would be a daunting task. In this study, we focused on the processes and biota that are easily measurable and strictly dependent on and/or unique to riparian zones. We limited the various functions of the modeled riparian forests to the following five categories:

1) coarse woody debris supply;
2) shade/temperature maintenance;
3) sediment filtering;
4) maintaining aquatic communities (macroinvertebrates and periphyton); and
5) maintaining habitat for riparian-associated passerine birds.
RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Gross revenues from timber cutting depended on stand composition and the volume of timber volume harvested. The gross income from the yellow-poplar stand ranged from $7,995/ha to $10,257/ha, while the gross revenue of timber from the mixed hardwood stand ranged from $10,084 to $12,931/ha (Fig. 2).

Logging costs, which varied with the equipment used, are deducted from the gross revenue of the timber harvest to determine net income. Harvesting costs for yellow-poplar range from $15.88 to $20.83/m³ and from $15.88 to $20.47/m³ for a mixed hardwood stand (Table 1). While logging costs are comparable between the two stands (Fig. 3), they represent a larger percentage of the gross revenue in the yellow-poplar stand because of a greater profit margin for the mixed hardwood stand.

Figure 2—Gross revenue by timber volume harvested from yellow-poplar and mixed hardwood stands.

(value of 0) and 100 percent representing complete protection against measurable changes in riparian functions creating conditions similar to undisturbed riparian areas (value of 15). Each SMZ protection option has a score ranging from 0 to 100 percent and represented the effectiveness of the SMZ in protecting riparian functions. It is hereafter referred to as the SMZ protection score. Although the structure within the SMZ changes over the 120-year rotation, our SMZ protection score described above is based on the immediate condition of the riparian area. The canopy cover may recover quickly even for the completely harvested unit however, large wood recruitment may take much longer where the unit is completely harvested but it may be shortened for the partial harvest options (Zobrist and others 2005). We did not consider changing SMZ protection score over the 120-year rotation because we simply do not have the necessary data.
Only the cost of the logging system was considered as a treatment in this study. Cable logging systems may reduce the roads and landings needed to harvest a tract thus reducing the potential for erosion and sediment production. Mechanized track mounted systems, such as the cut-to-length and the feller buncher with forwarder, may result in less soil disturbance and compaction, and thus reduce roading and landing area. In this study we did not address the physical or ecological impacts of alternative systems because we lack the necessary data. Undoubtedly, managers must consider logging system options when making decisions on SMZs.

SMZ Protection Options

Leaving no SMZ generated the most revenue (gross and net) to the landowner (Fig. 4a and 4b) by providing the largest volume of wood (Table 3) and gross revenues of $10,257 and $12,931/ha for the low value yellow-poplar stand (Fig. 4a) and high value mixed hardwood stand (Fig. 4b), respectively. The net revenue ranges from $3,415 to $5,048/ha for the yellow-poplar stand (Fig. 4a) and $5,903 to $7,546/ha for the mixed hardwood stand (Fig. 4b) depending on the logging technology.

Compared to leaving no SMZ, a 15m unharvested buffer on both sides of the stream removed 24m³/ha less wood from the yellow-poplar stand and 25m³/ha from the mixed hardwood stand (Table 3). This scenario grossed $754/ha less than leaving no SMZ for the yellow-poplar stand (Fig. 4a) and $949/ha less for the mixed hardwood stand (Fig. 4b). The difference in net revenue can be viewed as the opportunity cost for retaining that width of SMZ. The cost of maintaining 15m SMZ ranges from $252 to $370/ha (yellow-poplar stand, Fig. 5a) and $432 to $553/ha (mixed hardwood, Fig. 5b), depending on the logging technology.

Figure 3—Logging costs by volume removed for mixed hardwood and yellow-poplar stands for four different logging systems (see Table 1 for description of technologies used).
Table 3. Volume of timber harvested and retained for each protection option in the yellow-poplar and mixed hardwood stands.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Protection Option</th>
<th>Yellow-poplar</th>
<th>Mixed hardwood</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Volume</td>
<td>Volume</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Harvested</td>
<td>Retained</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No SMZ</td>
<td>328</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 m</td>
<td>304</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 m</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45 m</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 m with partial harvest</td>
<td>304</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Leaving a 30m SMZ on both sides of the stream removes $48\text{m}^3/\text{ha}$ and $50\text{m}^3/\text{ha}$ less merchantable wood than harvesting without an SMZ (Table 3) for the yellow-poplar and mixed hardwood stands, respectively. This level of SMZ protection decreases gross revenue from harvesting with no SMZ by $1,508/ha and $1,898/ha for the yellow-poplar (Fig. 4a) and mixed hardwood (Fig. 4b) stands, respectively. Leaving 30m buffers on both sides of the stream has a protection cost of $504 to $740/ha for yellow-poplar (Fig. 5a) and $864 to $1,106/ha for the mixed hardwood stand (Fig. 5b), depending on the logging technology.

A 45m SMZ on both sides of the stream removes $72 \text{m}^3/\text{ha}$ and $75 \text{m}^3/\text{ha}$ less merchantable timber for the yellow-poplar and mixed hardwood stand, respectively, as compared to harvesting with no SMZ (Table 3). Gross revenues decrease by $2,262/ha for yellow-poplar (Fig. 4a) and $2,847/ha for mixed hardwood (Fig. 4b) and protection costs range from $756 to $1,110/ha for yellow-poplar (Fig. 5a) and $1,296 to $1,659/ha for mixed hardwood (Fig. 5b) when compared to leaving no streamside buffer.

Removing 50 percent of the timber volume from a 30m SMZ results in removal of the same volume of timber as unharvested 15m buffers on both sides of the stream (Table 3). Compared to unharvested 30m buffers, harvesting 50 percent of the timber volume from the 30m SMZs can increase the gross revenue by $754/ha for yellow-poplar (Fig. 4a) and $949/ha for mixed hardwood (Fig. 4b) as well as decreasing the protection costs between $252 and $370/ha for yellow-poplar (Fig. 5a) and $432 and $553/ha for mixed hardwood (Fig. 5b).

Ecological Benefit

While maintaining SMZs represents a sizeable opportunity cost to the landowner, buffers provide a wide range of ecological benefits to riparian areas. SMZs that are too narrow cannot adequately protect all riparian functions, but...
Comparing Financial Costs with Ecological Benefits

Forest landowners are responsible for protecting water quality and maintaining riparian habitat for the public good, but they also have other objectives that may include making a return on their investments. The challenge for landowners is to find a balance between financial sacrifice and ecologic protection. To find this balance, we must consider that the revenue reductions attributed to SMZ protection occur only once—at the time of timber harvest—but the ecological benefits of SMZ protection accrue after the harvest and continue through the next rotation. To compare the current costs with future ecological benefits, a capital recovery factor can be calculated to convert revenue reductions to a series of uniform annual costs that begin at the time of harvest and extend through the next rotation. The capital recovery cost takes the protection costs of retaining an SMZ and, using a real interest rate of 4 percent, divides that cost into annual allotments. These calculations are the per-hectare cost to leave unnecessarily wide buffers produce an avoidable economic loss to the landowner (Castelle and Johnson 2000). The SMZ protection options (no SMZ, and unharvested 15m, 30m, 45m SMZs) resulted in varying levels of post-harvest change for the individual riparian functions (Table 4). The SMZ protection score increases with buffer width (Table 4). No SMZ results in a protection score of 0 percent; it did not protect any of the five categories of riparian function resulting in large changes following the harvest. A 15m SMZ has an SMZ protection score of 60 percent and a 30m SMZ has a protection score of 87 percent (Table 4). A 45m SMZ has a protection score of 100 percent; it protected against measurable changes in all five of the categories of riparian function (Table 4).

Benefit/Cost Analysis

We used the principle of benefit/cost ratios (Gregory 1972) to compare the ecological benefits with the opportunity costs. By comparing the capital recovery costs with the SMZ protection score, we can determine the benefit-cost ratio between ecological protection and SMZ width (Fig. 6a and 6b and Table 5). In summary:

• All B/C ratios were greater than or equal to 1. Thus, it is desirable to use SMZs.
• In all cases, B/C ratios are more robust for 15m SMZs.
• In all cases, B/C ratios are still very desirable for 30m SMZs
• B/C ratios, although still desirable for 45m SMZs, are not as robust as those from 15m and 30m SMZs, suggesting that the benefit produced is decreasing while costs are increasing.

SMZ protection scores increase with capital recovery costs for both stand types and all logging technologies. Harvesting without an SMZ leaves no
Table 4--SMZ protection scores for different SMZ widths for protecting against post-harvest changes in riparian functions for 2 to 4th order streams.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Riparian Function</th>
<th>No SMZ</th>
<th>15 m</th>
<th>30 m</th>
<th>45 m</th>
<th>References</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aquatic communities (macroinvertebrates and periphyton)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Newbold and others 1980, Noel and others 1986, Davies and Nelson 1994, Hetrick and others 1998, Kiffney and others 2003, Wilkerson and others in review&lt;sup&gt;3&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riparian bird communities (riparian associated passerines)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Triquet and others 1990, Whitaker and Monteverchi 1999, Pearson and Manuwal 2001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Score</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent SMZ effectiveness</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a</sup>Scoring: 0) Does not protect riparian function; 1) Results in moderate post-harvest changes in riparian function; 2) Results in small post-harvest changes in riparian function; 3) Completely protects against measurable changes in riparian function

<sup>3</sup>Wilkerson, Ethel; Hagan, John M.; Whitman, Andrew A. In review. The effectiveness of different buffer widths for protecting water quality and biotic communities of headwater streams in Maine. Freshwater Biology.
timber adjacent to the stream resulting in an SMZ protection score of 0 percent and no capital recovery costs. Retaining a 15m SMZ results in an SMZ protection score of 60 percent and costs between $10.18 and $14.95/ha/year for a yellow-poplar stand (Fig. 6a) and between $17.44 and $22.34/ha/year for a mixed hardwood stand (Fig. 6b), depending on the logging technology. A 30m SMZ results in an 87 percent SMZ protection score and cost between $20.36 and $29.90/ha/year (yellow-poplar, Fig. 6a) and between $34.88 and $44.68/ha/year (mixed hardwood, Fig. 6b). A 45m SMZ achieves a 100 percent riparian protection score but costs between $30.54 and $44.85/ha/year (yellow-poplar, Fig. 6a) and between $52.32 and $67.02/ha/year (mixed hardwood, Fig. 6b).

The relationship between increasing capital recovery costs and increasing SMZ protection score is not linear. This analysis shows that for SMZs wider than 15m, the rate of increasing SMZ protection begins to diminish while capital recovery costs continue to increase (Fig. 6a and 6b). Therefore, increasing streamside protection from a 15m SMZ to a 30m SMZ results in an increase in economic cost that is disproportional to the increase in ecological protection gained. However, if the goal is to completely protect riparian functions against measurable post-harvest changes (a 100 percent SMZ protection score), a 45m SMZ is required and landowners will pay an economic premium to achieve this level of protection. Although we could not calculate an SMZ protection score for the 30m partially harvested SMZ, the capital recovery costs are 50 percent less than the 30 m SMZ without timber removal. Landowners may choose partial removal of timber within the SMZ to reduce capital recovery costs while still maintaining a portion of riparian structure that can contribute to riparian function.

Considerations for Managers

Ultimately, landowners and managers and concerned public/outside interests must determine the appropriate balance between opportunity/capital recovery costs and SMZ protection. The level of riparian protection will vary between ownerships and even within different landscapes on a single ownership. On an ownership level, managers should consider state and local laws and BMPs, certification requirements, and their long-term strategies for
Figure 6--SMZ protection scores compared with capital recovery costs for the (a) yellow-poplar and (b) mixed hardwood stands under the four harvesting technologies. Symbols and lines represent different logging systems. SMZ protection scores are labeled on corresponding SMZ width (See Table 1 for description of technologies used).
maintaining and protecting fisheries and wildlife on their land base. At a smaller scale, managers should consider the slope and topography of the stand, the age class and disturbance history of the surrounding forests, and determine if there are species of special management concern within the watershed.

The decision on which logging system to use to harvest wood adjacent to and from within buffers requires careful consideration of the ecological functions that one wishes to protect. For example, cable logging systems usually require ridge top roads and landings, which may result in less erosion and sediment production. This could justify narrower buffer widths with partial volume removal if one was concerned with erosion and sediment production only. However, if the objective is to also provide habitat for breeding birds (Hanowski and others 2005), amphibians (Perkins and Hunter 2006) and use by some mammals, such as martens (Fuller and Harrison 2005), then wide (45m) buffers with no volume removed may be required.

Using computer simulations and the principles of benefit/cost analysis, we evaluated two stands, four logging technologies, five SMZ protection options, five riparian/ecological functions, a fixed real interest rate of 4 percent, and fixed market prices. The results reported here are specific to the conditions simulated and to the models and assumptions used and should not be generally inferred. However, the results provide an understanding of the costs and ecological benefits associated with alternative levels of SMZ protection.
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