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Systematic Review Revisited

• Part of riparian rule analysis (riparian alternatives supported by monitoring or science)

• Completed by ODF in 2013, most work completed by contractors

• Scope
  • Field-based studies
  • West of the crest of the Cascades, from northern California to southeast Alaska
    • Forest management effects on shade & temperature

• Data shown at coarse level – nuances (1 vs. 2 sided) not teased out
Backing into Option A – Basal area converted to no-cut distance

- Options A1,2 (80, 60 ft.2 total BA)
  - ≈20’ no-cut based on RipStream data
- Option A3 (160 ft.2 total BA)
  - ≈ 37’ no-cut based on RipStream data
• Options A1,2 (80, 60 ft.2 total BA)
• Option A3 (160 ft.2 total BA)
• Option B1, B (temp no-cut + var ret)
  • 50’ no-cut
  • 70’ no-cut
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PCW
Options A1-3, B: Minimize gaps in riparian area

• No studies were found evaluating this Rx
Option B: 4 years greenup

This was not part of SR review question, thus studies were not evaluated for this prescription
Option C: Sun-sided buffers

• Move ½ BA to sun side (gives conifer BA std. targets of 60 and 165-210 ft.²/1,000 on small and medium streams (20’ and 38-50’ no-cuts))

• One study (Dent & Walsh, 1997; Zwieniecki & Newton, 1999) with 3 sites that addressed this Rx

• Average harvest-related ΔT=0.5 deg. C

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Left buffer width (ft.)</th>
<th>Right buffer width (ft.)</th>
<th>Delta T (deg. C, 7-day Max.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cascade</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mill</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheele</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Dent & Walsh, 1997)