

# Managing the Water's Edge

## *Making Natural Connections*



### Problem Statement:

Despite significant research related to buffers, there remains no consensus as to what constitutes optimal riparian buffer design or proper buffer width for effective pollutant removal, water quality protection, prevention of channel erosion, provision of fish and wildlife habitat, enhancement of environmental corridors, augmentation of stream baseflow, and water temperature moderation.



**Our purpose in this document is to help protect and restore water quality, wildlife, recreational opportunities, and scenic beauty.**

This material was prepared in part with funding from the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency Great Lakes National Program Office provided through CMAP, the Chicago Metropolitan Agency for Planning.

## Introduction

Perhaps no part of the landscape offers more variety and valuable functions than the natural areas bordering our streams and other waters.

These unique “riparian corridor” lands help filter pollutants from runoff, lessen downstream flooding, and maintain stream baseflows, among other benefits. Their rich ecological diversity also provides a variety of recreational opportunities and habitat for fish and wildlife. Regardless of how small a stream, lake, or wetland may be, adjacent corridor lands are important to those water features and to the environment.

Along many of our waters, the riparian corridors no longer fulfill their potential due to the encroachment of agriculture and urban development. This publication describes common problems encountered along streamside and other riparian corridors, and the many benefits realized when these areas are protected or improved. It also explains what landowners, local governments, and other decision-makers can do to capitalize on waterfront opportunities, and identifies some of the resources available for further information. While much of the research examined here focuses on stream corridors, the ideas presented also apply to areas bordering lakes, ponds, and wetlands throughout the southern Lake Michigan area and beyond. This document was developed as a means to facilitate and communicate important and up-to-date general concepts related to riparian buffer technologies.

**Riparian corridors are unique ecosystems that are exceptionally rich in biodiversity**


## Contents

Introduction	2
What are Riparian Corridors? Riparian Buffers?	3
Beyond the Environmental Corridor Concept	5
Habitat Fragmentation—the Need for Corridors	8
Wider is Better for Wildlife	10
Maintaining Connections is Key	12
Basic Rules for Better Buffers	13
Creeks and Rivers Need to Roam Across the Landscape	14
Why Should You Care About Buffers?	15
A Matter of Balance	16
Case Study—Agricultural Buffers	17
Case Study—Urbanizing Buffers	18
Case Study—Urban Buffers	19
A Buffer Design Tool	20
Buffers are a Good Defense	21
Buffers Provide Opportunities	22
Summary	23
More to Come	24



## What Are Riparian Corridors? Riparian Buffer Zones?

The word riparian comes from the Latin word *ripa*, which means bank. However, in this document we use riparian in a much broader sense and refer to land adjoining any water body including ponds, lakes, streams, and wetlands. This term has two additional distinct meanings that refer to 1) the "natural or relatively undisturbed" corridor lands adjacent to a water body inclusive of both wetland and upland flora and fauna and 2) a buffer zone or corridor lands in need of protection to "buffer" the effects of human impacts such as agriculture and residential development.



The word buffer literally means something that cushions against the shock of something else (noun), or to lessen or cushion that shock (verb). Other useful definitions reveal that a buffer can be something that serves to separate features, or that is capable of neutralizing something, like filtering pollutants from stormwater runoff. Essentially, buffers and buffering help protect against adverse effects.

Riparian buffer zones function as core habitat as well as travel corridors for many wildlife species.

Riparian buffers are zones adjacent to waterbodies such as lakes, rivers, and wetlands that simultaneously protect water quality and wildlife, including both aquatic and terrestrial habitat. These zones minimize the impacts of human activities on the landscape and contribute to recreation, aesthetics, and quality of life. **This document summarizes how to maximize both water quality protection and conservation of aquatic and terrestrial wildlife populations using buffers.**






### What Are Riparian Corridors? Riparian Buffer Zones?

Buffers **can** include a range of complex vegetation structure, soils, food sources, cover, and water features that offer a variety of habitats contributing to diversity and abundance of wildlife such as mammals, frogs, amphibians, insects, and birds. Buffers can consist of a variety of canopy layers and cover types including ephemeral (temporary-wet for only part of year) wetlands/seasonal ponds/spring pools, shallow marshes, deep marshes, wetland meadows, wetland mixed forests, grasslands, shrubs, forests, and/or prairies. Riparian zones are areas of transition between aquatic and terrestrial ecosystems, and they can potentially offer numerous benefits to wildlife and people such as pollution reduction and recreation.

**In the water resources literature, riparian buffers are referred to in a number of different ways.** Depending on the focus and the intended function of a buffer, or a buffer-related feature, buffers may be referred to as stream corridors, critical transition zones, riparian management areas, riparian management zones, floodplains, or green infrastructure.

It is important to note that within an agricultural context, the term buffer is used more generally to describe filtering best management practices most often at the water's edge. Other practices which can be interrelated may also sometimes be called buffers. These include grassed waterways, contour buffer strips, wind breaks, field border, shelterbelts, windbreaks, living snow fence, or filter strips. These practices may or may not be adjacent to a waterway as illustrated in the photo to the right. For example, a grassed waterway is designed to filter sediment and reduce erosion and may connect to a riparian buffer. These more limited-purpose practices may link to multipurpose buffers, but by themselves, they are not adequate to provide the multiple functions of a riparian buffer as defined here.



### Beyond the Environmental Corridor Concept

The term “environmental corridors” (also known as “green infrastructure”) refers to an interconnected green space network of natural areas and features, public lands, and other open spaces that provide natural resource value. Environmental corridor planning is a process that promotes a systematic and strategic approach to land conservation and encourages land use planning and practices that are good for both nature and people. It provides a framework to guide future growth, land development, and land conservation decisions in appropriate areas to protect both community and natural resource assets.

Environmental corridors are an essential planning tool for protecting the most important remaining natural resource features in Southeastern Wisconsin and elsewhere. Since development of the environmental corridor concept, there have been significant advancements in landscape ecology that have furthered understanding of the spatial and habitat needs of multiple groups of organisms. In addition, advancements in pollutant removal practices, stormwater control, and agriculture have increased our understanding of the effectiveness and limitations of environmental corridors. In protecting water quality and providing aquatic and terrestrial habitat, there is a need to better integrate new technologies through their application within riparian buffers.



SEWRPC has embraced and applied the environmental corridor concept developed by Philip Lewis (Professor Emeritus of Landscape Architecture at the University of Wisconsin-Madison) since 1966 with the publication of its first regional land use plan. Since then, SEWRPC has refined and detailed the mapping of environmental corridors, enabling the corridors to be incorporated directly into regional, county, and community plans and to be reflected in regulatory measures. The preservation of environmental corridors remains one of the most important recommendations of the regional plan. Corridor preservation has now been embraced by numerous county and local units of government as well as by State and Federal agencies. The environmental corridor concept conceived by Lewis has become an important part of the planning and development culture in Southeastern Wisconsin.



## Beyond the Environmental Corridor Concept

Environmental corridors are divided into the following three categories.


- **Primary environmental corridors** contain concentrations of our most significant natural resources. They are at least 400 acres in size, at least two miles long, and at least 200 feet wide.
- **Secondary environmental corridors** contain significant but smaller concentrations of natural resources. They are at least 100 acres in size and at least one mile long, unless serving to link primary corridors.
- **Isolated natural resource areas** contain significant remaining resources that are not connected to environmental corridors. They are at least five acres in size and at least 200 feet wide.



### Key Features of Environmental Corridors

- Lakes, rivers, and streams
- Undeveloped shorelands and floodlands
- Wetlands
- Woodlands
- Prairie remnants
- Wildlife habitat
- Rugged terrain and steep slopes
- Unique landforms or geological formations
- Unfarmed poorly drained and organic soils
- Existing outdoor recreation sites
- Potential outdoor recreation sites
- Significant open spaces
- Historical sites and structures
- Outstanding scenic areas and vistas

## Beyond the Environmental Corridor Concept




The Minimum Goals of **75** within a Watershed

**75%** minimum of total stream length should be naturally vegetated to protect the functional integrity of the water resources.

(Environment Canada, How Much Habitat is Enough? A Framework for Guiding Habitat Rehabilitation in Great Lakes Areas of Concern, Second Edition, 2004)

**75 foot** wide minimum riparian buffers from the top edge of each stream bank should be naturally vegetated to protect water quality and wildlife. (SEWRPC Planning Report No 50, A Regional Water Quality Management Plan for the Greater Milwaukee Watersheds, December 2007)

Example of how the environmental corridor concept is applied on the landscape. For more information see "Plan on It!" series **Environmental Corridors: Lifelines of the Natural Resource Base** at <http://www.sewrpc.org/SEWRPC/LandUse/EnvironmentalCorridors.htm>



Environmental corridor concept expanded to achieve the Goals of 75. Note the expanded protection in addition to the connection of other previously isolated areas.



## Habitat Fragmentation—The Need for Corridors

Southeastern Wisconsin is a complex mosaic of agricultural and urban development. Agricultural lands originally dominated the landscape and remain a major land use. However, such lands continue to be converted to urban uses. Both of these dominant land uses fragment the landscape by creating islands or isolated pockets of wetland, woodland, and other natural lands available for wildlife preservation and recreation. By recognizing this fragmentation of the landscape, we can begin to mitigate these impacts.

**New developments should incorporate water quality and wildlife enhancement or improvement objectives** as design criteria by looking at the potential for creating linkages with adjoining lands and water features.

**At the time of conversion of agricultural lands to urban uses, there are opportunities to re-create and expand riparian buffers and environmental corridors** reconnecting uplands and waterways and restoring ecological integrity and scenic beauty locally and regionally. For example, placement of roads and other infrastructure across stream systems could be limited so as to maximize continuity of the riparian buffers. This can translate into significant cost savings in terms of reduced road maintenance, reduced salt application, and limited bridge or culvert maintenance and replacements. This simple practice not only saves the community significant amounts of money, but also improves and protects quality of life. Where necessary road crossings do occur, they can be designed to provide for safe fish and wildlife passage.



**Overland travel routes for wildlife are often unavailable, discontinuous, or life endangering within the highly fragmented landscapes of Southeastern Wisconsin and elsewhere.**




State Threatened Species: Blanding's turtle



## Habitat Fragmentation—The Need for Corridors

Forest understory plant species abundance among stands throughout Southern Wisconsin



**Forest fragmentation has led to significant plant species loss within Southern Wisconsin**

*(Adapted from David Rogers and others, 2008, Shifts in Southern Wisconsin Forest Canopy and Understory Richness, Composition, and Heterogeneity, Ecology, 89 (9): 2482-2492)*


**"...these results confirm the idea that large intact habitat patches and landscapes better sustain native species diversity. It also shows that people are a really important part of the system and their actions play an increasingly important role in shaping patterns of native species diversity and community composition. Put together, it is clear that one of the best and most cost effective actions we can take toward safeguarding native diversity of all types is to protect, enhance and create corridors that link patches of natural habitat."**

Dr. David Rogers, Professor of Biology at the University of Wisconsin-Parkside

Since the 1950s, forests have increasingly become more fragmented by land development, both agricultural and urban, and associated roads and infrastructure, which have caused these forests to become isolated "islands of green" on the landscape. In particular, there has been significant loss of forest understory plant species over time (shrubs, grasses, and herbs covering the forest floor.) It is important to note that **these forests lost species diversity even when they were protected as parks or natural areas.**

One major factor responsible for this decline in forest plant diversity is


that routes for native plants to re-colonize isolated forest islands are largely cut-off within fragmented landscapes. For example, the less fragmented landscapes in Southwestern Wisconsin lost fewer species than the more fragmented stands in Southeastern Wisconsin. In addition, the larger-sized forests and forests with greater connections to surrounding forest lands lost fewer species than smaller forests in fragmented landscapes.





## Wider is Better for Wildlife

**Why?** Because buffer size is the engine that drives important natural functions like food availability and quality, access to water, habitat variety, protection from predators, reproductive or resting areas, corridors to safely move when necessary, and help in maintaining the health of species' gene pools to prevent isolation and perhaps extinction.



**One riparian buffer size does not fit all conditions or needs.** There are many riparian buffer functions and the ability to effectively fulfill those functions is largely dependent on width. Determining what buffer widths are needed should be based on what functions are desired as well as site conditions. For example, as shown above, water temperature protection generally does not require as wide a buffer as provision of habitat for wildlife. Based on the needs of wildlife species found in Wisconsin, the minimum core habitat buffer width is about 400 feet and the optimal width for sustaining the majority of wildlife species is about 900 feet. Hence, the value of large undisturbed parcels along waterways which are part of, and linked to, an environmental corridor system. The minimum effective buffer width distances are based on data reported in the scientific literature and the quality of available habitats within the context of those studies.



## Wider is Better for Wildlife

Wildlife habitat needs change within and among species. **Minimum Core Habitat and Optimum Core Habitat distances were developed from numerous studies to help provide guidance for biologically meaningful buffers to conserve wildlife biodiversity.** These studies documented distances needed for a variety of biological (life history) needs to sustain healthy populations such as breeding, nesting, rearing young, foraging/feeding, perching (for birds), basking (for turtles), and overwintering/dormancy/hibernating. These life history needs require different types of habitat and distances from water, for example, one study found that Blanding's turtles needed approximately 60-foot-wide buffers for basking, 375 feet for overwintering, and up to 1,200 feet for nesting to bury their clutches of eggs. Some species of birds like the Blacked-capped chickadee or white breasted nuthatch only need about 50 feet of buffer, while others like the wood duck or great blue heron require




Although *Ambystoma* salamanders require standing water for egg laying and juvenile development, most other times of the year they can be found more than 400 feet from water foraging for food.

700-800 feet for nesting. Therefore, **understanding habitat needs for wildlife species is an important consideration in designing riparian buffers.**

Wisconsin Species	Minimum Core Habitat (feet)	Optimum Core Habitat (feet)	Number of Studies
Frogs	571	1,043	9
Salamanders	394	705	14
Snakes	551	997	5
Turtles	446	889	27
Birds	394	787	45
Mammals	263	No data	11
Fishes and Aquatic Insects	100	No data	11
Mean	388	885	

This approach was adapted from *R.D. Semlitsch and J.R. Bodie, 2003, Biological Criteria for Buffer Zones around Wetlands and Riparian Habitats for Amphibian and Reptiles, Conservation Biology, 17(5):1219-1228.* These values are based upon studies examining species found in Wisconsin and represent mean linear distances extending outward from the edge of an aquatic habitat. The Minimum Core Habitat and Optimum Core Habitat reported values are based upon the mean minimum and mean maximum distances recorded, respectively. Due to a low number of studies for snake species, the recommended distances for snakes are based upon values reported by *Semlitsch and Bodie.*





**"Large patches typically conserve a greater variety and quality of habitats, resulting in higher species diversity and abundance."** Larger patches contain greater amounts of interior habitat and less edge effects, which benefits interior species, by providing safety from parasitism, disease, and invasive species.

(Bentrop, G. 2008. *Conservation buffers: design guidelines for buffers, corridors, and greenways.* Gen. Tech. Rep. SRS-109. Asheville, NC: Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Southern Research Station)



## Maintaining Connections is Key

Like humans, all forms of wildlife require access to clean water. Emerging research has increasingly shown that, in addition to water, more and more species such as amphibians and reptiles cannot persist without landscape connectivity between quality wetland and upland habitats. Good connectivity to upland terrestrial habitats is essential for the persistence of healthy sustainable populations, because these areas provide vital feeding, overwintering, and nesting habitats found nowhere else. Therefore, both aquatic and terrestrial habitats are essential for the preservation of biodiversity and they should ideally be managed together as a unit.



Increasing connectivity among quality natural landscapes (wetlands, woodlands, prairies) can benefit biodiversity by providing access to other areas of habitat, increasing gene flow and population viability, enabling recolonization of patches, and providing habitat (Bentrop 2008).



## Basic Rules to Better Buffers

Protecting the integrity of native species in the region is one objective shared by all communities. The natural environment is an essential component of our existence and contributes to defining our communities and neighborhoods. Conservation design and open space development patterns in urbanizing areas and farm conservation programs in rural areas have begun to address the importance of maintaining and restoring riparian buffers and connectivity among corridors.

**How wide should the buffer be?** Unfortunately, there is no one-size-fits all buffer width adequate to protect water quality, wildlife habitat, and human needs. Therefore, the answer to this question depends upon the predetermined needs of the landowner and community objectives or goals.

As riparian corridors become very wide, their pollutant removal (buffering) effectiveness may reach a point of diminishing returns compared to the investment involved. However, the prospects for species diversity in the corridor keep increasing with buffer width. For a number of reasons, 400- to 800-foot-wide buffers are not practical along all lakes, streams, and wetlands within Southeastern Wisconsin. Therefore, communities should develop guidelines that remain flexible to site-specific needs to achieve the most benefits for water resources and wildlife as is practical.

There are opportunities to improve buffer functions to improve water quality and wildlife habitat, even in urban situations




- Channelized ditch
- Historic floodplain fill
- Invasive species dominate

- Meandered stream
- Reconnected floodplain
- Wetland diversity added
- Native species restored

### Key considerations to better buffers/corridors:

- Wider buffers are better than narrow buffers for water quality and wildlife functions
- Continuous corridors are better than fragmented corridors for wildlife
- Natural linkages should be maintained or restored
- Linkages should not stop at political boundaries
- Two or more corridor linkages are better than one
- Structurally diverse corridors (e.g., diverse plant structure or community types, upland and wetland complexes, soil types, topography, and surficial geology) are better than corridors with simple structures
- Both local and regional spatial and temporal scales should be considered in establishing buffers
- Corridors should be located along dispersal and migration routes.
- Corridors should be located and expanded around rare, threatened, or endangered species
- Quality habitat should be provided in a buffer whenever possible.
- Disturbance (e.g. excavation or clear cutting vegetation) of corridors should be minimized during adjacent land use development
- Native species diversity should be promoted through plantings and active management
- Non-native species invasions should be actively managed by applying practices to preserve native species
- Fragmentation of corridors should be reduced by limiting the number of crossings of a creek or river where appropriate.
- Restoration or rehabilitation of hydrological function, streambank stability, instream habitat, and/or floodplain connectivity should be considered within corridors.
- Restoration or retrofitting of road and railway crossings to promote passage of aquatic organisms.

## Creeks and Rivers Need to Roam Across the Landscape



Much of Southeastern Wisconsin's topography is generally flat with easily erodible soils, and therefore, dominated by low gradient stream systems. These streams meander across the landscape, forming meander belts that are largely a function of the characteristics of the watershed draining to that reach of stream. For watersheds with similar landcovers, as watershed size increases so does the width of the meander belt.

It is not uncommon for a stream in Southeastern Wisconsin to migrate more than 1 foot within a single year!

**Healthy streams naturally meander or migrate across a landscape over time.** Streams are transport systems for water and sediment and are continually eroding and depositing sediments, which causes the stream to migrate. When the amount of sediment load coming into a stream is equal to what is being transported downstream—and stream widths, depths, and length remain consistent over time—it is common to refer to that stream as being in a state of **"dynamic equilibrium."** In other words the stream retains its physical dimensions (equilibrium), but those physical features are shifted, or migrate, over time (dynamic).

**Room to Roam**

Riparian buffer widths should take into account the amount of area that a stream needs to be able to self-adjust and maintain itself in a state of dynamic equilibrium. ... These are generally greater than any minimum width needed to protect for pollutant removal alone.



**Streams are highly sensitive, and they respond to changes** in the amounts of water and sediment draining to them, which are affected by changing land use conditions. For example, streams can respond to increased discharges of water by increased scour (erosion) of bed and banks that leads to an increase in stream width and depth—or "degradation." Conversely, streams can respond to increased sedimentation (deposition) that leads to a decrease in channel width and depth—or "aggradation."



## Why Should You Care About Buffers?

### Economic Benefits:

- Increased value of riparian property
- Reduced lawn mowing time and expense
- Increased shade to reduce building cooling costs
- Natural flood mitigation protection for structures or crops
- Pollution mitigation (reduced nutrient and contaminant loading)
- Increased infiltration and groundwater recharge
- Prevented loss of property (land or structures) through erosion
- Greater human and ecological health through biodiversity



### Recreational Benefits:

- Increased quality of the canoeing/kayaking experience
- Improved fishing and hunting quality by improving habitat
- Improved bird watching/wildlife viewing quality and opportunities
- Increased potential for expansion of trails for hiking and bicycling
- Opportunities made available for youth and others to locally reconnect with nature


**Riparian buffers make sense and are profitable monetarily, recreationally, and aesthetically!**

### Social Benefits:

- Increased privacy
- Educational opportunities for outdoor awareness
- Improved quality of life at home and work
- Preserved open space/balanced character of a community
- Focal point for community pride and group activities
- Visual diversity
- Noise reduction



## A Matter of Balance



Although neatly trimmed grass lawns are popular, these offer limited benefits for water quality or wildlife habitat. A single house near a waterbody may not seem like a “big deal,” but the cumulative effects of many houses can negatively impact streams, lakes, and wetlands.

**All the lands within Southeastern Wisconsin ultimately flow into either the Mississippi River or the Great Lakes systems. The cumulative effects of agriculture and urban development in the absence of mitigative measures, ultimately affects water quality in those systems.** Much of this development causes increases in water runoff from the land into wetlands, ponds, and streams. This runoff transports water, sediments, nutrients, and

other pollutants into our waterways that can lead to a number of problems, including flooding that can cause crop loss or building damage; unsightly and/or toxic algae blooms; increased turbidity; damage to aquatic organisms from reduced dissolved oxygen, lethal temperatures, and/or concentrations of pollutants; and loss of habitat.

Riparian buffers are one of the most effective tools available for defending our waterways. Riparian buffers can be best thought of as forming a living, self-sustainable protective shield. This shield protects investments in the land and all things on it as well as our quality of life locally, regionally, and, ultimately, nationally. Combined with stormwater management, environmentally friendly yard care, effective wastewater treatment, conservation farming methods, and appropriate use of fertilizers and other agrichemicals, **riparian buffers complete the set of actions that we can take to minimize impacts to our shared water resources.**

Lakeshore buffers can take many forms, which require a balancing act between lake viewing, access, and scenic beauty. Lakeshore buffers can be integrated into a landscaping design that complements both the structural development and a lakeside lifestyle. Judicious placement of access ways and shoreline protection structures, and preservation or reestablishment of native vegetation, can enhance and sustain our use of the environment.






## Case Study—Agricultural Buffers

Agricultural nonpoint source pollution runoff continues to pose a threat to water quality and aquatic ecosystems within Wisconsin and elsewhere. In an effort to address this problem, the Wisconsin Buffer Initiative was formed with the goal of designing a buffer implementation program to achieve science-based, cost-effective, water quality improvements (report available online at <http://www.soils.wisc.edu/extension/nonpoint/wbi.php>).

While it is true that riparian buffers alone may not always be able to reduce nutrient and sediment loading from agricultural lands, WBI researchers found that **"...riparian buffers are capable of reducing large percentages of the phosphorus and sediment that are currently being carried by Wisconsin streams. Even in watersheds with extremely high loads (top 10%), an average of about 70% of the sediment and phosphorus can be reduced through buffer implementation."** (Diebel, M.J. and others, 2009, *Landscape planning for agricultural nonpoint source pollution reduction III: Assessing Phosphorus and sediment reduction potential*, *Environmental Management*, 43:69-83.).

Federal and state natural resource agencies have long recognized the need to apply a wide range of Best Management Practices on agricultural lands to improve stream water quality. Although there are many tools available in the toolbox to reduce pollutant runoff from agricultural lands, such as crop rotations, nutrient and manure management, conservation tillage, and contour plowing, riparian buffers are one

of the most effective tools to accomplish this task. Their multiple benefits and inter-connectedness from upstream to downstream make riparian buffers a choice with watershed-wide benefits.



The USDA in *Agroforestry Notes* (AF Note-4, January 1997) outlines a four step process for designing riparian buffers for Agricultural lands:

- 1-Determine what buffers functions are needed
- 2-Identify the best types of vegetation to provide the needed benefits
- 3-Determine the minimum acceptable buffer width to achieve desired benefits
- 4-Develop an installation and maintenance plan

### Challenge:

Buffers may take land out of cultivated crop production and require additional cost to install and maintain. Cost sharing, paid easements, and purchase of easements or development rights may sometimes be available to offset costs.

### Benefits:

Buffers may offset costs by producing perennial crops such as hay, lumber, fiber, nuts, fruits, and berries. In addition, they provide visual diversity on the landscape, help maintain long-term crop productivity, and help support healthier fish populations for local enjoyment.



Drain tiles can bypass infiltration and filtration of pollutants by providing a direct pathway to the water and "around" a buffer. This is important to consider in design of a buffer system which integrates with other agricultural practices.

## Case Study—Urbanizing Area Buffers

When development occurs near a water-body, the area in driveways, rooftops, sidewalks, and lawns increases, while native plants and undisturbed soils decrease. As a result, the ability of the shoreland area to perform its natural functions (flood control, pollutant removal, wildlife habitat, and aesthetic beauty) is decreased. In the absence of mitigating measures, one the consequences of urban development is an increase in the amount of stormwater, which runs off the land instead of infiltrating into the ground. Therefore, **urbanization impacts the watershed, not only by reducing groundwater recharge, but also by changing stream hydrology** through increased stormwater runoff volumes and peak flows. This means less water is available to sustain the baseflow regime. The urban environment also contains increased numbers of pollutants and generates greater pollutant concentrations and loads than any other land use. This reflects the higher density of the human population and associated activities, which demand measures to protect the urban water system.


Mitigation of urban impacts may be as simple as not mowing along a stream corridor or changing land management and yard care practices, or as complex as changing zoning ordinances or widening riparian corridors through buyouts.

**Challenge:**

**Urban development requires balancing flood protection, water quality protection, and the economic viability of the development.**

**Opportunities:**

Buffers may offset costs by providing adequate space for providing long-term water quantity and water quality protection. In addition, they provide visual diversity on the landscape, wildlife habitat and connectedness, and help maintain property values.



### Anatomy of an urban riparian buffer

**The most effective urban buffers have three zones:**

- Outer Zone**-Transition area between the intact buffer and nearest permanent structure to capture sediment and absorb runoff.
- Middle Zone**-Area from top of bank to edge of lawn that is composed of natural vegetation that provides wildlife habitat as well as improved filtration and infiltration of pollutants.
- Streamside Zone**-Area from the water's edge to the top of the bank or uplands that provides critical connection between water, wetland, and upland habitats for wildlife as well as protect streams from bank erosion

*(Fact sheet No. 6 Urban Buffer in the series Riparian Buffers for Northern New Jersey )*



## Case Study—Urban Buffers

**Placement of riparian buffers in established urban areas is a challenge that requires new and innovative approaches.** In these areas, historical development along water courses limits options and requires balancing flood management protection versus water quality and environmental protection needs. Consequently, some municipalities have begun to recognize the connections between these objectives and are introducing programs to remove flood-prone structures and culverts from the stream corridors and allow recreation of the stream, restoring floodplains, and improving both the quality of life and the environment.




In urban settings it may be necessary to limit pollution and water runoff before it reaches the buffer.

### Challenge:

There are many potential constraints to establishing, expanding, and/or managing riparian buffers within an urban landscape. Two major constraints to establishment of urban buffers include:

- 1) **Limited or confined space to establish buffers** due to encroachment by structures such as buildings, roadways, and/or sewer infrastructure;
- 2) **Fragmentation of the landscape** by road and railway crossings of creeks and rivers that disrupt the linear connectedness of buffers, limiting their ability to provide quality wildlife habitat.

Much traditional stormwater infrastructure intercepts runoff and diverts it directly into creeks and rivers, bypassing any benefits of buffers to infiltrate or filter pollutants. This is important to consider in design of a buffer system for urban waterways, which begin in yards, curbsides, and construction sites, that are figuratively as close to streams as the nearest storm sewer inlet.




## A Buffer Design Tool

**Design aids are needed to help municipalities, property owners, and others take the “guesswork” out of determining adequate buffer widths** for the purpose of water resource quality protection. While there are various complex mathematical models that can be used to estimate sediment and nutrient removal efficiencies, they are not easily applied by the people who need them including homeowners, farmers, businesses and developers.

To fill this gap, design aid tools are being developed using factors such as slope, soils, field length, incoming pollutant concentrations, and vegetation to allow the user to identify and test realistic buffer widths with respect to the desired percent pollutant load reduction and storm characteristics. By developing a set of relationships among factors that determine buffer effectiveness, the width of buffer needed to meet specific goals can be identified.

In the example below, 50-foot-wide buffers are necessary to achieve 75 % sediment removal during small, low intensity storms, while buffers more than 150 feet wide are necessary to achieve the same sediment reduction during more severe storms. Based on this information, decision-makers have the option of fitting a desired level of sediment removal into the context of their specific conditions. Under most conditions, a 75-foot width will provide a minimum level of protection for a variety of needs (SEWRPC PR No. 50, Appendix O.)



This generalized graph depicts an example of model output for an optimal buffer width to achieve a 75% sediment reduction for a range of soil and slope, vegetation, and storm conditions characteristic of North Carolina. (Adapted from Muñoz-Carpena R., Parsons J.E.. 2005. VFSMOD-W: Vegetative Filter Strips Hydrology and Sediment Transport Modeling System v.2.x. Homestead, FL: University of Florida. <http://carpena.ifas.ufl.edu/vfsmmod>.)



## Buffers Are A Good Defense

Today's natural resources are under threat. These threats are immediate as in the case of chemical accidents or manure spills, and chronic as in the case of stormwater pollution carrying everything from eroded soil, to fertilizer nutrients, to millions of drips from automobiles and other sources across the landscape. Non-native species have invaded, and continue to invade, key ecosystems and have caused the loss of native species and degradation of their habitats to the detriment of our use of important resources.

A more subtle, but growing, concern is the case of stresses on the environment resulting from climate change. Buffers present an opportunity for natural systems to adapt to such changes by providing the space to implement protective measures while also serving human needs. **Because riparian buffers maintain an important part of the landscape in a natural condition, they offer opportunities for communities to adjust to our changing world.**

Well-managed riparian buffers are a good defense against these threats. In combination with environmental corridors, buffers maintain a sustainable reserve and diversity of habitats, plant and animal populations, and genetic diversity of organisms, all of which contribute to the long-term preservation of the landscape. Where they are of sufficient size and connectivity, riparian buffers act as reservoirs of resources that resist the changes that could lead to loss of species.

**"Riparian ecosystems are naturally resilient, provide linear habitat connectivity, link aquatic and terrestrial ecosystems, and create thermal refugia for wildlife: all characteristics that can contribute to ecological adaptation to climate change."**

*(N. E. Seavy and others, Why Climate Change Makes Riparian Restoration More Important Than Ever: Recommendations for Practice and Research, 2009, Ecological Restoration 27(3):330-338)*



Northern Pike



Longear Sunfish

**Refuge or protection from increased water temperatures as provided by natural buffers is important** for the preservation of native cold-water, cool-water, and warm-water fishes and their associated communities.



Lake Sturgeon



Brook Trout

## Buffers Provide Opportunities



**River, lake, and wetland systems and their associated riparian lands form an important element of the natural resource base, create opportunities** for recreation, and contribute to attractive and well-balanced communities. These resources can provide an essential avenue for relief of stress among the population and improve quality of life in both urban and rural areas. Such uses also sustain industries associated with outfitting and supporting recreational and other uses of the natural environment, providing economic opportunities. Increasing access and assuring safe use of these areas enhances public awareness and commitment to natural resources. Research has shown that property values are higher adjoining riparian corridors, and that such natural features are among the most appreciated and well-supported parts of the landscape for protection.



**We demand a lot from our riparian buffers!**

Sustaining this range of uses requires our commitment to protect and maintain them.





## Summary

The following guidance suggestions highlight key points to improve riparian corridor management and create a more sustainable environment.

**Riparian corridors or buffers along our waters may contain varied features,** but all are best preserved or designed to perform multiple important functions.

**Care about buffers because of their many benefits.** Riparian buffers make sense and are profitable monetarily, recreationally, aesthetically, as well as environmentally.

**Enhance the environmental corridor concept.** Environmental corridors are special resources which deserve protection. They serve many key riparian corridor functions, but in some cases, could also benefit from additional buffering.

**Avoid habitat fragmentation of riparian corridors.** It is important to preserve and link key resource areas, making natural connections and avoiding habitat gaps.

**Employ the adage “wider is better” for buffer protection.** While relatively narrow riparian buffers may be effective as filters for certain pollutants, that water quality function along with infiltration of precipitation and runoff and the provision of habitat for a host of species will be improved by expanding buffer width where feasible.

**Allow creeks and rivers room to roam across the landscape.** Streams are dynamic and should be buffered adequately to allow for natural movement over time while avoiding problems associated with such movement.

**Consider and evaluate buffers as a matter of balance.** Riparian buffers are a living, self-sustainable shield that can help balance active use of water and adjoining resources with environmental protection.

**Agricultural buffers can provide many benefits.** Riparian buffers in agricultural settings generally work well, are cost-effective, and can provide multiple benefits, including possibly serving as areas to raise certain crops.

**Urban buffers should be preserved and properly managed.** Though often space-constrained and fragmented, urban buffers are important remnants of the natural system. Opportunities to establish or expand buffers should be considered, where feasible,, complemented by good stormwater management, landscaping, and local ordinances, including erosion controls.

**A buffer design tool is needed and should be developed.** Southeastern Wisconsin and the Southern Lake Michigan Basin would benefit from development of a specific design tool to address the water quality function of buffers. Such a tool would improve on the currently available general guidance on dimensions and species composition.

**Buffers are a good defense.** Combined with environmental corridors, riparian buffers offer a good line of defense against changes which can negatively impact natural resources and the landscape.

# Managing the Water's Edge

## MORE TO COME

Future editions in a riparian buffer planning series are being explored with the intent on focusing on key elements of this critical land and water interface. Topics may include:

- Information sharing and development of ordinances to integrate riparian buffers into existing land management plans and programs
- Integration of stormwater management practices and riparian buffer best management practices
- Application of buffers within highly constrained urban corridors with and without brownfield development
- Installation of buffers within rural or agricultural lands being converted to urban uses
- Utilization of buffers in agricultural areas and associated drainage systems
- Integration of riparian buffers into environmental corridors to support resources preservation, recreation and aesthetic uses
- Preservation of stream courses and drainageways to minimize maintenance and promote protection of infrastructure
- Guidance for placement or removal of infrastructure such as dams and road crossings, to balance transportation, recreation, aesthetic, property value, and environmental considerations.
- Protection of groundwater recharge and discharge areas
- Protection of high quality, sensitive coastal areas, including preservation of recreational potential

## MORE INFORMATION

Visit our website at [www.sewrpc.org](http://www.sewrpc.org) for more information, periodic updates, and a list of complementary publications.

\* \* \*

This publication may be printed without permission and is available from the Southeastern Wisconsin Regional Planning Commission,  
W239 N1812 Rockwood Drive, Waukesha, WI, 53187-1607.



Staff Acknowledgements:

Principal Author: Tom Slawski, PhD, Principal Planner

Michael Hahn, P.E., P.H., Chief Environmental Engineer

Laura Kletti, P.E, Principal Engineer

Gary Korb, Regional Planning Educator, UW-Extension/SEWRPC

Ed Schmidt, GIS Planning Specialist

Mike Scott, GIS Application Specialist

Sara Teske, Research Analyst

Jeff Thornton, PhD, Principal Planner





## Riparian Buffer Series MANAGING THE WATER'S EDGE MAKING NATURAL CONNECTIONS

<http://www.sewrpc.org/SEWRPC/Environment.htm>

### Reference Guide

*This document categorizes and lists all of the citations used in the development of the abovereferenced booklet. Many of the references listed below could have been cited in multiple categories, however, each reference was only place in one category in an attempt to provide a general organization of this large body of literature.*

#### SCIENCE-WATER QUALITY

##### Review/Design/Theory

Beier, P. and Noss, R., 1998. Do Habitat Corridors Provide Connectivity? *Conservation Biology* 12(6):1241-1252.  
[http://tongass-fpadjust.net/Documents/Beir\\_Noss\\_corridors.pdf](http://tongass-fpadjust.net/Documents/Beir_Noss_corridors.pdf)

Brown, M., Schaefer, J., and Brandt, K., 1990. Buffer Zones for Water, Wetlands, and Wildlife in East Central Florida. Report prepared for the East Central Florida Regional Planning Council. CFW Publ. #89-07.  
<http://www.cfw.ufl.edu/pdfs/Brown,Schaefer,Brandt.1990.CFW-89-07.pdf>

Castelle, A.J., Johnson, A.W. and Conolly, C., 1994. Wetland and Stream Buffer Size Requirement – A Review. *Journal of Environmental Quality* 23:878-882.  
[http://www.newjersey.gov/drbc/Flood\\_Website/FRES/WendelgassBuffer\\_publications.pdf](http://www.newjersey.gov/drbc/Flood_Website/FRES/WendelgassBuffer_publications.pdf)

Center for Watershed Protection. 1995. The Architecture of Urban Stream Buffers. *Watershed Protection Techniques* 1(4):155-163.  
[http://www.marc.org/Environment/Water/pdfs/Setback\\_Ordinances/ArchitectureUrbanStreamBuffers.pdf](http://www.marc.org/Environment/Water/pdfs/Setback_Ordinances/ArchitectureUrbanStreamBuffers.pdf)

Correll, D.L., 1996. Buffer Zones and Water Quality Protection: General Principles. Buffer Zones: Their Processes and Potential in Water Protection. The Proceedings of the International Conference on Buffer Zones: 7-20.  
<http://www.riparianbuffers.umd.edu/manuals/correll.html>

Correll, D.L., 1998. The Role of Phosphorus in the Eutrophication of Receiving Waters: A Review. *Journal of Environmental Quality* 27 (2):261-266.  
<http://www.esf.edu/efb/mitchell/Class%20Readings/JouEnvQua.27.261.266.pdf>

Davis, R., 1993. Evaluating and Designing Riparian Corridors for Water Quality. p. 89 in Mitchell, J.K. (ed.) 1993. *Integrated Risk Management*. Proceedings American Society of Agricultural Engineers, Dec. 13-14, 1993. Chicago, IL.  
NO LINK FOUND

Dosskey, M.G., Schultz, D., and Isenhart, T., 1997. USDA Forest Service Rocky Mountain Station, USDA Natural Resources Conservation Service. *Agroforestry Notes* 3: Riparian Buffers for Agricultural Land. AF Note—3.  
<http://www.unl.edu/nac/agroforestrynotes/an03rfb02.pdf>

- Dosskey, M.G., Schultz, D., and Isenhardt, T., 1997. USDA Forest Service Rocky Mountain Station, USDA Natural Resources Conservation Service. Agroforestry Notes 4: How to Design a Riparian Buffer for *Agricultural Land*. AF Note—4.  
<http://www.unl.edu/nac/agroforestrynotes/an04rfb03.pdf>
- Dosskey, M.G., Schultz, D., and Isenhardt, T., 1997. USDA Forest Service Rocky Mountain Station, USDA Natural Resources Conservation Service. Agroforestry Notes 5: A Riparian Buffer Design for Cropland. AF Note—5.  
<http://www.unl.edu/nac/agroforestrynotes/an05rfb04.pdf>
- Dosskey, M.G., Helmers, M.J., and Eisenhauer, D.E., 2008. A Design Aid for Determining Width of Filter Strips. *Journal of Soil and Water Conservation* 63(4):232-241.  
<http://www.unl.edu/nac/research/2008bufferwidth.pdf>
- Dwire, K. and Lowrance, R.R., 2006. Riparian Ecosystems and Buffers – Multiscale Structure, Function, and Management: Introduction. *Journal of the American Water Resources Association* 42(1):1-4.  
[http://www.fs.fed.us/rm/pubs\\_other/rmrs\\_2006\\_dwire\\_k001.pdf](http://www.fs.fed.us/rm/pubs_other/rmrs_2006_dwire_k001.pdf)
- Evans, R., Gilliam, W., 2006. U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. Region 4: Nonpoint Source. Riparian Buffers and Controlled Drainage Evaluation.  
<http://h2o.enr.state.nc.us/nps/ripbuf97.pdf>
- Fischer, R.A. and Fischenich, J.C., 2000. Design Recommendations for Riparian Corridors and Vegetated Buffer Strips. EMRRP Technical Notes Collection (ERDC TN-EMRRP-SR-24), U.S. Army Engineer Research and Development Center, Vicksburg, MS.  
<http://dnr.wi.gov/org/water/wm/dsfm/shore/documents/sr24.pdf>
- Fox, G. and Sabbagh, G., 2009. Letter to the Editor. Comment on “Major Factors Influencing the Efficacy of Vegetated Buffers on Sediment Trapping: A Review and Analysis,” by Xingmei Liu, Xuyang Zhang, and Minghua Zhang in *Journal of Environmental Quality* 2008 37:1667-1674. *American of Environmental Quality* 38:1-3.  
<http://abe.ufl.edu/carpena/files/pdf/software/vfsmod/CommentOnMajorFactorsInfluencingTheEfficacy.pdf>
- Gregory, S., Swanson, F., McKee, A., and Cummins, K., 1991 An Ecosystem Perspective of Riparian Zones. Focus on Links between Land and Water. *Bioscience* 41(8):540-549.  
<http://a-s.clayton.edu/jboudell/BIOL4500/Gregory%20et%20al.-Riparian%20zones.pdf>
- Jackson, C.R., 2006. Considerations in Prescribing Riparian Buffer Widths with Emphasis on Georgia Warmwater Streams. Warnell School of Forest Resources, University of Georgia, Athens, GA. Attachment G: <http://www.historicboulevard.com/information/brickyardcreek/HiawasseeReport3-24-06.pdf>
- Johnson, L., Richards, C., Host, G., and Arthur, J., 1997. Landscape Influences on Water Chemistry in Midwestern Stream Ecosystems. *Freshwater Biology* 37(1):193-208.  
<http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1046/j.1365-2427.1997.d01-539.x/abstract>
- Jorgensen, E., Canfield, T., and Mayer, P., 2002. U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. Advances in Restoration Science, Number 1: Research Needs in Riparian Buffer Restoration. Cincinnati, OH: National Risk Management Research Laboratory.  
[http://www.epa.gov/nrmrl/pubs/600s02002/epa\\_600\\_s02\\_002.pdf](http://www.epa.gov/nrmrl/pubs/600s02002/epa_600_s02_002.pdf)
- Kline, M. and Dolan, K., 2008. Fluvial Geomorphic-Based Methodology to Reduce Flood Hazards and Protect Water Quality. Vermont Agency of Natural Resources River Corridor Protection Guide.  
[http://www.vtwaterquality.org/rivers/docs/rv\\_RiverCorridorProtectionGuide.pdf](http://www.vtwaterquality.org/rivers/docs/rv_RiverCorridorProtectionGuide.pdf)



- Mayer, P., Reynolds, S., and Canfield, T., 2005. Riparian Buffer Width, Vegetative Cover, and Nitrogen Removal Effectiveness: A Review of Current Science and Regulations. Cincinnati, OH: National Risk Management Research Laboratory.  
<http://www.epa.gov/nrmrl/pubs/600R05118/600R05118.pdf>
- Moore, R.D., 2005. Small Stream Channels and Their Riparian Zones in Forested Catchments of the Pacific Northwest: Introduction. *Journal of the American Water Resources Association* 41(4):759-761.  
<http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/j.1752-1688.2005.tb03769.x/abstract>
- Munoz-Carpena, R., Parsons, J., and Gilliam, J.W., 1999. Modeling Hydrology and Sediment Transport in Vegetative Filter Strips. *Journal of Hydrology* 214:111-129.  
[http://abe.ufl.edu/carpena/files/pdf/publications/refereed\\_articles/ModelingHydrologyAndSedimentTransport.pdf](http://abe.ufl.edu/carpena/files/pdf/publications/refereed_articles/ModelingHydrologyAndSedimentTransport.pdf)
- Osmond, D., Gilliam, J., and Evans, R. 2002. "Riparian Buffers: What Are They and How Do They Work?" Riparian Buffers and Controlled Drainage to Reduce Agricultural Nonpoint Source Pollution, North Carolina Agricultural Research Service Technical Bulletin 318, North Carolina State University, Raleigh, NC. 7-21.  
[www.soil.ncsu.edu/publications/BMPs/buffers.html](http://www.soil.ncsu.edu/publications/BMPs/buffers.html)
- Paerl, H., 1993. Emerging Role of Atmospheric Nitrogen Deposition in Coastal Eutrophication: Biogeochemical and Trophic Perspectives. *Canadian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Sciences* 50(10):2254-2269.  
<http://www.nrcresearchpress.com/doi/abs/10.1139/f93-251>
- Poletika, N., Coody, P., Fox, G., Sabbagh, G., Dolder, S., White, J., 2009. Chlorpyrifos and Atrazine Removal from Runoff by Vegetated Filter Strips: Experiments and Predictive Modeling. *Journal of Environmental Quality* 38:1042-1052.  
<https://www.crops.org/publications/jeq/pdfs/38/3/1042>
- Rupprecht, R., Kilgore, C., and Gunther, R., 2009. Riparian and Wetland Buffers for Water-Quality Protection: A Review of Current Literature. *Journal of Stormwater Quality Professionals*.  
<http://www.stormh2o.com/november-december-2009/riparian-wetland-buffers.aspx>
- Sabbagh, G.J., Fox, G.A., Kamanzi, A., Roepke, B., and Tang, J.Z., 2009. Effectiveness of Vegetative Filter Strips in Reducing Pesticide Loading: Quantifying Pesticide Trapping Efficiency. *Journal of Environmental Quality* 38:762-771.  
<https://www.soils.org/publications/jeq/articles/38/2/762>
- Schultz, R.C., Colletti, J.P., Isenhardt, T.M., Simpkins, W.W., Mize, C.W., and Thompson, M.L., 1995. Design and Placement of a Multi-Species Riparian Buffer Strip. *Agroforestry Systems* 29:201-225.  
<http://www.buffer.forestry.iastate.edu/Research/HTML/abstracts/design.htm>
- Schwartz, S. and Houser, D. 2006. Riparian Setbacks: Technical Information for Decision Makers. Chagrin River Watershed Partners, Inc.  
[http://www.crrwp.org/pdf\\_files/riparian\\_setback\\_paper\\_jan\\_2006.pdf](http://www.crrwp.org/pdf_files/riparian_setback_paper_jan_2006.pdf)
- Shisler, J.K., Jordan, R.A., Wargo, R.N., 1987. Coastal Wetland Buffer Delineation. New Jersey Department of Environmental Protection.  
NO LINK FOUND
- Todd, A. and Phoenix, L., Editors. 2008. Riparian Ecosystems and Buffers. *Water Resources Impact*. 10(3).  
[http://www.awra.org/impact/issues/0805imp\\_toc.pdf](http://www.awra.org/impact/issues/0805imp_toc.pdf)

Tomer, M., Dosskey, M., Burkart, M., James, D., Helmers, M., and Eisenhauer, D., 2009. Methods to Prioritize Placement of Riparian Buffers for Improved Water Quality. *Agroforestry Systems* 75:17-25.  
<http://www.springerlink.com/content/p316k56221171003/fulltext.pdf>

Understanding Our Streams and Rivers: Are Minnesota Streams Healthy? St. Paul, MN: Minnesota Department of Natural Resources.  
[http://files.dnr.state.mn.us/publications/waters/understanding\\_our\\_streams\\_and\\_rivers.pdf](http://files.dnr.state.mn.us/publications/waters/understanding_our_streams_and_rivers.pdf)

Ward, A., Mecklenburg, D., Mathews, J., and Farver, D., 2002. Sizing Stream Setbacks to Help Maintain Stream Stability. ASAE Meeting Paper No. 022239. St. Joseph, Michigan: ASAE.  
<http://nemo.osu.edu/pdf/sizingstream.pdf>

Ward, A., Moore, M., Bouchard, V., Powell, K., Mecklenburg, D., Cooper, C., and Smith, S., 2004. Water Quality Benefits of Grassed Fluvial Features in Drainage Ditches. In: Proceedings of the 4th International Hydroscience Engineering Conference. May 30-June 3, 2004, Brisbane, Australia. p. 63-65.  
[http://www.ars.usda.gov/research/publications/publications.htm?SEQ\\_NO\\_115=161281](http://www.ars.usda.gov/research/publications/publications.htm?SEQ_NO_115=161281)

Welsch, D., 1991. Riparian Forest Buffers: Function and Design for Protection and Enhancement of Water Resources. U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Northeastern Area State and Private Forestry. Publication NA-PR-07-91. Randor, PA.  
[http://www.na.fs.fed.us/spfo/pubs/n\\_resource/buffer/cover.htm](http://www.na.fs.fed.us/spfo/pubs/n_resource/buffer/cover.htm)

Wenger, S., 1999. A Review of the Scientific Literature on Riparian Buffer Width, Extent, and Vegetation. Office of Public Service & Outreach Institute of Ecology University of Georgia. Athens, GA.  
[http://www.rivercenter.uga.edu/service/tools/buffers/buffer\\_lit\\_review.pdf](http://www.rivercenter.uga.edu/service/tools/buffers/buffer_lit_review.pdf)

Wong, S.L.W. and McCuen, R.H., 1982. The Design of Vegetative Buffer Strips for Runoff and Sediment Control. A Technical Paper Developed As Part of a Study of Stormwater Management in Coastal Areas Funded by Maryland Coastal Zone Management Program.  
REMOVED FROM WEBSITE – NOTHING OLDER THAN 2000

#### **Water Quality/Pollutant Removal/Modeling/Nutrients**

Angier, J. and McCarty, G., 2008. Variations in Base-Flow Nitrate Flux in a First-Order Stream and Riparian Zone. *Journal of American Water Resources Association* 44(2):367-380.  
<http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/j.1752-1688.2007.00153.x/abstract>

Blakney, C., and Kavassalis, C., 2001-2004. BioMuncie.Org. "Land Contamination".  
<http://www.biomuncie.org/Land%20Contamination.htm>

Borin, M. and Bigon, E., 2002. Abatement of NO<sub>3</sub>-N concentration in Agricultural Waters by Narrow Buffer Strips. *Environmental Pollution* 117(1):165-168.  
<http://www.ingentaconnect.com/content/els/02697491/2002/00000117/00000001/art00142>

Brusch, W. and Nilsson, B., 1993. Nitrate Transformation and Water Movement in a Wetland Area. *Hydrobiologia*. 251:103-111.  
NO LINK FOUND

Burns, D.A. and Nguyen, L., 2002. Nitrate Movement and Removal along a Shallow Groundwater Flow Path in a Riparian Wetland within a Sheep-Grazed Pastoral Catchment: Results of a Tracer Study. *New Zealand Journal of Marine and Freshwater Research* 36:371-385.  
<http://ny.water.usgs.gov/pubs/jrn/ny0168/jrn02-ny0168.pdf>



- Cey, E.E., Rudolph, D.L., Aravena, R., and Parkin, G., 1999. Role of the Riparian Zone in Controlling the Distribution and Fate of Agricultural Nitrogen near a Small Stream in Southern Ontario. *Journal of Contaminant Hydrology* 37(1-2):45-67.  
<http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/journal/01697722/37/1-2>
- Clausen, J.C., Guillard, K., Sigmund, C.M., and Dors, K.M., 2000. Water Quality Changes from Riparian Buffer Restoration in Connecticut. *Journal of Environmental Quality* 29(6):1751-1761, 2000.  
<https://www.agronomy.org/publications/jeq/abstracts/29/6/JEQ0290061751>
- Correll, D., 1999. Vegetated Stream Riparian Zones: Their Effects on Stream Nutrients, Sediments, and Toxic Substances. An Annotated and Indexed Bibliography of the World Literature Including Buffer Strips, and Interactions with Hyporheic Zones and Floodplains. Smithsonian Environmental Research Center. Edgewater, Maryland, USA.  
[http://www.puyallup.wsu.edu/agbuffers/pdf/vegetated\\_stream\\_riparian\\_zones.pdf](http://www.puyallup.wsu.edu/agbuffers/pdf/vegetated_stream_riparian_zones.pdf)
- Craig, S. Palmer, M., Richardson, D. Filoso, S., Bernhardt, E., Bledsoe, B., Doyle, M., Groffman, P., Hasett, B., Kaushal, S., Mayer, P., Smith, S., and Wilcock, P., 2008. Stream Restoration Strategies for Reducing River Nitrogen Loads. *Frontiers in Ecology and the Environment* 6(10):529-538.  
[http://palmerlab.umd.edu/restoration\\_course\\_docs/2008resources/Craig\\_et\\_al\\_2008.pdf](http://palmerlab.umd.edu/restoration_course_docs/2008resources/Craig_et_al_2008.pdf)
- Dabney, S., Moore, M., and Martin, L., 2006. Integrated Management of In-Field, Edge-of-Field, and After-Field Buffers. *Journal of the American Water Resources Association* 42(1):15-24.  
<http://nationalorganiccoalition.org/dabneystudy.pdf>
- Dillaha, T.A., Reneau, R.B., Mostaghimi, S., and Lee, D., 1989. Vegetative Filter Strips for Agricultural Nonpoint Source Pollution Control. *Transactions of the American Society of Agricultural Engineers* 32(2):513-519.  
<http://asae.frymulti.com/abstract.asp?aid=31033&t=1>
- Dillaha, T.A., Sherrard, J.H., Lee, D., Mostaghimi, S., and Shanholtz, V.O., 1988. Evaluation of Vegetative Filter Strips as a Best Management Practice for Feed Lots. *Journal of the Water Pollution Control Federation* 60(7):1231-1238.  
<http://www.jstor.org/action/doBasicSearch?Query=Evaluation+of+Vegetative+Filter+Strips&acc=off&wc=on>
- Doyle, R.C., Stanton, G.C., and Wolf, D.C., 1977. Effectiveness of Forest and Grass Buffer Strips in Improving the Water Quality of Manure Polluted Runoff. *American Society of Agricultural Engineers Paper*, 77-2501. St. Joseph, MI.  
<http://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/showciting?jsessionid=1699C4CA8BC8DC6D8A9C823600BEB884?cid=218363>
- Francy, D., Myers, D., and Metzker, K., 1993. *Escherichia Coli* and Fecal-Coliform Bacteria as Indicators of Recreational Water Quality. U.S. Geological Survey. Water-Resources Investigations Report 93-4083, Columbus, Ohio  
<http://oh.water.usgs.gov/reports/Abstracts/wrir.93-4083.html>
- Ghaffarzadeh, M., Robinson, C.A., and Cruse, R.M., 1994. Vegetative Filter Strip Effects on Sediment Deposition from Overland Flow. *Agronomy Abstracts* 324.  
NO LINK FOUND
- Hanson, G.C., Groffman, P.M., and Gold, A.J., 1994. Symptoms of Nitrogen Saturation in a Riparian Wetland. *Ecological Applications* 4(4):750-756.  
<http://www.uri.edu/cels/nrs/whl/Publications/Journals/Hanson%20ecol%20applications.pdf>

- Haycock, N.E. and Pinay, G., 1993. Groundwater Nitrate Dynamics in Grass and Poplar Vegetated Riparian Buffer Strips during the Winter. *Journal of Environmental Quality* 22(2):273-278.  
<https://www.agronomy.org/publications/jeq/abstracts/22/2/JEQ0220020273>
- Haycock, N.E., Groffman, P.M., and Gold, A.J., 1993. Role of Floodplain Sediments in Reducing the Nitrate Concentration of Subsurface Run-Off: A Case Study in the Cotswolds, UK. *Hydrological Processes* 7(3):287-295.  
<http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1002/hyp.3360070306/abstract>
- Hefting, M.M. and de Klein, J.M., 1998. Nitrogen Removal in Buffer Strips along a Lowland Stream in the Netherlands: A Pilot Study. *Environmental Pollution* 102:S1:521-526.  
<http://cat.inist.fr/?aModele=afficheN&cpsidt=1696832>
- Hill, A.R., Devito, K., Campagnolo, S., and Sanmugadas, K., 2000. Subsurface Denitrification in a Forest Riparian Zone: Interactions between Hydrology and Supplies of Nitrate and Organic Carbon. *Biogeochemistry* 51:193-223.  
<http://www.springerlink.com/content/q5t6q00519772368/>
- Horner, R.R. and Mar, B.W., 1982. Guide for Water Quality Impact Assessment of Highway Operations and Maintenance. Washington Department of Transportation. Publication Number: WA-RD 39.14.  
<http://www.wsdot.wa.gov/research/reports/fullreports/039.14.pdf>
- Hubbard, R.K. and Lowrance, R.R., 1997. Assessment of Forest Management Effects on Nitrate Removal by Riparian Buffer Systems. *Transactions of the American Society of Agricultural Engineers* 40(2):383-391.  
<http://asae.frymulti.com/abstract.asp?aid=21283&t=1>
- Hubbard, R.K. and Sheridan, J.M., 1989. Nitrate Movement to Groundwater in the Southeastern Coastal Plain. *Journal of Soil and Water Conservation* 44(1):20-27.  
<http://www.jswconline.org/content/44/1/20.short>
- Hunt, P.G., Matheny, T.A., and Ro, K.S., 2007. Nitrous Oxide Accumulation in Soils from Riparian Buffers of a Coastal Plain Watershed-Carbon/Nitrogen Ratio Control. *Journal of Environmental Quality* 36:1368-1376.  
<https://www.agronomy.org/publications/jeq/articles/36/5/1368?highlight=JmFydGlibGVfeWVhcj0yMDA3JnE9cmlwYXJpYW4rTlIrYnVmZmVycyZsZW49MTAmc3RhcncQ9MSZzdGVtPWZhbHNIJnNvcnQ9JmZhY2V0LWpvdXJuYWw9JTlyamVxJTly>
- Inamdar, S., 2006. Challenges in Modeling Hydrologic and Water Quality Processes in Riparian Zones. *Journal of the American Water Resources Association* 42(1):5-14.  
<http://udel.edu/~inamdar/papers/JAWRA2006.pdf>
- Jacobs, T.C. and Gilliam, J.W., 1985. Riparian Losses of Nitrate from Agricultural Drainage Waters. *Journal of Environmental Quality* 14(4):472-478.  
<https://www.soils.org/publications/jeq/abstracts/14/4/JEQ0140040472>
- James, W.F., Smith, C., Barko, J., and Field, S., 1995. Direct and Indirect Influences on Aquatic Macrophyte Communities on Phosphorus Mobilization from Littoral Sediments of an Inlet Region in Lake Delavan, Wisconsin. U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Technical Report W-95-2.  
LISTED IN USCOE LIBRARY, BUT NO WEB LINK
- Jordan, T.E., Correll, D.L., and Weller, D.E., 1993. Nutrient Interception by a Riparian Forest Receiving Inputs from Adjacent Cropland. *Journal of Environmental Quality* 22(3):467-473.  
<https://www.soils.org/publications/jeq/abstracts/22/3/JEQ0220030467>



- Kim, I.-J., Hutchinson, S., Hutchenson, J.M., and Young, C.B., 2007. Riparian Ecosystem Management Model: Sensitivity to Soil, Vegetation, and Weather Input Parameters. *Journal of the American Water Resources Association* 43(5):1171-1182.  
<http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/j.1752-1688.2007.00096.x/abstract>
- Lowrance, R.R., 1992. Groundwater Nitrate and Denitrification in a Coastal Plain Riparian Forest. *Journal of Environmental Quality* 21(3):401-405.  
<https://www.soils.org/publications/jeq/abstracts/21/3/JEQ0210030401>
- Lowrance, R.R., Altier, L.S., Newbold, J.D., Schnabel, R.R., Groffman, P.M., Denver, J.M., Correll, D.L., Gilliam, J.W., Robinson, J.L., Brinsfield, R.B., Staver, K.W., Lucas, W., and Todd, A.H., 1997. Water Quality Functions of Riparian Forest Buffer Systems in Chesapeake Bay Watersheds. *Environmental Management* 21:687-712.  
<http://nepis.epa.gov/Exe/ZyNET.exe/50000NPG.txt?ZyActionD=ZyDocument&Client=EPA&Index=1995%20Thru%201999&Docs=&Query=903R95004&Time=&EndTime=&SearchMethod=1&TocRestrict=n&Toc=&TocEntry=&QField=pubnumber%5E%22903R95004%22&QFieldYear=&QFieldMonth=&QFieldDay=&UseQField=pubnumber&IntQFieldOp=1&ExtQFieldOp=1&XmlQuery=&File=D%3A%5CZYFILES%5CINDE X%20DATA%5C95THRU99%5CTXT%5C0000003%5C50000NPG.txt&User=ANONYMOUS&Password=anonymous&SortMethod=h%7C-&MaximumDocuments=10&FuzzyDegree=0&ImageQuality=r75g8/r75g8/x150y150g16/i425&Display=p%7Cf&DefSeekPage=x&SearchBack=ZyActionL&Back=ZyActionS&BackDesc=Results%20page&MaximumPages=1&ZyEntry=1&SeekPage=x>
- Lowrance, R.R., Todd, R.L., and Asmussen, L.E., 1984. Nutrient Cycling in an Agricultural Watershed: I. Phreatic Movement. *Journal of Environmental Quality* 13(1):22-27.  
<https://www.agronomy.org/publications/jeq/abstracts/13/1/JEQ0130010022>
- Lowrance, R.R., Todd, R.L., Fail Jr., J., Hendrickson Jr., O., Leonard, R., and Asmussen, L. 1984. Riparian Forests As Nutrient Filters in Agricultural Watersheds. *BioScience* 34(6):374-377.  
<http://www.cpes.peachnet.edu/sewrl/Papers/riparian.pdf>
- Lynch, J., Corbett, E., and Mussaliem, K., 1985. Best Management Practices for Controlling Nonpoint Source Pollution of Forested Watersheds. *Journal of Soil and Water Conservation* 40(1):164-167.  
<http://www.jswconline.org/content/40/1/164.abstract>
- Madison, C.E., Blevins, R.L., Frye, W.W., and Barfield, B.J., 1992. Tillage and Grass Filter Strip Effects upon Sediment and Chemical Losses. *Agronomy Abstracts*, 331.  
<http://www.lib.msu.edu/cgi-bin/flink.pl?recno=27346>
- Magette, W.L., Brinsfield, R.B., Palmer, R.E., and Wood, J.D., 1989. Nutrient and Sediment Removal by Vegetated Filter Strips. *Transactions of the American Society of Agricultural Engineers* 32(2):663-667.  
<http://asae.frymulti.com/abstract.asp?aid=31054&t=2>
- Mander, U., 2006. Presentation: Efficiency of Riparian Buffer Zones. Institute of Geography, University of Tartu, Vanemuise 46, 51014 Tartu, Estonia.  
<http://www.ruoko.fi/uploads/pdf/UloMander1.pdf>
- Mankin, K., Ngandu, D., Barden, C., Hutchinson, S., and Geyer, W., 2007. Grass-Shrub Riparian Buffer Removal of Sediment Phosphorus, and Nitrogen from Simulated Runoff. *Journal of American Water Resources Association* 43(5):1108-1116.  
<http://www.gpsaf.unl.edu/GPPubs/GrassShrubBufSed.pdf>

- Martin, T.L., Cook, S., Nduhiu, J.W., Kaushik, N.K., and Whiteley, H.R., 1999. Groundwater Nitrate Concentrations in the Riparian Zones of Two Southern Ontario Streams. *Canadian Water Resources Journal* 24(2):125-138.  
<http://pubs.cwra.org/doi/pdf/10.4296/cwrj2402125>
- Matteo, M., Randhir, T., and Bloniarz, D., 2006. Watershed-Scale Impacts of Forest Buffers on Water Quality and Runoff in Urbanizing Environment. *Journal of Water Resources Planning and Management* 132(3):144-152.  
<http://biology.wsc.ma.edu/Biol516/files/matteo%20et%20al%202006%20forest%20riparian%20effects.pdf>
- Mayer, P., Reynolds, S., and Canfield, T., 2005. Riparian Buffer Width, Vegetative Cover, and Nitrogen Removal Effectiveness: A Review of Current Science and Regulations, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Office of Research and Development, National Risk Management Research Laboratory, EPA/600/R-05/118.  
<http://www.epa.gov/nrmrl/pubs/600R05118/600R05118.pdf>
- Moe, P.G., Mannering, J.V., and Jonson, C.B., 1968. A Comparison of Nitrogen Losses from Urea and Ammonium Nitrate in Surface Runoff Water. *Soil Science* 105(6):428-433.  
[http://journals.lww.com/soilsci/Citation/1968/06000/A\\_Comparison\\_of\\_Nitrogen\\_Losses\\_From\\_Urea\\_and.8.aspx](http://journals.lww.com/soilsci/Citation/1968/06000/A_Comparison_of_Nitrogen_Losses_From_Urea_and.8.aspx)
- Neibling, W.H. and Alberts, E.E., 1979. Composition and Yield of Soil Particles Transported through Sod Strips. American Society of Agricultural Engineers Paper No. 79-2065, St. Joseph, Michigan.  
NO LINK FOUND
- Osbourne, L.L. and Kovacic, D.A., 1993. Riparian Vegetated Buffer Strips in Water Quality Restoration and Stream Management. *Freshwater Biology* 29(2):243-258.  
<http://lshs.tamu.edu/docs/lshs/end-notes/Riparian%20vegetated%20buffer%20strips%20in%20water-quality%20restor-0588496923/Riparian%20vegetated%20buffer%20strips%20in%20water-quality%20restoration%20and%20stream%20management..pdf>
- Peterjohn, W.T. and Correll, D.L., 1984. Nutrient Dynamics in an Agricultural Watershed: Observations on the Role of a Riparian Forest. *Ecology* 65(5):1466-1475.  
<http://www.esajournals.org/doi/abs/10.2307/1939127>
- Pinay, G. and Decamps, H., 1988. The Role of Riparian Woods in Regulating Nitrogen Fluxes between Alluvial Aquifer and Surface Water: A Conceptual Model. *Regulated Rivers: Research and Management* 2(4):507-516.  
<http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1002/rrr.3450020404/abstract>
- Pinay, G., Roques, L., and Fabre, A., 1993. Spatial and Temporal Patterns of Denitrification in Riparian Forest. *Journal of Applied Ecology* 30(4):581-591.  
<http://www.jstor.org/pss/2404238>
- Pinho, A., Morris, L., Jackson, C.R., White, W.J., Bush, P., and Matos, A., 2008. Contaminant Retention Potential of Forested Filter Strips Established as SMZs in the Piedmont of Georgia. *Journal of the American Water Resources Association* 44(6):1564-1577.  
<http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/j.1752-1688.2008.00260.x/abstract>
- Prach, K. and Rauch, O., 1992. On Filter Effects of Ecotones. *Ekologia* 11:293-298.  
ON LINE DOCUMENTS – NOTHING OLDER THAN 2003
- Puckett, L.J., Cowdery, T.K., McMahon, P.B., Ternes, L.H., and Stoner, J.D., 2002. Using Chemical Hydrologic, and Age Dating Analysis to Delineate Redox Processes and Flow Paths in the Riparian Zone of a Glacial Outwash Aquifer-Stream System. *Water Resources Research* 38(8):10.1029.  
[http://water.usgs.gov/nawqa/nutrients/pubs/wrr\\_v38/wrr\\_v38.pdf](http://water.usgs.gov/nawqa/nutrients/pubs/wrr_v38/wrr_v38.pdf)



- Robertson, D.M., Field, S., Elder, J., Goddard, G., and James, W., 1996. Phosphorus Dynamics in Delavan Lake Inlet, Southeastern Wisconsin, 1994, U.S. Geological Survey Water Resources Report 96-4160. <http://wi.water.usgs.gov/pubs/WRIR-96-4160/index.html>
- Schellinger, G.R. and Clausen, J.C., 1992. Vegetative Filter Treatment of Dairy Barnyard Runoff in Cold Regions. *Journal of Environmental Quality* 21(1):40-45. <https://www.agronomy.org/publications/view-abstracts?article-id%5B%5D=jeq%2F21%2F1%2FJEQ0210010040>
- Schmitt, T.J., Dosskey, M.G., and Hoagland, K.D., 1999. Filter Strip Performance and Processes for Different Vegetation, Widths, and Contaminants. *Journal of Environmental Quality* 28(5):1479-1489. <https://www.agronomy.org/publications/view-abstracts?article-id%5B%5D=jeq%2F28%2F5%2FJEQ0280051479>
- Schoonover, J.E. and Williard, K.W.J., 2003. Ground Water Nitrate Reduction in Giant Cane and Forest Riparian Buffer Zones. *Journal of the American Water Resources Association* 39(2):347-354. <http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/j.1752-1688.2003.tb04389.x/abstract>
- Schwer, C.B. and Clausen, J.C., 1989. Vegetative Filter Strips of Dairy Milkhouse Wastewater. *Journal of Environmental Quality* 18(4):446-451. <https://www.agronomy.org/publications/view-abstracts?article-id%5B%5D=jeq%2F18%2F4%2FJEQ0180040446>
- Simmons, R.C., Gold, A.J., and Groffman, P.M., 1992. Nitrate Dynamics in Riparian Forests: Groundwater Studies. *Journal of Environmental Quality* 21(4):659-665. <https://www.agronomy.org/publications/jeq/abstracts/21/4/JEQ0210040659>
- Spruill, T.B., 2004. Effectiveness of Riparian Buffers in Controlling Groundwater Discharge of Nitrate to Streams in Selected Hydrogeological Settings of the North Carolina Coastal Plain. *Water Science and Technology* 49(3):63-70. <http://nc.water.usgs.gov/reports/abstracts/Spr04Eff.pdf>
- Vanderholm, D.H. and Dickey, E.C., 1980. Design of Vegetative Filters for Feedlot Runoff Treatment in Humid Areas. *American Society of Agricultural Engineers* 23(3):681-684. <http://asae.frymulti.com/abstract.asp?aid=34646&t=1>
- Vellidis, G., Lowrance, R.R., Gay, P., and Hubbard, R.K. 2003. Nutrient Transport in a Restored Riparian Wetland. *Journal of Environmental Quality* 32(2):711-726, 2003. <https://www.agronomy.org/publications/jeq/articles/32/2/711?highlight=JmFydGljbGVfeWVhcj0yMDAzJmFydGljbGVfdm9sdW11PTMyJnE9KGF1dGhvcj0lMjJWZWxsaWRpeyUyMikmbGVuPTEwJnN0YXJ0PTEmc3RibT1mYWxzZSZzb3J0PQ%3D%3D>
- Vidon, P. and Dosskey, M., 2008. Testing a Simple Field Method for Assessing Nitrate Removal in Riparian Zones. *Journal of the American Water Resources Association* 44(2):523-534. [http://www.srs.fs.usda.gov/pubs/ja/ja\\_vidon001.pdf](http://www.srs.fs.usda.gov/pubs/ja/ja_vidon001.pdf)
- P.G.F. Vidon, and A.R. Hill. 2004. Landscape Controls on Nitrate Removal in Stream Riparian Zones. *Water Resources Research* 40(3):1-14., W03201. <http://www.agu.org/pubs/crossref/2004/2003WR002473.shtml>

Vought, L.B.-M., Dahl, J., Pedersen, C.J., Lacousiere, J.O., 1994. Nutrient Retention in Riparian Ecotones. *Ambio* 23 (6):343-348.  
<http://www.citeulike.org/group/5855/article/2982407>

Wang, C. and Wang, P-F., 2008. Retention and Removal of Suspended Solids and Total Phosphorus from Water by Riparian Reeds. *Journal of Environmental Engineering* 134(9):771-777.  
[http://ascelibrary.org/eo/resource/1/joee/v134/i9/p771\\_s1?isAuthorized=no](http://ascelibrary.org/eo/resource/1/joee/v134/i9/p771_s1?isAuthorized=no)

Yates, P. and Sheridan, J.M., 1983. Estimating the Effectiveness of Vegetated Floodplains/Wetlands as Nitrate-Nitrite and Orthophosphorus Filters. *Agriculture, Ecosystems and Environment* 9(3):303-314.  
<http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/0167880983901044>

Young, R.A., Huntrods, T., and Anderson, W., 1980. Effectiveness of Vegetated Buffer Strips in Controlling Pollution from Feedlot Runoff. *Journal of Environmental Quality* 9(3):483-487, 1980.  
<https://www.agronomy.org/publications/jeq/abstracts/9/3/JEQ0090030483>

Zirschky, J., Crawford, D., Norton, L., Richards, S., Reemer, D., 1989. Ammonia Removal Using Overland Flow. *Journal of the Water Pollution Control Federation* 61(7):1225-1232.  
<http://www.jstor.org/pss/25043736>

### **Modeling**

Haith, D., Mandel, R., and Wu, R.S., 1992. GWLF, Generalized Watershed Loading Functions, Version 2.0, User's Manual. Department of Agricultural & Biological Engineering, Cornell University, Ithaca, N.Y. Model available upon request from D. Haith: <http://bee.cornell.edu/cals/bee/people/profile-haith.cfm>

Lowrance, R.R., Altier, L.S., Williams, R.G., Inamdar, S.P., Sheridan, J.M., Bosch, D.D., Hubbard, R.K., and Thomas, D.L., 2000. REMM: The Riparian Ecosystem Management Model. *Journal of Soil and Water Conservation* 55(1):27-34.  
<http://www.jswconline.org/content/55/1/27.abstract>

### **Wisconsin Buffer Initiative**

Ambs, T. et al., Ad Hoc Committee, 2002. Filter Strips and Buffers on Wisconsin's Private Lands: An Opportunity for Adaptive Management. University of Wisconsin-Madison.  
[www.nelson.wisc.edu/people/nowak/wbi/report.doc](http://www.nelson.wisc.edu/people/nowak/wbi/report.doc)

Diebel, M., Maxted, J., Nowak, P., Robertson, D., Han, S., Vander Zanden, M.J., 2009. Landscape Planning for Agricultural Nonpoint Source Pollution Reduction III: Assessing Phosphorus and Sediment Reduction Potential. *Environmental Management* 43:69-83.  
[http://limnology.wisc.edu/personnel/jakevz/pdf/2009\\_EnvMan\\_Diebeletal%20landscape%20planning%20III.pdf](http://limnology.wisc.edu/personnel/jakevz/pdf/2009_EnvMan_Diebeletal%20landscape%20planning%20III.pdf)

Diebel, M., Maxted, J., Nowak, P., Vander Zanden, M.J., 2008. Landscape Planning for Agricultural Nonpoint Source Pollution Reduction I: Geographical Allocation Framework. *Environmental Management* 42:789-802.  
[http://limnology.wisc.edu/personnel/jakevz/pdf/2008\\_EnvMan\\_Diebeletal%20landscape%20planning%20I.pdf](http://limnology.wisc.edu/personnel/jakevz/pdf/2008_EnvMan_Diebeletal%20landscape%20planning%20I.pdf)

Maxted, J., Diebel, M., Vander Zanden, J., 2009. Landscape Planning for Agricultural Nonpoint Source Pollution Reduction II: Balancing Watershed Size, Number of Watersheds, and Implementation Effort. *Environmental Management* 43:60-68.  
[http://limnology.wisc.edu/personnel/jakevz/pdf/2009\\_EnvMan\\_Maxtedetal%20landscape%20planning%20II.pdf](http://limnology.wisc.edu/personnel/jakevz/pdf/2009_EnvMan_Maxtedetal%20landscape%20planning%20II.pdf)

Nowak, P., Good, L., Norman, J., Bundy, L., Vander Zanden, J., Maxted, J., Diebel, M., Molling, C., Ventura S., Webb, B., 2005. The Wisconsin Buffer Initiative. Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources and the University of Wisconsin-Madison, College of Agricultural and Life Sciences.  
<http://www.nelson.wisc.edu/people/nowak/wbi/reports/nrbFinalReport.pdf>



**Wetland Function/Vegetation**

- Bodamer, B.L. and Bossenbroek, J.M., 2008. Wetlands as Barriers: Effects of Vegetated Waterways on Downstream Dispersal of Zebra Mussels. *Freshwater Biology* 53(10):2051-2060.  
<http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/j.1365-2427.2008.02027.x/abstract>
- Brinson, M., 1993. Changes in the Functioning of Wetlands along Environmental Gradients. *Wetlands* 13(2):65-74.  
<http://www.springerlink.com/content/u6521532k721n753/>
- Croonquist, M., and Brooks, R., 1991. Use of Avian and Mammalian Guilds as Indicators of Cumulative Impacts in Riparian-Wetland Areas. *Environmental Management* 15(5):701-714.  
<http://www.springerlink.com/content/l7483816719k4327/>
- Dennison, W., Orth, R., Moore, K., Stevenson, J., Carter, V., Kollar, S., Bergstrom, P., Batiuk, R., 1993. Assessing Water Quality with Submersed Aquatic Vegetation. *BioScience* 43(2):86-94.  
[http://ocean.st.usm.edu/~w546990/MarBot/Dennison\\_etal\\_1993\\_BioSci43.pdf](http://ocean.st.usm.edu/~w546990/MarBot/Dennison_etal_1993_BioSci43.pdf)
- Evans, R., Gilliam, J., Lilly, J., 1993. Wetlands and Water Quality. NC Cooperative Extension Service: AG-473-7. N. C. Cooperative Extension Service.  
<http://www.bae.ncsu.edu/programs/extension/evans/ag473-7.html>
- Gilliam, J., 1994. Riparian Wetlands and Water Quality. *Journal of Environmental Quality* 23(5):896-900.  
<https://www.agronomy.org/publications/view-abstracts?article-id%5B%5D=jeq%2F23%2F5%2FJEQ0230050896>
- Gu, J.-D., Berry, D., Taraban, R., Martens, D., Walker, Jr., H., and Edmonds, W., 1992. Biodegradability of Atrazine, Cyanazine, and Dicamba in Wetland Soils. *Virginia Water Research Center Bulletin* 172.  
<http://vwrrc.vt.edu/pdfs/bulletins/bulletin172.pdf>
- Hanson, G., Groffman, P., Gold, A., 1994. Denitrification in a Riparian Wetland Receiving High and Low Groundwater Nitrate Inputs. *Journal of Environmental Quality* 23:917-922.  
[http://www.uri.edu/cels/nrs/whl/Publications/Journals/Hanson\\_etal\\_1994.pdf](http://www.uri.edu/cels/nrs/whl/Publications/Journals/Hanson_etal_1994.pdf)
- Harris, L., 1988. The Nature of Cumulative Impacts on Biotic Diversity of Wetland Vertebrates. *Environmental Management* 12(5):675-693.  
[http://cfpub.epa.gov/si/si\\_public\\_record\\_Report.cfm?dirEntryID=32272](http://cfpub.epa.gov/si/si_public_record_Report.cfm?dirEntryID=32272)
- Hemond, H., and Benoit, J., 1988. Cumulative Impacts on Water Quality Functions of Wetlands. *Environmental Management* 12(5):639-653.  
[http://www.ci.bainbridge-isl.wa.us/documents/pln/2001\\_smp\\_reference2/hemond\\_hf\\_cumulative\\_impacts\\_on\\_water\\_quality\\_functions\\_of\\_wetlands.pdf](http://www.ci.bainbridge-isl.wa.us/documents/pln/2001_smp_reference2/hemond_hf_cumulative_impacts_on_water_quality_functions_of_wetlands.pdf)
- Jacobsen, M., 1994. Prairie Wetland Restoration and Water Quality Concerns. M.S. Thesis, University of Minnesota, College of Natural Resources, 101 pp.  
<http://www.npwrc.usgs.gov/resource/wetlands/wetsympo/prairiew.htm>
- Johnston, C., 1991. Sediment and Nutrient Retention by Freshwater Wetlands: Effects on Surface Water Quality. *Critical Reviews in Environmental Control* 21(5,6):491-565.  
REMOVED FROM WEBSITE – NOTHING OLDER THAN 2000

Phillips, P., Denver, J., Shedlock, R., Hamilton, P., 1993. Effect of Forested Wetlands on Nitrate Concentrations in Ground Water and Surface Water on the Delmarva Peninsula. *Wetlands* 13(2):75-83.  
<https://springerlink3.metapress.com/content/v622277075vrgn08/resource-secured/?target=fulltext.pdf&sid=e3xlmw40cb0ctr32e2iiqjd4&sh=www.springerlink.com>

### **Vegetation**

Barden, C., Mankin, K., Ngandu, D., Geyer, W., Devlin, D., and McVay, K., 2003. Keeping Up with Research 137: Assessing the Effectiveness of Various Riparian Buffer Vegetation Types. Kansas State University Agricultural Experiment Station and Cooperative Extension. SRL 137.  
<http://www.ksre.ksu.edu/library/forst2/SRL137.pdf>

Coles-Ritchie, M., Roberts, D., Kershner, J., and Henderson, R., 2007. Use of a Wetland Index to Evaluate Changes in Riparian Vegetation after Livestock Exclusion. *Journal of the American Water Resources Association* 43(3):731-743.  
[http://www.fs.fed.us/biology/resources/pubs/feu/pibo/07coles-ritchie\\_wetland\\_index.pdf](http://www.fs.fed.us/biology/resources/pubs/feu/pibo/07coles-ritchie_wetland_index.pdf)

Rogers, D., Rooney, T., Hawbaker, T., Radeloff, V., and Waller, D., 2009. Paying the Extinction Debt in Southern Wisconsin Forest Understories. *Conservation Biology* 23(6):1497-1506.  
[http://silvis.forest.wisc.edu/sites/default/files/pubs/Rogers\\_etal\\_ConsBio\\_2009.pdf](http://silvis.forest.wisc.edu/sites/default/files/pubs/Rogers_etal_ConsBio_2009.pdf)

Rogers, D., Rooney, T., Olson, D., and Wallner, D., 2008. Shifts in Southern Wisconsin Forest Canopy and Understory Richness, Composition, and Heterogeneity. *Ecology* 89(9):2482-2492.  
<http://www.esajournals.org/doi/abs/10.1890/07-1129.1>  
<http://esapubs.org/archive/ecol/E089/139/appendix-A.htm>  
<http://esapubs.org/archive/ecol/E089/139/appendix-B.htm>  
<http://esapubs.org/archive/ecol/E089/139/appendix-D.htm>

Ryder, M.H and Fares, A., 2008. Evaluating Cover Crops (Sudex, Sunn Hemp, Oats) for Use As Vegetative Filters to Control Sediment and Nutrient Loading from Agricultural Runoff in a Hawaiian Watershed. *Journal of American Water Resources Association* 44(3):640-653.  
<http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/j.1752-1688.2008.00189.x/abstract>

Sakai, J., 2009. Isolated Forest Patches Lose Species, Diversity. University of Wisconsin-Madison. News. June 9, 2009.  
[www.news.wisc.edu/16808](http://www.news.wisc.edu/16808)

Shafroth, P., Friedman, J., Auble, G., Scott, M., and Braatne, J., 2002. Potential Responses of Riparian Vegetation to Dam Removal. *Bioscience* 52(8):703-712.  
<http://business.highbeam.com/411908/article-1G1-90317050/potential-responses-riparian-vegetation-dam-removal>

Wynn, T. and Mostaghimi, S., 2006. The Effects of Vegetation and Soil Type on Streambank Erosion, Southwestern Virginia, USA. *Journal of the American Water Resources Association* 42(1):69-82.  
<http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/j.1752-1688.2006.tb03824.x/abstract>

### **Management**

Ewel, K., Cressa, C., Kneib, R., Lake, P.S., Levin, L., Palmer, M., Snelgrove, P., and Wall, D., 2000. Managing Critical Transition Zones. *Ecosystems* 4:452-460.  
<http://www.sfrc.ufl.edu/faculty/ewel/pubs/Ecosystem-Services/Ewel%20et%20al%202001.pdf>



Fischer, R., Martin, C., and Fischenich, J.C., 2000. Improving Riparian Buffer Strips and Corridors for Water Quality and Wildlife. International Conference on Riparian Ecology and Mangement in Multi-Land Use Watersheds. American Water Resources Association. August 2000.  
<http://www.swf.usace.army.mil/pubdata/environ/regulatory/other/links/stream/improvingriparianbufferstrips.pdf>

Gabanski, L., 2009. EPA Launches Healthy Watersheds Initiative. U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. Nonpoint Source News-Notes Issue 87:3-5.  
<http://www.epa.gov/owow/info/NewsNotes/pdf/87issue.pdf>

Henderson, R., 2010. Influence of Patch Size, Isolation, and Fire History on Hopper (Homoptera: Auchenorrhyncha) Communities of Eight Wisconsin Prairie Remnants. Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources Research Report 189.  
<http://dnr.wi.gov/org/es/science/publications/pub-ss-589-2010.pdf>

Schultz, R., Isenhardt, T., and Colletti, J., 1994. Riparian Buffer Systems in Crop and Rangelands. Agroforestry and Sustainable Systems: Symposium Proceedings August 1994.  
<http://www.unl.edu/nac/aug94/rip-crop.html>

Shandas, V., 2007. An Empirical Study of Streamside Landowners' Interest in Riparian Conservation. Journal of American Planning Association 73(2):173-184.  
<http://web.pdx.edu/~vshandas/JAPARiparianConservation.pdf>

#### **Temperature/Shade/Light**

Bartholow, J., 2000. Estimating Cumulative Effects of Clearcutting on Stream Temperatures. Rivers 7(4), 284-297.  
[http://smig.usgs.gov/SMIG/features\\_0902/clearcut.html](http://smig.usgs.gov/SMIG/features_0902/clearcut.html)

DeWalle, D., 2008. Guidelines for Riparian Vegetative Shade Restoration Based Upon a Theoretical Shaded-Stream Model. Journal of the American Water Resources Association 44(6):1373-1387.  
<http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/j.1752-1688.2008.00230.x/abstract>

Liebl, D. and Korth, R., 2000. Sensible Shoreland Lighting: Preserving the Beauty of the Night. Madison, WI. University of Wisconsin-Extension, Wisconsin Lakes Partnership and the Solid and Hazardous Waste Education Center.  
<http://www4.uwsp.edu/cnr/uwexplakes/humanimpact/lighting.pdf>

Thompson, A.M, Wilson, T., Norman, J.M., Gemechu, A.L., and Roa-Espinosa, A., 2008. Modeling the Effect of Summertime Heating on Runoff Temperature. Journal of the American Water Resources Association 44(6):1548-1563.  
<http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/j.1752-1688.2008.00259.x/abstract>

#### **Data/Mapping**

Dilts, T., Yang, J., and Weisberg, P. 2010. Mapping Riparian Vegetation with Lidar Data: Predicting Plant Community Using Height Above River and Flood Height. ArcUser. Winter 2010: 18-21.  
<http://www.esri.com/news/arcuser/0110/files/mapping-with-lidar.pdf>

Fitsik, R., Quigley, M., Stecker, E., Jones, J., Clary, J., and O'Brien, J., 2008. Managing the International BMP Database. Water Resources Impact 10(6):22-24.  
[http://www.awra.org/impact/issues/0811imp\\_toc.pdf](http://www.awra.org/impact/issues/0811imp_toc.pdf)

Frazier, B., Moore, B., 1993. Some Tests of Film Types for Remote Sensing of Purple Loosestrife, *Lythrum Salicaria* at Low Densities. Wetlands 13(3):145-152.  
<http://www.springerlink.com/content/q85r505h186u3425/>

Herring, R., Schultz, R., and Isenhardt, T., 2006. Watershed Scale Inventory of Existing Riparian Buffers in Northeast Missouri Using GIS. *Journal of American Water Resources Association* 42(1):145-155.  
<http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/j.1752-1688.2006.tb03830.x/abstract;jsessionid=CC61C56A10D0C9F4A4B6B714300C6A3F.d01t04>

Kosco, J. and Singelis, N., 2008. Presenting Urban Stormwater BMP Performance Data to a Broad Audience. *Water Resources Impact* 10(6):25-27.  
<http://awramedia.org/mainblog/2009/01/07/impact-article-presenting-urban-stormwater-bmp-performance-data-to-a-broad-audience/>

### **Climate Change**

Landers, J., 2009. Riparian Restoration Can Reduce Harmful Effects of Climate Change, Study Says. *Civil Engineering* 79(10):27-28.  
<http://cedb.asce.org/cgi/WWWdisplay.cgi?175628>

Seavy, N., Gardali, T., Golet, G., Griggs, F.T., Howll, C., Kelsey, R., Small, S., Viers, J., and Weigand, J., 2009. Why Climate Change Makes Riparian Restoration More Important than Ever: Recommendations for Practice and Research. *Ecological Restoration* 27(3):330-338.  
<http://er.uwpress.org/content/27/3/330.full.pdf+html>

### **Economics**

Austin, J., Dezenski, E., and Affolter-Caine, B., 2008. The Vital Connection: Reclaiming Great Lakes Economic Leadership in the Bi-National U.S.-Canadian Region. Metropolitan Policy Program at Brookings: 1-27.  
[http://www.brookings.edu/~media/Files/rc/reports/2008/0324\\_greatlakes\\_canada\\_austin/greatlakes\\_canada.pdf](http://www.brookings.edu/~media/Files/rc/reports/2008/0324_greatlakes_canada_austin/greatlakes_canada.pdf)

Colby, B. and Smith-Incer, E., 2005. Visitor Values and Local Economic Impacts of Riparian Habitat Preservation: California's Kern River Preserve. *Journal of the American Water Resources Association* 41(3):709-717.  
<http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/j.1752-1688.2005.tb03765.x/abstract>

Fairfax, S., Gwin, L., King, M.A., Raymond, L., and Watt, L., 2005. *Buying Nature: The Limits of Land Acquisition As a Conservation Strategy*. The MIT Press, Cambridge, MA.  
<http://mitpress.mit.edu/catalog/item/default.asp?type=2&tid=10639>

Feinsinger, P., 2001. *Designing Field Studies for Biodiversity Conservation*. Island Press, Washington, D.C.  
<http://www.amazon.com/Designing-Field-Studies-Biodiversity-Conservation/dp/1559638788>

Gexa, M., Barfield, B.J., Huhnke, R.L., Stoecker, A., Storm, D.E., and Stevens, E.W., 2009. Comparison of Targeted Replacement and Vegetative Filter Strips for Sediment Control and Cost Effectiveness. *Journal of Water Resources Planning and Management* 135(5):406-409.  
<http://cedb.asce.org/cgi/WWWdisplay.cgi?173367>

Higgs, E., 2003. *Nature by Design: People, Natural Process, and Ecological Restoration*. The MIT Press, Cambridge, MA.  
<http://mitpress.mit.edu/catalog/item/default.asp?type=2&tid=9595>

King, D., 1991. Economics: Costing Out Restoration. *Ecological Restoration* 9(1):15-21.  
<http://er.uwpress.org/content/9/1/15.full.pdf>

King, D., and Bohlen C., 1994. Estimating the Costs of Restoration. *National Wetlands Newsletter* 16(3).  
<http://www.wetlandsnewsletter.org>



- Moran, E. and Ostrom, E., 2005. Seeing the Forest and the Trees: Human-Environment Interactions in Forest Ecosystems. The MIT Press, Cambridge, MA.  
<http://mitpress.mit.edu/catalog/item/default.asp?type=2&tid=10562>
- Qiu, Z., Prato, T., and Boehm, G., 2006. Economic Valuation of Riparian Buffer and Open Space in a Suburban Watershed. *Journal of the American Water Resources Association* 42(6):1583-1596.  
<http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/j.1752-1688.2006.tb06022.x/abstract>
- Riley, A., 2009. Putting a Price on Riparian Corridors as Water Treatment Facilities. California Regional Water Quality Control Board, San Francisco Bay Region: 1-18.  
[http://www.swrcb.ca.gov/sanfranciscobay/water\\_issues/programs/watershed/Riley\\_2009.pdf](http://www.swrcb.ca.gov/sanfranciscobay/water_issues/programs/watershed/Riley_2009.pdf)
- Scott, J.M., Heglund, P., Morrison, M., Haufler, J., Raphael, M., Wall, W., and Samson, F., 2002. Predicting Species Occurrences: Issues of Accuracy and Scale. Island Press, Washington, D.C.  
[http://www.amazon.com/Predicting-Species-Occurrences-Issues-Accuracy/dp/1559637870#reader\\_1559637870](http://www.amazon.com/Predicting-Species-Occurrences-Issues-Accuracy/dp/1559637870#reader_1559637870)
- Werblow, S. Agricultural Drainage Water Management Shows Promise for Economic & Environmental Benefits. *Land and Water Magazine* January/February 2010:48-51.  
<http://www.agridrain.com/agdwmsshowspromise.pdf>
- Yang, W. and Weersink, A., 2005. Cost-Effective Targeting of Riparian Buffers. *Canadian Journal of Agricultural Economics* 52(1):17-34.  
<http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/j.1744-7976.2004.tb00092.x/abstract>

## SCIENCE-WILDLIFE

### Streams/Fisheries/Habitat

- Barton, D., Taylor, W., and Biette, R.M., 1985. Dimensions of Riparian Buffer Strips Required to Maintain Trout Habitat in Southern Ontario Streams. *North American Journal of Fisheries Management* 5:364-378.  
<http://www.unl.edu/nac/bufferguidelines/docs/2/2.11ref.pdf> and  
<http://www.unl.edu/nac/bufferguidelines/docs/2/2.12ref.pdf>
- Fischer, J., Quist, M., Wigen, S., Schaefer, A., Stewart, T., and Isenhardt, T., 2009. Assemblage and Population-Level Responses of Stream Fish to Riparian Buffers at Multiple Spatial Scales. *Transactions of the American Fisheries Society* 139:185-200.  
[http://www.jrfischer.com/uploads/7/2/6/2/7262746/fischer\\_et\\_al.\\_2010\\_tafs.pdf](http://www.jrfischer.com/uploads/7/2/6/2/7262746/fischer_et_al._2010_tafs.pdf)
- Hanson, P., 1997. National Water-Quality Assessment Program (NAWQA). The Relation of Fish Community Composition to Riparian Cover and Runoff Potential in the Minnesota River Basin, Minnesota and Iowa U.S. Department of the Interior. U.S. Geological Survey Fact Sheet FS-105-00.  
<http://pubs.usgs.gov/fs/2000/0105/report.pdf>
- Horwitz, R., Johnson, T., Overbeck, P., O'Donnell, T.K., Hession, W.C., and Sweeney, B., 2008. Effects of Riparian Vegetation and Watershed Urbanization on Fishes in Streams of the Mid-Atlantic Piedmont (USA). *Journal of the American Water Resources Association* 44(3):724-741.  
<http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/j.1752-1688.2008.00201.x/abstract>
- Jones III, E., Helfman, G., Harper, J., and Bolstad, P., 1999. Effect of Riparian Forest Removal on Fish Assemblages in Southern Appalachian Streams. *Conservation Biology* 13(6):1454-1465.  
<http://coweeta.uga.edu/publications/1544.pdf>

- Wang, L., Lyons, J., and Kanehl, P., 2002. Effects of Watershed Best Management Practices on Habitat and Fish in Wisconsin Streams, *Journal of the American Water Resources Association* 38(3):663-680.  
<http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/j.1752-1688.2002.tb00988.x/abstract>
- Lyons, J., Weigel, B.M., Paine, L.K., Undersander, D.J., 2000. Influence of Intensive Rotational Grazing on Bank Erosion, Fish Habitat Quality, and Fish Communities in Southwestern Wisconsin Trout Streams. *Journal of Soil and Water Conservation* 55(3):271-276.  
<http://www.jswconline.org/content/55/3/271.abstract>
- Medor, M. and Goldstein, R., 2003. Assessing Water Quality at Large Geographic Scales: Relations Among Land Use, Water Physicochemistry, Riparian Condition, and Fish Community Structure. *Environmental Management* 31(4):504-517.  
[http://water.usgs.gov/nawqa/ecology/pubs/metrics\\_abstract.html](http://water.usgs.gov/nawqa/ecology/pubs/metrics_abstract.html)
- Newman, S. and Swanson, S., 2008. Assessment of Changes in Stream and Riparian Conditions of the Mary's River Basin, Nevada. *Journal of the American Water Resources Association* 44(1):1-13.  
<http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/j.1752-1688.2007.00134.x/abstract>
- Nowell, L., Capel, P., and Dileanis, P., 1999. Pesticides in Stream Sediment and Aquatic Biota: Distribution, Trends, and Governing Factors. *Pesticides in the Hydrologic Systems*, Vol. 4. Lewis Publishers, Boca Rotan, FL.  
<http://www.amazon.com/Pesticides-Stream-Sediment-Aquatic-Biota/dp/1566704693>
- Osborne, L., and Kovacic, D., 1993. Riparian Vegetated Buffer Strips in Water-Quality Restoration and Stream Management. *Freshwater Biology*. 29:243-258.  
<http://lshs.tamu.edu/docs/lshs/end-notes/Riparian%20vegetated%20buffer%20strips%20in%20water-quality%20restor-0588496923/Riparian%20vegetated%20buffer%20strips%20in%20water-quality%20restoration%20and%20stream%20management..pdf>
- Shields, Jr., F.D., Langendoen, E., and Doyle, M., 2006. Adapting Existing Models to Examine Effects of Agricultural Conservation Programs on Stream Habitat Quality. *Journal of the American Water Resources Association* 42(1):25-33.  
[http://ars.usda.gov/SP2UserFiles/person/5120/adapting\\_existing\\_models.pdf](http://ars.usda.gov/SP2UserFiles/person/5120/adapting_existing_models.pdf)
- Stewart, J., Wang, L., Lyons, J., Horwath, J., and Bannerman, R., 2001. Influences of Watershed, Riparian-Corridor, and Reach-Scale Characteristics on Aquatic Biota in Agricultural Watersheds. *Journal of the American Water Resources Association* 37(6):1475-1487.  
<http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/j.1752-1688.2001.tb03654.x/abstract;jsessionid=F2CCA666FA27B920180CB53F42A8E4E9.d02t01>
- Talmage, P., Perry, J., and Goldstein, R., 2002. Relation of Instream Habitat and Physical Conditions to Fish Communities of Agricultural Streams in the Northern Midwest. *North American Journal of Fisheries Management* 22(3):825-833.  
<http://wrs.umn.edu/alumni/msgrads/talmage/index.htm>
- Wang, L., Lyons, J., and Kanehl, P., 2002. Effects of Watershed Best Management Practices on Habitat and Fish in Wisconsin Streams. *Journal of the American Water Resources Association* 38(3):663-680.  
<http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/j.1752-1688.2002.tb00988.x/abstract>



- Wang, L., Lyons, J., Rasmussen, P., Seelbach, P., Simon, T., Wiley, M., Kanehl, P., Baker, E., Niemela, S., and Stewart, P., 2003. Watershed, Reach, and Riparian Influences on Stream Fish Assemblages in the Northern Lakes and Forest Ecoregion, USA. *Canadian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Sciences* 60(5):491-505.  
<http://openurl.ingenta.com/content?genre=article&issn=0706-652X&volume=60&issue=5&spage=491&epage=505>
- Weigel, B., Lyons, J., Paine, L., Dodson, S., Undersander, D., 2000. Using Stream Macroinvertebrates to Compare Riparian Land Use Practices on Cattle Farms in Southwestern Wisconsin. *Journal of Freshwater Ecology* 15(1):93-106.  
<http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/02705060.2000.9663725>
- Weigel, B.M., Emmons, E.E., Stewart, J.S., and Bannerman, R., 2005. Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources Bureau of Integrated Science Services, Buffer Width and Continuity for Preserving Stream Health in Agricultural Landscapes. Research Management Findings, Issue Fifty-Six.  
[http://dnr.wi.gov/org/es/science/publications/pub\\_ss\\_756\\_2005.pdf](http://dnr.wi.gov/org/es/science/publications/pub_ss_756_2005.pdf)
- Zaimes, G., Schultz, R., and Isenhardt, T., 2006. Riparian Land Uses and Precipitation Influences on Stream Bank Erosion in Central Iowa. *Journal of the American Water Resources Association* 42(1):83-97.  
<http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/j.1752-1688.2006.tb03825.x/abstract>
- Amphibians/Reptiles**
- Banks, S. and DiStefano, R., 2002. Diurnal Habitat Associations of the Madtoms *Noturus albater*, *N. exilis*, *N. flavater*, and *N. flavus* in Missouri Ozarks Streams. *American Midland Naturalist* 148(1):138-145.  
<http://www.highbeam.com/doc/1P3-141401521.html>
- Bodie, J.R., 2001. Stream and Riparian Management for Freshwater Turtles. *Journal of Environmental Management* 62:1-14.  
<http://www.biosci.missouri.edu/semlitsch/research/pubs/Bodie-JEM2001.pdf>
- Bodie, J.R. and Semlitsch, R., 2000. Spatial and Temporal Use of Floodplain Habitats by Lentic and Lotic Species of Aquatic Turtles. *Oecologia* 122:138-146.  
<http://www.biosci.missouri.edu/semlitsch/research/pubs/Bodie2000-Oecologia.pdf>
- Brode, J. and Bury, R.B., 1984. The Importance of Riparian Systems to Amphibians and Reptiles. *California Riparian Systems: Ecology, Conservation, and Productive Management*. Berkeley: University of California Press. Warner, Richard E., and Kathleen M. Hendrix, editors. 1984.  
<http://publishing.cdlib.org/ucpressebooks/view?docId=ft1c6003wp&chunk.id=d0e4027&toc.depth=1&toc.id=d0e4027&brand=ucpress>
- Burbrink, F., Phillips, C., and Heske, E., 1998. A Riparian Zone in Southern Illinois as a Potential Dispersal Corridor for Reptiles and Amphibians. *Biological Conservation* 86:107-115.  
<http://www.library.csi.cuny.edu/~fburbrink/Research/Publications/RiparianZone.pdf>
- Calhoun, A. and deMayandier, P., 2004. Forestry Habitat Management Guidelines for Vernal Pool Wildlife. MCA Technical Paper No. 6, Metropolitan Conservation Alliance, Wildlife Conservation Society.  
[http://www.maine.gov/doc/mfs/pubs/pdf/vernal\\_pool\\_hmg.pdf](http://www.maine.gov/doc/mfs/pubs/pdf/vernal_pool_hmg.pdf)
- Crawford, J. and Semlitsch, R., 2007. Estimation of Core Terrestrial Habitat for Stream-Breeding Salamanders and Delineation of Riparian Buffers for Protection of Biodiversity. *Conservation Biology* 21(1):152-158.  
<http://www.biosci.missouri.edu/semlitsch/research/pubs/Crawford&%20Semlitsch2007.pdf>

- Hannon, S., Paszkowski, C., Boutin, S., DeGroot, J., Macdonald, S.E., Wheatley, M., and Eaton, B., 2002. Abundance and Species Composition of Amphibians, Small Mammals, and Songbirds in Riparian Forest Buffer Strips of Varying Widths in the Boreal Mixedwood of Alberta. *Canada Journal of Forest Research* 32:1784-1800.  
<http://www.ualberta.ca/~emacдона/pdff/hannon-et-al-CJFR-2002.pdf>
- Harding, J., 1997. Amphibians and Reptiles of the Great Lakes Region. Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press: 158-162.  
<http://www.press.umich.edu/titleDetailDesc.do?id=10269>
- Harper, E., Rittenhouse, T., and Semlitsch, R., 2008. Demographic Consequences of Terrestrial Habitat Loss for Pool-Breeding Amphibians: Predicting Extinction Risks Associated with Inadequate Size of Buffer Zones. *Conservation Biology* 22(5):1205-1215.  
<http://www.biosci.missouri.edu/semlitsch/research/pubs/Harper%20etal2008.pdf>
- Hibbs, D. and Giordano, P., 1996. Vegetation Characteristics of Alder-Dominated Riparian Buffer Strips in the Oregon Coast Range. *Northwest Science* 70(3):213-222.  
[http://www.vetmed.wsu.edu/org\\_NWS/NWSci%20journal%20articles/1996%20files/Issue%203/v70%20p213%20Hibbs%20and%20Giordano.PDF](http://www.vetmed.wsu.edu/org_NWS/NWSci%20journal%20articles/1996%20files/Issue%203/v70%20p213%20Hibbs%20and%20Giordano.PDF)
- Kluber, M., Olson, D., and Puettmann, K., 2008. Amphibian Distributions in Riparian and Upslope Areas and their Habitat Associations on Managed Forest Landscapes in Oregon Coast Range. *Forest Ecology and Management* 256:529-535.  
<http://www.cof.orst.edu/cof/fs/kpuettmann/FEM%20256%202008.pdf>
- Lannoo, M., 2005. Amphibian Declines: The Conservation Status of United States Species. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press: 566-568.  
<http://www.ucpress.edu/book.php?isbn=9780520235922>
- Perkins, D. and Hunter, M., 2006. Effects of Riparian Timber Management on Amphibians in Maine. *Journal of Wildlife Management* 70(3):657-670.  
[http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.2193/0022-541X\(2006\)70\[657:EORTMO\]2.0.CO;2/abstract](http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.2193/0022-541X(2006)70[657:EORTMO]2.0.CO;2/abstract)
- Peterman, W. and Semlitsch, R., 2009. Efficacy of Riparian Buffers in Mitigating Local Population Declines and the Effects of Even-Aged Timber Harvest on Larval Salamanders. *Forest Ecology and Management* 257:8-14.  
<http://www.biosci.missouri.edu/semlitsch/research/pubs/Peterman&Semlitsch2008.pdf>
- Price, S., Marks, D., Howe, R., Hanowski, J., and Niemi, G., 2004. The Importance of Spatial Scale for Conservation and Assessment of Anuran Populations in Coastal Wetlands of the Western Great Lakes, USA. *Landscape Ecology* 20:441-454.  
[http://www.bio.davidson.edu/people/midorcas/research/herpstaff/StevePrice/SJPPublications/Price\\_et\\_al2005\\_LandscapeEcology.pdf](http://www.bio.davidson.edu/people/midorcas/research/herpstaff/StevePrice/SJPPublications/Price_et_al2005_LandscapeEcology.pdf)
- Richter, K., 1997. Criteria for the Restoration and Creation of Wetland Habitats of Lentic-Breeding Amphibians of the Pacific Northwest. pp. 72-94 in K.B. Macdonald and F. Weinmann, editors. *Wetland and Riparian Restoration: Taking a Broader View*. Publication EPA 910-R-97-007. USEPA, Region 10, Seattle, Washington.  
LISTED ON EPA WEBSITE, BUT NO LINK
- Rundio, D. and Olson, D., 2007. Influence of Headwater Site Conditions and Riparian Buffers on Terrestrial Salamander Response to Forest Thinning. *Forester Science* 53(2):320-330.  
[http://www.fs.fed.us/pnw/pubs/journals/pnw\\_2007\\_rundio001.pdf](http://www.fs.fed.us/pnw/pubs/journals/pnw_2007_rundio001.pdf)

- Semlitsch, R., 1998. Biological Delineation of Terrestrial Buffer Zones for Pond-Breeding Salamanders. *Conservation Biology* 12(5):1113-1119.  
<http://www.biosci.missouri.edu/semlitsch/research/pubs/Semlitsch1998.pdf>
- Semlitsch, R. and Bodie, R., 2003. Biological Criteria for Buffer Zones Around Wetlands and Riparian Habitats for Amphibians and Reptiles. *Conservation Biology* 17(5):1219-1228.  
<http://www.biosci.missouri.edu/semlitsch/research/pubs/Semlitsch&Bodie2003.pdf>
- Thompson, J., 2008. Saving Streams at their Source: Managing for Amphibian Diversity in Headwater Forests. *Science Findings* 99:1-5.  
<http://www.fs.fed.us/pnw/science/scifi99.pdf>
- Vesely, D., 1996. Terrestrial Amphibian Abundance and Species Richness in Headwater Riparian Buffer Strips, Oregon Coast Range. Diss. Oregon State University, 1997.  
[http://openlibrary.org/works/OL11577085W/Terrestrial\\_amphibian\\_abundance\\_and\\_species\\_richness\\_in\\_headwater\\_riparian\\_buffer\\_strips\\_Oregon\\_Coast\\_Range](http://openlibrary.org/works/OL11577085W/Terrestrial_amphibian_abundance_and_species_richness_in_headwater_riparian_buffer_strips_Oregon_Coast_Range)
- Vesely, D. and McComb, W., 2002. Salamander Abundance and Amphibian Species Richness in Riparian Buffer Strips in the Oregon Coast Range. *Forest Science* 48:291-297.  
<http://ir.library.oregonstate.edu/xmlui/handle/1957/11196>
- Vogt, R., 1981. Natural History of Amphibians and Reptiles of Wisconsin. Milwaukee: Milwaukee Public Museum and Friends of the Museum, Inc.: 78-80.  
<http://www.amazon.com/Natural-History-Amphibians-Reptiles-Wisconsin/dp/0893260606>
- Birds**
- Blair, R.B., 1996. Land Use and Avian Diversity Along an Urban Gradient. *Ecological Applications* 6(2):506-519.  
<http://www.citeulike.org/user/cuyjet/article/1248369>
- Boren, J., Engle, D., Palmer, M., Masters, R., and Criner, T., 1999. Land Use Change Effects on Breeding Bird Community Composition. *Journal of Range Management* 52(5):420-430.  
[http://digitalcommons.library.arizona.edu/objectviewer?o=http://jrm.library.arizona.edu/Volume52/Number5/azu\\_jrm\\_v52\\_n5\\_420\\_430\\_m.pdf](http://digitalcommons.library.arizona.edu/objectviewer?o=http://jrm.library.arizona.edu/Volume52/Number5/azu_jrm_v52_n5_420_430_m.pdf)
- Chapman, K. and Reich, P., 2007. Land Use and Habitat Gradients Determine Bird Community Diversity and Abundance in Suburban, Rural and Reserve Landscapes of Minnesota, USA. *Biological Conservation* 135:527-541.  
<http://forestecology.cfans.umn.edu/Chapman2007BioCons.pdf>
- DeLuca, W., Studts, C., Rockwood, L., and Marra, P., 2004. Influence of Land Use on the Integrity of Marsh Bird Communities of Chesapeake Bay, USA. *Wetlands* 24(4):837-847.  
<http://nationalzoo.si.edu/Publications/ScientificPublications/pdfs/DeLuca%20et%20al.%202004.pdf>
- Hagan, J., Vander Haegen, W., McKinley, P., 1996. The Early Development of Forest Fragmentation Effects on Birds. *Conservation Biology* 10(1):188-202.  
<http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1046/j.1523-1739.1996.10010188.x/abstract>
- Lock, P. and Naiman, R., 1998. Effects of Stream Size on Bird Community Structure in Coastal Temperate Forests of the Pacific Northwest, USA. *Journal of Biogeography* 25(4):773-782.  
<http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1046/j.1365-2699.1998.2540773.x/abstract>



- Machtans, C., Villard, M-A., and Hannon, S., 2002. Use of Riparian Buffer Strips as Movement Corridors by Forest Birds. *Conservation Biology* 10(5):1366-1379.  
<http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1046/j.1523-1739.1996.10051366.x/abstract>
- Montevecchi, W. and Whitaker, D., 1999. Breeding Bird Assemblages Inhabiting Riparian Buffer Strips in Newfoundland, Canada. *The Journal of Wildlife Management* 63(1):167-179.  
<http://www.faqs.org/abstracts/Zoology-and-wildlife-conservation/Breeding-bird-assemblages-inhabiting-riparian-buffer-strips-in-Newfoundland-Canada.html>
- Odell, E. and Knight, R., 2001. Songbird and Medium-Sized Mammal Communities Associated with Exurban Development in Pitkin County, Colorado. *Conservation Biology* 15(4):1143-1150  
<http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1046/j.1523-1739.2001.0150041143.x/abstract>
- Ortega-Alvarez, R. and MacGregor-Fors, I., 2009. Living In the Big City: Effects of Urban Bird Community Structure, Diversity, and Composition. *Landscape and Urban Planning* 90(3-4):189-195.  
<http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0169204608002004>
- Ribic, C., Guzy, M., and Sample, D., 2009. Grassland Bird Use of Remnant Prairie and Conservation Reserve Program Fields in an Agricultural Landscape in Wisconsin. *The American Midland Naturalist* 161(1):110-122.  
<http://www.bioone.org/doi/abs/10.1674/0003-0031-161.1.110>
- Sauvajot, R., Kamradt, D., and Schonewald, C., 1998. Patterns of Human Disturbance and Response by Small Mammals and Birds in Chaparral near Urban Development. *Urban Ecosystems* 2:279-297.  
[http://www38.homepage.villanova.edu/jameson.chace/Urban%20Ecology/sauvajot\\_blockhold.pdf](http://www38.homepage.villanova.edu/jameson.chace/Urban%20Ecology/sauvajot_blockhold.pdf)
- Temple, S. and Wiens, J., 1989. Bird Populations and Environmental Changes: Can Birds Be Bio-Indicators? *American Birds* 43(2):260-270.  
<http://elibrary.unm.edu/sora/NAB/v043n02/front.pdf>
- Invertebrates**
- Clarke, A., Mac Nally, R., Bond, N., and Lake, P.S., 2008. Macroinvertebrate Diversity in Headwater Streams: A Review. *Freshwater Biology* 50:1707-1721.  
<http://www.biolsci.monash.edu.au/research/acb/docs/macroinvertebrate.pdf>
- Dudgeon, D., 1988. The Influence of Riparian Vegetation on Macroinvertebrate Community Structure in Four Hong Kong Streams. *Journal of Zoology, London* 216:609-627.  
<http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/j.1469-7998.1988.tb02461.x/abstract>
- Sandin, L., 2009. The Effects of Catchment Land-Use, Near-Stream Vegetation, and River Hydromorphology on Benthic Macroinvertebrate Communities in a South-Swedish Catchment. *Fundamental and Applied Limnology* 174(1):75-87.  
[http://www.schweizerbart.de/resources/downloads/paper\\_previews/57004.pdf](http://www.schweizerbart.de/resources/downloads/paper_previews/57004.pdf)
- Smith, R., Alexander, L., and Lamp, W., 2009. Dispersal by Terrestrial Stages of Stream Insects in Urban Watersheds: A Synthesis of Current Knowledge. *Journal of the North American Benthological Society* 28(4):1022-1037.  
[http://www.clfs.umd.edu/entm/lamp/reprints/Smith\\_etal\\_2009.pdf](http://www.clfs.umd.edu/entm/lamp/reprints/Smith_etal_2009.pdf)
- Sweeney, B., 1993. Effects of Streamside Vegetation on Macroinvertebrate Communities of White Clay Creek in Eastern North America. *Proceedings of the Academy of Natural Sciences of Philadelphia* 144:291-340.  
[http://www.stroudcenter.org/about/pdfs/bs\\_StreamVegWCC.pdf](http://www.stroudcenter.org/about/pdfs/bs_StreamVegWCC.pdf)

Weigel, B., Emmons, E., Stewart, J., and Bannerman, R., 2005. Buffer Width and Continuity for Preserving Stream Health in Agricultural Landscapes. Research Management Findings. Bureau of Integrated Science Services, Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources (56).  
[http://dnr.wi.gov/org/es/science/publications/pub\\_ss\\_756\\_2005.pdf](http://dnr.wi.gov/org/es/science/publications/pub_ss_756_2005.pdf)

### **Mammals**

Barrett, G. and Peles, J., editors. 1999. Landscape Ecology of Small Mammals. Springer-Verlag New York, Inc. New York, New York. USA.  
[http://www.amazon.com/Landscape-Ecology-Small-Mammals-Barrett/dp/0387986464#reader\\_0387986464](http://www.amazon.com/Landscape-Ecology-Small-Mammals-Barrett/dp/0387986464#reader_0387986464)

Chapman, E. and Ribic, C., 2002. The Impact of Buffer Strips and Stream-Side Grazing on Small Mammals in Southwestern Wisconsin. Agriculture, Ecosystems and Environment 88:49-59.  
[http://www.ccpo.odu.edu/~chapman/transfer/chapman\\_agriculture.pdf](http://www.ccpo.odu.edu/~chapman/transfer/chapman_agriculture.pdf)

Lehmkuhl, J., Peffer, R., and O'Connell, M., 2008. Riparian and Upland Small Mammals on the East Slope of the Cascade Range, Washington. Northwest Science 82(2):94-107.  
[http://www.fs.fed.us/pnw/pubs/journals/pnw\\_2008\\_lehmkuhl001.pdf](http://www.fs.fed.us/pnw/pubs/journals/pnw_2008_lehmkuhl001.pdf)

Markovchick-Nicholls, L., Regan, H., Deutschman, D., Widyanata, A., Martin, B., Noreke, L., and Hunt, T., 2008. Relationships between Human Disturbance and Wildlife Land Use in Urban Habitat Fragments. Conservation Biology 22(1):99-109.  
[ftp://ftp.panaftosa.org.br/CEDOC/RABIES\\_CONTROL\\_AND\\_ELIMINATION\\_IN\\_DOGS/Markovchick-Nicholls-Relationships-between-human.pdf](ftp://ftp.panaftosa.org.br/CEDOC/RABIES_CONTROL_AND_ELIMINATION_IN_DOGS/Markovchick-Nicholls-Relationships-between-human.pdf)

Richter, K. and Azous, A. 1997. Small Mammal Distribution, Abundance and Habitat Use. Wetland and Urbanization: Implications for the Future. Washington State Department of Ecology, King County Water and Land Resources Division, University of Washington: 128-138.  
<http://your.kingcounty.gov/dnrp/library/archive-documents/wlr/wetlands-urbanization-report/Chap7.pdf>

Zabel, C. and Anthony, R. 2003. Mammal Community Dynamics: Management and Conservation in the Coniferous Forests of Western North America. Cambridge University Press. 709 pp.  
[http://www.amazon.com/Mammal-Community-Dynamics-Management-Conservation/dp/0521008654#reader\\_0521008654](http://www.amazon.com/Mammal-Community-Dynamics-Management-Conservation/dp/0521008654#reader_0521008654)

### **BROCHURES/GREY LITERATURE**

Agroforestry: Riparian Buffer Strips. Lexington, KY: Debrah Hill, Cooperative Extension Service, University of Kentucky College of Agriculture, 2009.  
<http://www.ca.uky.edu/agc/pubs/for/for112/for112.pdf>

Agroforestry Notes: Riparian Buffers for Agricultural Land. Lincoln, NE: National Agroforestry Center, 1997.  
<http://digitalcommons.unl.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1001&context=agroforestnotes>

Aquatic Buffers Fact Sheet: Buffer Zones. USEPA. 2002.  
[http://www.stormwatercenter.net/Assorted%20Fact%20Sheets/Tool3\\_Buffers/BufferZones.htm](http://www.stormwatercenter.net/Assorted%20Fact%20Sheets/Tool3_Buffers/BufferZones.htm)

Bay-Lake Regional Environmental Corridors Summary Sheet. Green Bay, WI: Bay-Lake Regional Planning Commission, 2005.  
<http://www.baylakerpc.org/media/2049/blrec-2005.pdf>

Buffers: Common-Sense Conservation. Washington, DC: The United States Department of Agriculture, 1997.  
<http://www.agroforestry.net/overstory/overstory73.html>

- Buffers and Water Quality: A Property Owner's Guide to Manage Riparian Buffers and Protect Water Resources. Albermarle County, VA: County of Albermarle, 2008.  
[http://www.albermarle.org/upload/images/forms\\_center/departments/community\\_development/forms/Water\\_Resources/Stream\\_Buffer\\_Guide.pdf](http://www.albermarle.org/upload/images/forms_center/departments/community_development/forms/Water_Resources/Stream_Buffer_Guide.pdf)
- Buffer Strips: Common Sense Conservation. The United States Department of Agriculture.  
[ftp://ftp-fc.sc.egov.usda.gov/NH/Conserv\\_Tips&Fact\\_Sheets/BufferBrochure.pdf](ftp://ftp-fc.sc.egov.usda.gov/NH/Conserv_Tips&Fact_Sheets/BufferBrochure.pdf)
- Environmental Corridors. Green Bay, WI: Bay-Lake Regional Planning Commission, 2005.  
<http://www.baylakerpc.org/media/2059/poster-region.pdf>
- Environmental Corridors: Lifelines for Living. Taylorville, IL: University of Illinois-Extension, Natural Resources.  
<http://urbanext.illinois.edu/lcr/environmental.cfm>
- Fact Sheet: Environmental Corridors. Madison, WI: Capital Area Regional Planning Commission, 2008.  
[http://danedocs.countyofdane.com/webdocs/PDF/capd/Env\\_Corridor\\_Fact\\_Sheet.pdf](http://danedocs.countyofdane.com/webdocs/PDF/capd/Env_Corridor_Fact_Sheet.pdf)
- Fact Sheet 724: Riparian Buffer Management, An Introduction to the Riparian Forest Buffer. College Park, MD: Maryland Cooperative Extension, University of Maryland College Park-Eastern Shore, 2004.  
<http://www.riparianbuffers.umd.edu/PDFs/FS724.pdf>
- Fact Sheet 725: Riparian Buffer Management, Riparian Forest Buffer Design, Establishment, and Maintenance. College Park, MD: Maryland Cooperative Extension, University of Maryland College Park-Eastern Shore, 2004.  
<http://www.riparianbuffers.umd.edu/PDFs/FS725.pdf>
- Fresh Coast Green Solutions: Weaving Milwaukee's Green & Grey Infrastructure into a Sustainable Future. Milwaukee, WI: Milwaukee Metropolitan Sewerage District, 2009.  
<http://v3.mmsd.com/AssetsClient/Documents/sustainability/SustainBookletweb1209.pdf>
- Green Topeka, Restoring the Health of Topeka's Streams: The Stream Buffer Ordinance. Topeka, KS: City of Topeka Water Pollution Control, 2003.  
<http://greentopeka.org/Resources/Brochures/Buffer%20Brochure%20GT2.pdf>
- Greenways & Blueways, Northwest Indiana Regional Plan: Maps and Executive Summary. Northwestern Indiana Regional Planning Commission, 2007.  
<http://nirpc.org/OldNirpc/Greenway%20and%20Blueway.htm>
- How Much Habitat is Enough: A Framework for Guiding Habitat Rehabilitation in Great Lakes Areas of Concern. Downsview, ON, Canada: Environment Canada, Canadian Wildlife Service, 2004.  
<http://www.on.ec.gc.ca/wildlife/factsheets/pdf/fs-howmuchhabitat-e.pdf>  
<http://www.ec.gc.ca/Publications/1B5F659B-B931-4F37-A988-3DD73DF656B7/CWSHowMuchHabitatisEnoughAFramework.pdf>
- Introduction to Stream Management. Medina, OH: Medina County Soil & Water Conservation District.  
<http://www.medinaswcd.org/STREAM%20MANAGMENT%20BROCHURE.pdf>
- Land Information Bulletin: Environmental Corridors Land Use Planning Guide. Madison, WI: Land Information & Computer Graphics Facility, College of Agricultural & Life Sciences, University of Wisconsin-Madison, 1998.  
<http://www.ruralgis.org/publications/documents/EnvCorr.pdf>



- Landowner Guide to Buffer Success: A Comprehensive Seasonal Guide for Your Forested Buffer Project. USDA, CREP, 2007.  
<http://www.cbf.org/Document.Doc?id=257>
- Livestock and Streams: Understanding the Benefits of Healthy Riparian Areas. Columbus, OH: The Ohio State University-Extension, School of Environment and Natural Resources, 2005.  
<http://ohioline.osu.edu/ls-fact/pdf/0001.pdf>
- Living with Wetlands: A Handbook for Homeowners in Northeastern Illinois. Chicago, IL: The Wetland Initiative, 2004.  
<http://www.lrc.usace.army.mil/co-r/lwwetlands.pdf>
- Natural Resources Conservation Service Conservation Practice Standard: Riparian Forest Buffer Code 391. Natural Resources Conservation Service, 2010.  
[http://www.nrcs.usda.gov/Internet/FSE\\_DOCUMENTS/nrcs143\\_026098.pdf](http://www.nrcs.usda.gov/Internet/FSE_DOCUMENTS/nrcs143_026098.pdf)
- Pennsylvania Wildlife No. 16: Riparian Buffers for Wildlife. University Park, Pa: Penn State College of Agricultural Sciences, Agricultural Research and Cooperative Extension, 2004.  
<http://pubs.cas.psu.edu/FreePubs/pdfs/uh165.pdf>
- Restoring and Managing Stream Greenways: A Landowner's Handbook. Chicago, IL: Northeastern Illinois Planning Commission, 2002.  
[http://www.chicagowilderness.org/sustainable/water/greenways/Restoring\\_Managing\\_Stream\\_Greenways.pdf](http://www.chicagowilderness.org/sustainable/water/greenways/Restoring_Managing_Stream_Greenways.pdf)
- Riparian Area Management: A Citizens Guide. Libertyville, IL: Lake County Stormwater Management Commission, 2006.  
<http://www.lakecountyil.gov/Stormwater/Publications/BMPs/Riparian%20Area%20Management%20Guide.pdf>
- "Riparian Buffer." *Wikipedia, The Free Encyclopedia. Wikimedia Foundation, Inc.* 16 January 2010. Web 11 October 2011.  
[http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Riparian\\_buffer](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Riparian_buffer)
- River Banks & Buffers No. 1: Introduction to Riparian Buffers for the Connecticut River Watershed. Charleston, NH: Connecticut River Joint Commission, 2000.  
<http://www.crjc.org/buffers/Introduction.pdf>
- River Banks & Buffers No. 2: Backyard Buffers for the Connecticut River Watershed. Charleston, NH: Connecticut River Joint Commission, 2000.  
<http://www.crjc.org/buffers/Backyard%20buffers.pdf>
- River Banks & Buffers No. 3: Forestland Buffers for the Connecticut River Watershed. Charleston, NH: Connecticut River Joint Commission, 2000.  
<http://www.crjc.org/buffers/Forestland%20buffers.pdf>
- River Banks & Buffers No. 4: Buffers for Habitat for the Connecticut River Watershed. Charleston, NH: Connecticut River Joint Commission, 2000.  
<http://www.crjc.org/buffers/Buffers%20for%20Habitat.pdf>
- River Banks & Buffers No. 5: Buffers for Agriculture for the Connecticut River Watershed. Charleston, NH: Connecticut River Joint Commission, 2000.  
<http://www.crjc.org/buffers/Buffers%20for%20Agriculture.pdf>

- River Banks & Buffers No. 6: Urban Buffers for the Connecticut River Watershed.  
Charleston, NH: Connecticut River Joint Commission, 2000.  
<http://www.crjc.org/buffers/Urban%20Buffers.pdf>
- River Banks & Buffers No. 7: Guidance for Communities in the Connecticut River Watershed.  
Charleston, NH: Connecticut River Joint Commission, 2000.  
<http://www.crjc.org/buffers/Guidance%20for%20Communities.pdf>
- River Banks & Buffers No. 8: Planting Riparian Buffers in the Connecticut River Watershed.  
Charleston, NH: Connecticut River Joint Commission, 2000.  
<http://www.crjc.org/buffers/Planting%20Riparian%20Buffers.pdf>
- River Banks & Buffers No. 9: Riparian Buffer Field Assessment for the Connecticut River Watershed.  
Charleston, NH: Connecticut River Joint Commission, 2000.  
<http://www.crjc.org/buffers/Field%20Assessment.pdf>
- River Banks & Buffers No. 10: Sources of Assistance for the Connecticut River Watershed.  
Charleston, NH: Connecticut River Joint Commission, 2000.  
<http://www.crjc.org/buffers/Sources%20of%20Assistance.pdf>
- Sign Up for Success: Buffers Can Protect the Land, Water and Check Book.  
Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources, 2005.  
<http://dnr.wi.gov/wnrmag/html/supps/2005/jun05/sign/intro.htm>
- Stormwater Best Management Practices in an Ultra-Urban Setting: Selection and Monitoring.  
U.S. Department of Transportation Federal Highway Administration, 2000.  
<http://environment.fhwa.dot.gov/ecosystems/ultraurb/uubmp4p3.asp>
- Southeast Watershed Forum Wetland Fact Sheet: Riparian Buffer Zones. Nashville, TN:  
Southeast Watershed Forum.  
[http://www.watershed-assistance.net/resources/files/SEWF\\_WetlandFactsheet\\_RiparianBuffer.pdf](http://www.watershed-assistance.net/resources/files/SEWF_WetlandFactsheet_RiparianBuffer.pdf)
- Southeastern Wisconsin Regional Planning Commission, 2007. Planning Report No. 50. A Regional Water Quality Management Plan Update for the Greater Milwaukee Watershed, Appendix O: 1307-1319.  
[http://www.sewrpc.org/SEWRPCFiles/Publications/pr/pr-050\\_part-2\\_water\\_quality\\_plan\\_for\\_greater\\_mke\\_watersheds.pdf?](http://www.sewrpc.org/SEWRPCFiles/Publications/pr/pr-050_part-2_water_quality_plan_for_greater_mke_watersheds.pdf?)
- Storm Water Basins: Using Natural Landscaping for Water Quality & Esthetics, A Primer on Planting and Managing Native Landscaping for Storm Water Basins. University of Wisconsin-Extension and Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources, 2005.  
<http://learningstore.uwex.edu/Assets/pdfs/GWQ045.pdf>
- Stream Corridor Management: Guidelines for Rural Landowners, A Series of Fact Sheets on Regional Planning Issues. Waukesha, WI: University of Wisconsin-Extension, Southeastern Wisconsin Regional Planning Commission, 1996.  
<http://www.sewrpc.org/SEWRPCFiles/Publications/ppr/plan-on-it-stream-corridor-management.pdf>
- Streamside Buffers for Your Backyard. Pittsburgh, PA: Three Rivers Partnership.  
<http://www.twpusc.org/comdev/stormwater/riparian.html#zone>
- Understanding the Science Behind Riparian Forest Buffers: Effects on Plant and Animal Communities.  
Blacksburg, VA: Julia Klapproth and James Johnson, Virginia Cooperative Extension, 2009.  
<http://www.pubs.ext.vt.edu/420/420-152/420-152.html>

What is a Shoreland Buffer? University of Wisconsin Extension, the Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources Basin Educators, the GMU Basin Teams, the Wisconsin Lakes Partnership, and Wisconsin Association to Lakes, 1999.

[http://www4.uwsp.edu/cnr/uwexplakes/ecology/shorelands/background\\_information/pdf\\_docs/what\\_is\\_a\\_shoreland\\_buffer.pdf](http://www4.uwsp.edu/cnr/uwexplakes/ecology/shorelands/background_information/pdf_docs/what_is_a_shoreland_buffer.pdf)

Yard Care and the Environment: Managing Leaves and Yard Trimmings. Madison, WI: University of Wisconsin-Extension, the Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources, and the Southeastern Wisconsin Regional Planning Commission, 1999.

<http://learningstore.uwex.edu/Assets/pdfs/GWQ022.pdf>

Yard Care and the Environment: Rethinking Yard Care. Madison, WI: University of Wisconsin-Extension and the Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources, 1999.

<http://learningstore.uwex.edu/Assets/pdfs/GWQ009.pdf>

Yard Care and the Environment: Shoreline Plants and Landscaping. Madison, WI: University of Wisconsin-Extension and the Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources, 1999.

<http://learningstore.uwex.edu/Assets/pdfs/GWQ014.pdf>