

BUFFER OPTIONS FOR THE BAY: EXPLORING THE TRENDS, SCIENCE, AND OPTIONS OF BUFFER  
MANAGEMENT IN THE GREAT BAY WATERSHED

*SOCIAL SCIENCE BIBLIOGRAPHY*

LISA GRAICHEN<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>UNH COOPERATIVE EXTENSION AND NH SEA GRANT, NESMITH HALL, ROOM 211, 131 MAIN STREET, DURHAM, NH  
03824, [LDD22@WILDCATS.UNH.EDU](mailto:LDD22@WILDCATS.UNH.EDU)

### Potential categories/avenues:

- A. Stakeholders' preferences, perceptions, understanding, awareness, values re: buffers
- B. Stakeholders' perspectives/opinions about policy options (e.g., Wells study)
- C. Socioeconomic benefits of buffers for individuals/communities (e.g., quality of life, well-being, health, recreation, aesthetics, property values, etc.)
  - a. *Maybe David/Dana have covered this sufficiently; if not, want to make sure it's complete*
- D. Cost-benefit analysis/ecosystem service valuation studies of buffers
  - a. *Think Dana will be covering this*

### References:

#### *Local*

1. Choices for Our Land and Water: A Survey of Kennebunk, Sanford, and Wells Residents. Wells National Estuarine Research Reserve, Wells, ME, and Clark University, Worcester, MA.
2. DeLauer, V. (2015). Sustaining Coastal Landscapes: Communication Audit and Mental Mapping Research Summary.
3. Johnston, R.J., Feurt, C., and Holland, B. (2015). Ecosystem Services and Riparian Land Management in the Merriland, Branch Brook, and Little River Watershed: Quantifying Values and Tradeoffs. George Perkins Marsh Institute, Clark University, Worcester, MA, and the Wells National Estuarine Research Reserve, Wells, ME.
4. Novak, C.S., and Smith, A.E. (2012). New Hampshire Conservation Attitude Survey Highlights Report. *The Survey Center, University of New Hampshire*.
5. Veysey Powell, J.S. (2014). *Conserving Wetlands for Humans and Amphibians: A Multidisciplinary Approach to Understanding the Social and Ecological Effectiveness of New England's Wetland Policies*. Retrieved from ProQuest Digital Dissertations. (3681138)
6. Washburn, E.L. (2009). *To Pave or Not to Pave: A Social Landscape Analysis of Land Use Decision-Making in the Lamprey River Watershed*. University of New Hampshire. Dissertation.
7. Brown, C. 2016. Water Concerns Unite Citizen Activists. *Carsey Perspectives*.

#### *Not local*

1. Armstrong, A., and Stedman, R.C. (2012). Landowner Willingness to Implement Riparian Buffers. *Landscape and Urban Planning*, 105, 211-220.
2. Dutcher, D.D., Finley, J.C., Luloff, A.E., and Johnson, J. (2004). Landowner Perceptions of Protecting and Establishing Riparian Forests: A Qualitative Analysis. *Society and Natural Resources*, 17, 329-342.
3. Corbett, J.B. (2002). Motivations to Participate in Riparian Improvement Programs. *Science Communication*, 23(3), 243-263.
4. Gary, G., and Allred, S.B. (2015). HDRU Publ. 15-1. Dept. of Natural Resources, College of Agriculture and Life Sciences, Cornell University, Ithaca, NY. *Needs Assessment of Hudson River Estuary Streamside Landowners: Flooding and stream management behaviors, motivations, and education preferences*.
5. Hairston, A.B. (1996). *Response to Water Protection Rule Changes in the Oregon Forest Practices Act: Landowner/Operator Opinions and Streamside Conditions*. Oregon State University. Dissertation. Retrieved from <https://ir.library.oregonstate.edu/xmlui/bitstream/handle/1957/9797/Hairston,%20Anne%20PhD.pdf?sequence=1>.
6. Hairston-Strang, A.B., and Adams, P.W. (1997). Oregon's Streamside Rules: Achieving Public Goals on Private Land. *Journal of Forestry*.
7. Hermans, C., Howarth, R.B., Noordewier, T., and Erickson, J.D. (2008). Constructing Preferences

- in Structured Group Deliberative Processes. In R.B. Howarth and C. Zografos (Eds.), *Deliberative Ecological Economics* (50-79). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
8. Jacobson, M.G. (2002). Factors Affecting Private Landowner Interest in Ecosystem Management. *Environmental Management*, 30(4), 577-583.
  9. Kenwick, R.A., Shammin, M.R., and Sullivan, W.C. (2009). Preferences for Riparian Buffers. *Landscape and Urban Planning*, 91, 88-96.
  10. Larson, K.L., and Santelmann, M.V. (2007). An Analysis of the Relationship between Residents' Proximity to Water and Attitudes about Resource Protection. *The Professional Geographer*, 59(3), 316-333.
  11. Lovell, S.T., and Sullivan, W.C. (2006). Environmental benefits of conservation buffers in the United States: Evidence, promise, and open questions. *Agriculture, Ecosystems and Environment*, 112, 249-260.
  12. Lynch, L., and Brown, C. (2000). Landowner Decision-Making about Riparian Buffers. *Journal of Agricultural and Applied Economics*, 32(3), 585-596.
  13. Lynch, L., Hardie, I., and Parker, D. (2002). Analyzing Agricultural Landowners' Willingness to Install Streamside Buffers. University of Maryland, College Park.
  14. Mojica-Howell, M.N., and Collins, A.R. (2012). What Do Riparian Landowners Know and Want? Survey Results from the Headwaters of the Potomac River. *Environmental and Natural Resources Research*, 2(1).
  15. Rosenberg, S., and Margerum, R.D. (2008). Landowner Motivations for Watershed Restoration. *Journal of Environmental Planning and Management*, 51(4), 477-496.
  16. Schrader, C.C. (1995). Rural Greenway Planning: the role of streamland perception in landowner acceptance of land management strategies. *Landscape and Urban Planning*, 33, 375-390.
  17. Slagle, K.M., Wilson, R.S., and Heeren, A. (2015). Seeking, Thinking, Acting: Understanding Suburban Resident Perceptions and Behaviors Related to Stream Quality. *Journal of American Water Resources Association*, 51(3), 821-832.
  18. Sterner, G., Bryant, R., Kleinman, P.J.A., Watson, J., and Alter, T. 2015. Community Implementation Dynamics: Nutrient Management in the New York City and Chesapeake Bay Watersheds. *International Journal of Rural Law and Policy*.
  19. Vivek, S. (2007). An Empirical Study of Streamside Landowners' Interest in Riparian Conservation. *Journal of the American Planning Association*, 73(2), 173-184.
  20. Allred, S., Stedman, R., Heady, L., Strong, K., and Tse, C. 2015. Conservation and Land Use Planning: Linking Municipal Capacity and Biodiversity Outcomes. *Cornell University Community and Regional Development Institute: Research and Policy Brief Series: 70*.
  21. Allred, S., Stedman, R., Heady, L., Strong, K., and Tse, C. 2015. Conservation and Land Use Planning: Engaging Municipal Officials in Improving Natural Resource-Based Planning. *Cornell University Community and Regional Development Institute: Research and Policy Brief Series: 69*.
  22. Klapproth, J.C., and Johnson, J.E. 2009. *Understanding the Science Behind Riparian Forest Buffers: Benefits to Communities and Landowners*. Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University.