

1 Proceedings

2 Feasibility of Sustainable Management of Secondary 3 Atlantic Forest: Recovery and Mortality Rates of 4 Damaged Trees Two Years After Harvesting [†]

5 Pedro C. Britto ^{1,*}, Dirk Jaeger ¹, Stephan Hoffmann ¹, Renato C. G. Robert ²,
6 Alexander C. Vibrans ³ and Alfredo C. Fantini ⁴

7 ¹ Department of Forest Work Science and Engineering, University of Göttingen, Büesgenweg 4, 37077
8 Göttingen, Germany; dirk.jaeger@uni-goettingen.de

9 ² Department of Forest Engineering and Technology, Federal University of Paraná (UFPR), Av. Prefeito
10 Lothário Meissner 632, 80210170 Curitiba, Brazil; renatorobert@ufpr.br

11 ³ Department of Forest Engineering, University of Blumenau, R. São Paulo 3250, 89030000 Blumenau, Brazil;
12 acv@furb.br

13 ⁴ Laboratory of Ecology and Management of Forest Ecosystems, Federal University of Santa Catarina (UFSC),
14 Rodovia Admar Gonzaga 1346, 88034000 Florianópolis, Brazil; alfredo.fantini@ufsc.br

15 * Correspondence: pedro.britto@gmx.de; Tel.: +49-(0)551-39-23580 (P.C.B.)

16 [†] Presented at the 1st International Electronic Conference on Forests, 15–30 November 2020;

17 Available online: <https://sciforum.net/conference/IECF2020>

18 Published: November 2020

19 **Abstract:** Subject to over exploitation in the past centuries, the Atlantic Forest is now strictly
20 protected including a ban on timber harvesting. However, this strict protection is a very
21 controversial issue. It resulted in a lack of willingness of landholders to conserve and possibly even
22 expand native forest areas. The lack of knowledge on impacts of potential timber-harvesting causes
23 conflicts between conservation and management of the remnant Atlantic Forest. We believe that
24 sustainable forest management, with reduced harvesting impact, has the potential to generate
25 income for the landowners while sustaining important ecological services of the forest. Therefore,
26 we assessed the harvesting impact of a conventional harvesting method (CM) and compared it to
27 an alternative harvesting method (AM) in three different stands. We measured damage intensities
28 of all remnant trees directly after harvesting and two years after harvesting. Tree damages were
29 recorded at three different tree zones (crown, bole and leaning) and rated in three different intensity
30 classes (minor, moderate and severe). Furthermore, we assessed the recovery and mortality rates of
31 each damaged tree two years after harvesting. Improved AM harvesting reduced the impacts on
32 trees with multiple damages, in particular to crown and bole damages combined. There is a strong
33 relationship between steep terrains and crown damages. High mortality rates were related to stands
34 with a high density of smaller trees and also to trees with leaning damages. Moreover, completely
35 recovered trees were related to trees with light bole damages.

36 **Keywords:** reduced impact logging; logging damages; tractor winch

38 **Publisher’s Note:** MDPI stays neutral with regard to jurisdictional claims in published maps and
39 institutional affiliations.



© 2020 by the authors. Submitted for possible open access publication under the terms
and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY) license
(<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>).