

# Journal of Environmental Management

## Economic returns and the perceived obstacles to adopting active management in the forest-grassland transition ecoregion in south-central USA

--Manuscript Draft--

<b>Manuscript Number:</b>	JEMA-D-23-01126
<b>Article Type:</b>	Research Article
<b>Keywords:</b>	Equivalent annual income; Logistic regression; Oklahoma; Timber; Deer habitat; Cattle management
<b>Abstract:</b>	<p>Forest-grassland ecotones are a mosaic of grassland, savanna, and upland forest. As such, landowners can choose to manage their lands for multiple objectives. We estimated the economic returns from managing forest and rangeland in southeastern Oklahoma to produce different combinations of timber, cattle forage, and white-tailed deer (<i>Odocoileus virginianus</i>) browse for a 40-year period. We further conducted a survey to understand landowner perceptions of obstacles to adopting active management that involve timber harvest and prescribed fire. The highest net return was obtained from the treatment with harvested timber and burned every four years (uneven-aged woodland/forest) because it had the greatest gross return from a combination of timber (46%), cattle forage (42%), and deer browse (11%). The return from this treatment was greater than that of managed for timber only (closed-canopy forest) or prioritizing cattle and deer (savanna). Survey results suggested that landowners were aware of the benefits of active management but that the majority (66%) considered cost as a major obstacle in the management of their forest or rangeland. Women forestland owners and older landowners considered cost an obstacle. Our findings advocate integrated timber, cattle, and deer management as the best economic strategy within the forest-grassland ecotone and for targeted outreach and landowner education related to the benefits of active management.</p>

**Economic returns and the perceived obstacles to adopting active management in the  
forest-grassland transition ecoregion in south-central USA**

Bijesh Mishra, Omkar Joshi, Ron Masters, Caleb McKinney, Arjun Adhikari, Chris B.

Zou, Rodney E. Will

Bijesh Mishra, Department of Natural Resource Ecology and Management, Oklahoma State University, Stillwater, OK

Omkar Joshi, Department of Natural Resource Ecology and Management, Oklahoma State University, Stillwater, OK 74078; email: [omkar.joshi@okstate.edu](mailto:omkar.joshi@okstate.edu)

Ron Masters, College of Natural Resources, University of Wisconsin-Stevens Point, Stevens Point, Wisconsin 54481 USA

Caleb McKinney, Department of Natural Resource Ecology and Management, Oklahoma State University, Stillwater, OK

Arjun Adhikari, Department of Natural Resource Ecology and Management, Oklahoma State University, Stillwater, OK

Chris B. Zou. Department of Natural Resource Ecology and Management, Oklahoma State University, Stillwater, OK

Rodney E. Will, Department of Natural Resource Ecology and Management, Oklahoma State University, Stillwater, OK.

Treatment harvested and burned every four years provided the highest return.

Most landowners were aware of the benefits of active management.

The cost was identified as the primary obstacle to active management.


[Click here to view linked References](#)


## Abstract

Forest-grassland ecotones are a mosaic of grassland, savanna, and upland forest. As such, landowners can choose to manage their lands for multiple objectives. We estimated the economic returns from managing forest and rangeland in southeastern Oklahoma to produce different combinations of timber, cattle forage, and white-tailed deer (*Odocoileus virginianus*) browse for a 40-year period. We further conducted a survey to understand landowner perceptions of obstacles to adopting active management that involve timber harvest and prescribed fire. The highest net return was obtained from the treatment with harvested timber and burned every four years (uneven-aged woodland/forest) because it had the greatest gross return from a combination of timber (46%), cattle forage (42%), and deer browse (11%). The return from this treatment was greater than that of managed for timber only (closed-canopy forest) or prioritizing cattle and deer (savanna). Survey results suggested that landowners were aware of the benefits of active management but that the majority (66%) considered cost as a major obstacle in the management of their forest or rangeland. Women forestland owners and older landowners considered cost an obstacle. Our findings advocate integrated timber, cattle, and deer management as the best economic strategy within the forest-grassland ecotone and for targeted outreach and landowner education related to the benefits of active management.

Keywords: Equivalent annual income, Logistic regression, Oklahoma, Timber, Deer habitat, Cattle management

## 1. Introduction

 Forest landowners choose among management alternatives such as maximizing the value of specific tree products, reducing tree cover to increase understory productivity to balance tree growth with forage and browse for livestock and wildlife, and minimizing tree cover to optimize herbaceous productivity for livestock or grassland-dependent wildlife species (Bettinger et al., 2010; Nyland, 2016). Management decisions depend on the landowner's expected economic returns, perceived obstacles, experience, and willingness to implement various management strategies (Butler et al., 2016; Joshi and Arano, 2009). Understanding the economic returns from scenarios that vary outputs among trees, cattle, and wildlife is vital for informed management decisions (Bettinger et al. 2010). Landowner opinions on perceived obstacles can further help design appropriate outreach programs to facilitate decision-making.

 The Central Forest-grassland Transition Ecotone of the south-central USA is a dynamic region consisting of tallgrass prairie, savanna, and upland forest that occurs between the grasslands of the Great Plains and the forests of the eastern USA (Hallgren et al., 2012; Hoff et al., 2018a; Joshi et al., 2019b). The ecoregion is affected by prolonged droughts (Tian et al., 2018), erratic rainfall (Otkin et al., 2019), and unpredictable wildfires (Clark et al., 2007; Hallgren et al., 2012) which alter the relative abundance of trees vs herbaceous vegetation. Historically, the transitional nature of the region was maintained by climate and frequent burning that was influenced by topographic features, particularly waterway distribution (Anderson, 1983, 2006; Hoff et al., 2018a). Fire was largely excluded since the mid 20<sup>th</sup> Century, which increased forest cover, increased the abundance of mesic hardwood tree species, and allowed encroachment of eastern redcedar (*Juniperus virginiana*) (Hoff et al., 2018b; Kaur et al., 2019). The changes resulting from fire exclusion have adverse effects on many ecosystem services

(Joshi et al., 2019b) including reduced understory productivity (Feltrin et al., 2016), which provides forage and browse for cattle and some wildlife species.


Management using prescribed fire at three years or less return interval can maintain savanna while longer fire intervals or fire exclusion result in uneven-aged or even-aged forests respectively (Adhikari et al., 2021a; Feltrin et al., 2016; Masters et al., 2006). Active management to shift from a closed-canopy forest to woodland or savanna using thinning and prescribed fire benefits a number of ecosystem services. For example, evapotranspiration is greater in forest than in mixed cover and non-forested land (Zhang et al., 2001) such that reducing tree cover increases water yield to streams (Qiao et al., 2017; Zhong et al., 2020). Prescribed fire and thinning improves forest health by reducing fuel load (Starr et al., 2019), improves wildlife habitat (Harper and Johnson, 2008), and increases grass production (e.g., Feltrin et al. 2016) for cattle forage.

Implementation of prescribed fire and thinning is, however, limited by economic and financial burdens and liabilities incurred by landowners (Starr et al., 2019). While portions of the Central Forest-Grassland Transition ecotone have a viable timber industry, cost becomes a major impediment for adoption of active management, especially on marginal forestlands or areas not near mills and processing facilities (OFS, 2010). Therefore, landowners may prefer integrated enterprises (Hines et al., 2021), especially on lands not suited for row-crop agriculture or plantation silviculture. Landowners in Oklahoma, USA, in the Central Forest-Grasslands Transition ecotone, have the potential to earn income from timber, cattle, and wildlife. In Oklahoma, the forest sector annually contributes more than 5.5 billion dollars in direct industry output and indirectly generated about 18,500 jobs (Gore et al., 2022). Oklahomans received an estimated \$722.4 million in total annual ecosystem services from cattle grazing on approximately

15 million acres of mostly private rangeland (Maher et al., 2020). White-tailed deer (*Odocoileus virginianus*) hunting is an important wildlife management tool (Arnett and Southwick, 2015; Hines et al., 2021), an avenue for social interaction, and holds cultural value in the southern United States (Arnett and Southwick, 2015). Annually, 13.7 million deer hunters contribute \$38.3 billion to the USA economy (Arnett and Southwick, 2015).

Our first objective was to determine the economic returns from different management scenarios including timber harvest, thinning, and prescribed fire to create stand conditions ranging from closed-canopy forest to savanna/grassland in southeastern Oklahoma. Specifically, we compared benefits and costs related to management objectives for timber, cattle, and white-tailed deer habitat over a 40-year time horizon. The second objective was to understand landowner perceptions of obstacles to adopting active management that involve timber harvest and prescribed fire. Cost comes as a major obstacle to managing marginal forestlands (Starr et al. 2019; Kaur et al. 2019) even though the lack of knowledge and awareness are some of the common reasons for not participating in active management in productive timberland regions (Kendra, 2003). Therefore, an economic analysis does not provide a complete picture without understanding the social issues that may come as obstacle in active management.

It is, thus, imperative to explore how landowner management objectives, socio-economic realities, and landownership characteristics are associated with their perceptions of cost as an obstacle in adopting active management in the forest-grassland transition ecoregion. This research is especially important along the forest-grassland ecotone as forest production is typically lower than areas with greater precipitation. The relative production of trees and herbaceous vegetation shifts according to management regime, weather, and climate. Economics and perceptions of cost are driving factors to influence landowners' decisions to actively manage


their land. Our research, therefore, will provide a basis for decision-making and allow prediction of how potential economic returns and perceptions on costs may affect management choices by landowners. 

## 2. Methods

### 2.1 Data collection and analyses

#### 2.1.1 Economic value of timber, cattle forage, and deer forage

We utilized the field data collected from the ~53 ha Forest Habitat Research Area located at the Pushmataha Wildlife Management Area to understand the economics of management for different mixes of timber, cattle, and deer habitat. The research site is in the semi-humid region of Oklahoma characterized by hot summers and moderate winters (Thornton et al. 2018).

Research plots were established in 1983 using a random experimental design and included  Control, HT (harvest pine and thin hardwood), HT2, HT3, HT4 (harvest pine, thin hardwood and burn at 2-year interval, 3-year interval, 4-year interval, respectively). Details on the study area are available in previous publications (Adhikari et al., 2021a; Adhikari et al., 2021b; Masters and Waymire, 2012; Masters et al., 2006). In 2017, the Control treatment was closed-canopy mixed pine, oak and hickory forest approximately 90 years-old, the HT treatment was a closed-canopy even-aged forest approximately 35-years-old, the HT4 treatment was an uneven-aged woodland, and the HT3 and HT2 treatments were savanna (Adhikari et al., 2022; Adhikari et al., 2021b).

We utilized the data collected from the three Control stands using 20 variable-radius plots per stand (**BAF 10 prism**) that included tree DBH and height (Feltrin et al., 2016) to represent the condition of stands before treatments were implemented. **Forest vegetation simulator (FVS)** was used to simulate the growth and yield over 40 years of time horizon. The growth and yield simulation in the Control stands did not receive any treatment. The HT, HT2, HT3, and HT4 stands were simulated with the appropriate combination of thinning and prescribed fire. The



growth rate and burn-induced mortality rates within FVS were adjusted such that FVS outputs closely mimic the measured basal areas reported in Adhikari et al. (2021a) and Feltrin et al. (2016) for the years 1984, 2014, and 2018. These adjustments were necessary because FVS simulations are known to over-predict post-fire mortality (Barker et al., 2019).

The average annual stumpage prices of sawlogs and pulpwood in northeastern Texas were obtained from Texas A&M Forest Service annual summary report. The time value of money was taken into consideration for the financial analysis as timber revenues are realized through commercial harvesting at the end of rotation. The timber value was annualized using the Equivalent Annual Income (EAI) formula. The EAI reports the equivalent of the revenue that can be obtained annually over the life of an investment considering the discount rate applied (5.5%) (Bettinger et al. 2010).

$$\text{Timber value} = \sum_{t=0}^T R_t (1 + r)^t \quad \text{Eq (1)}$$

$$\text{EAI} = \text{Timber value} \left( \frac{r}{(1+r)^t - 1} \right) \quad \text{Eq (2)}$$

In the above equation,  $R_t$  represents the timber value in the current year,  $r$  represents the discount rate and  $t$  represents the rotation age.

The aboveground net primary production (ANPP) of understory vegetation was collected annually from the research plots from 1987 to 2017 (Adhikari et al., 2021b) and used to calculate the average annual forage available during the 40-year simulation. We assumed that cattle and deer don't compete for forage with low to moderate stocking rates and thus, classified legume, understory woody growth, forbs, (Johnson et al., 1995), and cool season *Panicum* and *Dichanthelium* spp. (Gee et al., 2011), as deer forage, and grass and sedge (Sedivec and Printz, 2014) as cattle forage. The total forage produced was multiplied by 0.25 (25% of ANPP) to

account for grazing and browsing efficiency (Redfearn and Bidwell, 2017). The stocking rate of cattle and deer (Meehan et al., 2018), the total number of cattle or deer supported by available dry forage on one hectare of land, was calculated using Eq (3). We assumed a dry matter intake of 10.89 kg cattle<sup>-1</sup> day<sup>-1</sup> (Rasby, 2013) and 1.93 kg deer<sup>-1</sup> day<sup>-1</sup> (Fulbright and Ortega-S, 2013) for this analysis. The total land required per head of cattle or deer was the inverse of the stocking rate.

$$\text{Stocking Rate} = \frac{\text{Cattle or deer forage dry mass (kg)/hectare/day} \times 365 \times 0.25}{\text{Dry forage consumed by a cattle or deer} \times 365 / \text{day}} \text{Eq (3)}$$

The market price of cattle for a 226.8 to 272.2 kg (500 to 600 pounds) steer was obtained from Oklahoma National Stockyards (Oklahoma National Stockyard, 2022) between 1984 to 2020 whereas prices between 2021 to 2024 were predicted using the **FORCAST formula** in excel. The annual economic value of cattle forage was obtained by multiplying the annual auction price of cattle, producer price index (PPI) ratio, and stocking rate of cattle after adjusting for grazing efficiency (Meehan et al., 2018; Redfearn and Bidwell, 2017; Sedivec and Printz, 2014). A non-market-based valuation approach was needed to obtain the value of a deer forage because deer is not sold in the market and thus, does not have a market value like livestock or timber.

While hunting lease can be used to capture market value of the land (Baen, 1997), tenant access to hunting land does not directly provide value of a deer. Therefore, we relied on a survey instrument administered to landowners in the study region to determine the economic value of a deer. The survey responses and respondent details are discussed in section 2.1.3. In the survey, two questions were designed to obtain necessary information. The first question revealed the landowner's total willingness to pay (WTP) to maintain the current population of deer observed

1  
2  
3  
4 at their regular deer hunting location. The second question asked respondents to report total  
5  
6 number of deer observed per visit at their regular hunting site. The reported average WTP in  
7  
8  
9 first the question was divided by the average number of deer observed per visit in second  
10  
11 question to calculate WTP per deer, which we used as the economic value of a deer. We  
12  
13 calculated the average WTP to see one additional deer was \$12.96. The annual economic value  
14  
15 of deer was obtained by multiplying WTP (\$) deer<sup>-1</sup> by the deer stocking rate adjusted for  
16  
17 grazing efficiency.  
18  
19

20  
21 We calculated total economic return by summing the market (cattle forage + timber) and  
22  
23 non-market based (deer forage) ecosystem services, which is consistent with the common  
24  
25 practice of adding provisioning (timber and cattle) with cultural (WTP based on deer habitat  
26  
27 management) ecosystem services together (Costanza et al., 1997).  
28  
29

### 30 31 *2.1.2 Prescribed fire costs* 32

33 Expenses for prescribed burning were the only active management cost considered for  
34  
35 the financial analysis. We reported average annual prescribed fire costs separately because  
36  
37 management costs served as inputs to obtain outputs for timber, cattle forage, and deer forage.  
38  
39 The time value of money considerations were deemed to be impractical in annualizing prescribed  
40  
41 fire cost calculations as cattle forage is produced and sold on an annual basis whereas timber-sale  
42  
43 revenues are realized at the end of the rotation. Prescribed fire costs, available from secondary  
44  
45 sources in year 1990 (Masters et al., 1993), 1994 (Cleaves 2000), 1996 (Gabbert 2014), 2016  
46  
47 (Maggard and Barlow 2018), 2020 (Maggard 2021), and 2021 (Watts et al. 2022) were converted  
48  
49 to 2021 dollars using an inflation adjustment calculator and were projected for 2024. Therefore,  
50  
51 annual values of prescribed fire were obtained by dividing average prescribed fire costs by its  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

frequency. Net returns then were calculated by subtracting annualized prescribed fire costs from the annualized total economic return.

### *2.1.3 Data on landowner perceptions on cost as an obstacle for active management*

A survey ~~instrument~~ was designed to understand the factors that influence landowner perception of impediments for active management in the study area. The survey ~~instrument~~ was designed following Dillman et al. (2014) and mailed to 2,500 randomly selected landowners in the forest-grassland transition ecoregion living in the counties east of interstate I-35 in Oklahoma. The survey constituted several questions asking about landowner perceptions toward active forest management, obstacles to implementing active management, their land management objectives, preferences for deer hunting sites, and socio-demographics. Further, we asked landowners to select the major obstacles to implementing active management in their forest or rangeland. The options included cost, time limitation, fire risk and liability, lack of knowledge, government policy, economically not beneficial, practically not feasible, rented out the property, don't live close to property. Because cost was chosen as an obstacle by the highest percentage of the landowners (66%), our focus was to understand the factors associated with cost as a perceived obstacle in adopting active management in the forest or rangeland.

The dependent variable, cost as a perceived obstacle in adopting active management, was measured as a binary choice (chosen/not chosen). We used a binary probit regression model to understand the factors (independent variables) that had a statistically significant association with cost as an obstacle. Landowner management objectives, awareness about the issue, and the socio-demographic information had significant associations with management behavior (Arano and Munn, 2006; Sun et al., 2009; Joshi and Arano, 2009; Joshi et al., 2013) and were significant in past research. These attributes, thus, were chosen as candidate independent variables in our

1  
2  
3  
4 regression model. The summary statistics of the dependent and independent variables used in  
5  
6  
7 probit regression analysis are provided in table 5. The empirical specification of the binary probit  
8  
9 model can be described as:

10  
11 Choice (cost as an obstacle) =  $f$  (awareness, interest, management objectives, socio-  
12  
13 demographics) Eq (4).

### 14 15 16 **3. Results**

#### 17 18 19 ***3.1 Economics of active management***

##### 20 21 ***3.1. 1. Quantification of timber, cattle, and deer forage***

22  
23 The basal area (BA), merchantable timber volume, and sawlog volume in the non-  
24  
25 managed Control stands were the highest among all treatments at the beginning of the simulation  
26  
27 in 1984. Among the forest treatments, the increase in BA was smallest ( $3.1 \text{ m}^2 \text{ ha}^{-1}$ ) in Control  
28  
29 stands during the 40-year period, largest in the HT treatment stands ( $34.6 \text{ m}^2 \text{ ha}^{-1}$ ), and  
30  
31 intermediate in the HT4 treatment ( $19.6 \text{ m}^2 \text{ ha}^{-1}$ ). The two savanna treatments (HT3 and HT2)  
32  
33 increased in BA  $< 3 \text{ m}^2 \text{ ha}^{-1}$ . The initial BA of the Control stands ( $26.6 \text{ m}^2 \text{ ha}^{-1}$ ) resulted in a  
34  
35 stocking of approximately 80% (Rogers, 1983) and remained below 100% even with no thinning  
36  
37 due to relatively slow growth and occasional individual tree mortality (stocking based on  
38  
39 shortleaf pine which was ~60% of total basal area). The initial reduction in competition due to  
40  
41 thinning and harvesting treatments provided growing space for existing and new trees in HT  
42  
43 stands such that, in 2024, the treatment was an overstocked (110%), even-aged stand undergoing  
44  
45 some density-dependent mortality. The HT4 stands developed as more open, uneven-aged stands  
46  
47 (70% stocking) as trees would sporadically establish between the four-year period between  
48  
49 burns. The HT2 and HT3 treatments were savanna or open woodland with the repeated fires  
50  
51 maintaining these conditions.  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

While the Control treatment had the greatest merchantable timber at the end of the simulation, much of that was present at the beginning, resulting in net growth of 43.1 tons ha<sup>-1</sup> (Table 1). In contrast, the other treatments had low initial basal area such that the HT (144.8 tons ha<sup>-1</sup>) and HT4 (97.3 tons ha<sup>-1</sup>) treatments grew more. Repeated fire in the HT3 and HT2 treatments limited growth of merchantable timber (< 25 tons ha<sup>-1</sup>). The ratio of merchantable timber in sawlog vs pulpwood size classes in 2024 depended on initial density and tree sizes. Most of the trees reached sawlog size classes (> 95% of merchantable timber was sawlogs) due to the lower stand densities in the HT2, HT3, and HT4 treatments. In the Control treatment, most of the new growth was in the sawlog category as sawlog-sized trees grew larger (79% of merchantable timber growth was sawlogs). In contrast, the HT treatment was overstocked, and majority of the trees remained pulpwood sized and only 32% of merchantable timber growth was sawlogs.

Cattle forage was dominated by warm-season grasses, i.e., 97% grass vs 3% sedge. The average ANPP of sedge was the greatest in HT2 stands (42 kg ha<sup>-1</sup> yr<sup>-1</sup>), but still composed only 2% of cattle forage (Table 2). Cattle forage was greatest in the HT2 and HT3 treatments that were savanna (> 2000 kg ha<sup>-1</sup> y<sup>-1</sup>), intermediate in the HT4 treatment (1491 kg ha<sup>-1</sup> y<sup>-1</sup>), and minimal in the closed-canopy forests (Control and HT < 120 kg ha<sup>-1</sup> y<sup>-1</sup>). Deer forage, i.e. woody browse, legume, forb, and panicum grass (cool season *Panicum* and *Dichanthelium* spp.), was dominated by the woody component (> 71%) (Table 2) in all treatments. Legumes, forbs, and panicum grass made up 8%, 6%, and 8% of deer forage respectively. Deer forage was relatively large in the HT2 (1027 kg ha<sup>-1</sup> y<sup>-1</sup>), HT3 (1001 kg ha<sup>-1</sup> y<sup>-1</sup>) and HT4 (922 kg ha<sup>-1</sup> y<sup>-1</sup>) treatments and low in the HT (175 kg ha<sup>-1</sup> y<sup>-1</sup>) and Control (158 kg ha<sup>-1</sup> y<sup>-1</sup>) treatments. The percentage of the different vegetation categories was similar among treatments except for legumes, which were

greater in the burned treatments (8%) compared to the non-burned treatments (4%). The number of cattle supported were 9 to 13 times greater and number of deer were 5 to 6 times greater for the HT2, HT3, and HT4 stands compared to the Control and HT stands (Table 3).

### 3.1.2 *Economic Analysis*

The greatest annual economic return per hectare from combining timber, cattle forage, and deer forage were in the burned treatments, i.e., HT4 (\$38.06) followed by HT2 (\$31.64) and HT3 (\$31.54), and lowest in the non-burned treatments HT (\$16.35) and Control (\$8.91) (Table 4). The returns in the highest producing treatment (HT4) were 46% from timber, 42% from cattle forage, and 11% from deer forage. The most heavily forested treatments, Control and HT, had 78% and 88% of returns from timber, while returns for the frequently burned savanna treatments were dominated by cattle forage, HT3 (72%) and HT2 (70%). Returns from deer forage ranged between 5% in the HT treatment to 15% in the HT2 and HT3 treatments. Even though the HT treatment produced the most timber, the HT4 treatment provided the greatest timber revenue (\$2411.78 ha<sup>-1</sup>) over 40 years because of the larger fraction of sawlog vs pulpwood production. The Control, HT3, and HT2 treatments had timber revenues less than \$1000 ha<sup>-1</sup> over the 40-year period because of lower timber productivity.

The costs were proportional to burn frequency. Net returns were lowest in the HT2 treatment (\$3.63 per year) when costs of prescribed burning were included (Table 4). The HT4 treatment had the greatest net return (\$24.05 per year) because it had the greatest gross return and the cost of burning were incurred only once in every four years. In contrast, gross and net returns of the Control and HT treatments were the same (no burning costs), such that the HT treatments had the second largest net return (\$16.35 per year). Compared to the net return of the

savanna treatment burned every two years (HT2), net return of the savanna treatment with a three-year fire return interval (HT3) was more than three times (\$12.86 per year).

### 3.2 *Cost as an obstacle in active management*

The survey received the adjusted response rate of 20.5%, which is comparable to other social science research conducted in the past decade (Cleary et al., 2021; Joshi and Arano, 2009). Concerning demographics, most landowners were elderly, white, and had college education, which are comparable with the national woodland owner database (Caputo and Butler, 2021). Landowners revealed that forest or rangelands were owned by them or their family for an average of 47.7 years. The majority were still interested in knowing more about active management even though 88% landowners practiced active management such as removal of unwanted trees, weed control, and prescribed burning. Female landowners had lower income, education, and landholding size, but higher average age than the male landowners.

The definitions of the variables used in the regression analysis are reported in Table 5 and the results based on binary probit regression analysis are presented in Table 6. The overall logistic regression model was statistically significant (wald chi-square= 25.96; P=0.0038). Six out of ten independent variables were statistically significant at  $P < 0.10$ . The landowners who were aware that active management could enhance forage and timber production in their forest or rangeland were more likely to consider cost as obstacle in their decision whether to adopt active management. Those interested in learning more about active management of forest and rangeland also seemed concerned about costs. In contrast, landowners with mostly rangeland and those having wildlife management objectives were less likely to consider cost as obstacle compared to others. Females were more likely to consider cost as obstacle, and those having



1  
2  
3  
4 higher education and younger landowners were less likely to consider cost as obstacle. Interest,  
5  
6 land investment, forest majority, and income were not statistically significant (Table 6).  
7  
8

#### 9 **4. Discussion**

10  
11 The treatment with the highest net return was the HT4, which had both the greatest gross  
12  
13 return of all treatments and the least cost among the burned treatments. For this treatment,  
14  
15 returns from timber and cattle forage were approximately equal indicating the benefits of multi-  
16  
17 purpose management within forest-grassland ecotones. Cattle forage was calculated as the  
18  
19 average ANPP measured between 1987-2017. For the HT4 treatment, the herbaceous  
20  
21 component was declining as tree canopy cover increased such that ANPP was approximately half  
22  
23 the savanna treatments at the end of the period (Adhikari et al. 2021b), which is less than the  
24  
25 approximately 70% based on the long-term average. With continued stand development, cattle  
26  
27 and deer forage would continue to decrease in the HT4 treatment. In contrast, understory  
28  
29 productivity was relatively constant over time for the other treatments (Adhikari et al. 2021b).  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34

35  
36 Timber production was relatively low in our study given it was a naturally regenerated  
37  
38 stand of shortleaf pine growing along the drier, western edge of the species' range on soils with a  
39  
40 large fraction of surface rock and coarse fragments. However, this area can support commercial  
41  
42 loblolly pine (*Pinus taeda* L.) plantations. Adopting plantation management with genetically  
43  
44 improved seedlings may increase the timber product growth and the economic returns (Bettinger  
45  
46 et al. 2010). However, the longer than average distance to mills, high risk of disturbance from  
47  
48 drought and ice storms, and uncertain timber markets, make it difficult for landowners in the  
49  
50 study area justify the investment in plantation management.  
51  
52  
53  
54

55 The HT2 and HT3 treatments produced cattle forage which was 69% of annually burned  
56  
57 grasslands at the same site (Adhikari et al. 2021b). While annual burning would have increased  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62

cattle forage, Annual burning increased forage as well as the cost of management which could be a reason for negative net return. Given the ecological threshold between burning at a four-year interval (forest) and three-year interval (savanna), burning at a 3-year interval minimizes the costs related to prescribed fire if the objective is to maintain savanna with ample cattle forage. Current cattle leases are approximately \$37 ha<sup>-1</sup> for native grasslands in eastern Oklahoma (Sahs, 2021), which is below the value of the annualized cattle forage we calculated. However, our values were scaled to a grazing efficiency of 25% such that more intensive grazing will increase the number of cattle produced, but likely reduce sustainability and limit the ability to conduct prescribed fire due to reduction of fuels. In addition, our site exhibited fairly low productivity (2000 kg ha<sup>-1</sup> y<sup>-1</sup>) compared to other grasslands in the region that produced between 2,500 to 7,000 kg ha<sup>-1</sup> y<sup>-1</sup> (Schmidt et al., 2021).

Prescribed fire is necessary to maintain high levels of deer browse. Even the HT4 treatment, which had transitioned to an uneven-aged forest produced 4.5 times greater woody browse compared to the Control or HT treatments, and woody browse did not decrease over time (Adhikari et al. 2021b). The calculated economic values of deer browse were below deer hunting lease rates of \$5 to \$25 per hectare in Oklahoma (Porter et al., 2017). We calculated the value of deer browse based on landowner willingness to pay for additional deer. In contrast, a lessee is paying for access to suitable areas to hunt. Therefore, contingent valuation based WTP numbers are not directly comparable to hunting leases. To this end, our findings quantified the relative value of deer forage produced within different ecosystems and justifies placing a premium lease rate on savanna and woodland.

For calculating cattle and deer forage we combined several vegetation types. While the sedges composed a minor component of cattle forage, they are often available during the cool

1  
2  
3  
4 season, which can make them important seasonal sources of nutrition. Likewise, panicums in the  
5  
6 genus *Dichanthelium* are cool season, which may be available for deer when legumes and forbs  
7  
8 are not. In addition, the nutritive quality differs among plant species and time of year  
9  
10 (McKinney, 2021) which affect the overall quality and timing of forage availability.  
11  
12

13  
14 The relative abundance of grassland vs forest in the south-central USA can change  
15  
16 depending on drought and other changes in weather (Albertson and Weaver, 1945; Rice and  
17  
18 Penfound, 1959). Therefore, climate change may alter the optimal management strategies if  
19  
20 there are differential responses of timber, cattle forage, and deer browse. Adhikari et al. (2021a,  
21  
22 2021b) determined the effect of climate variability between 1987 and 2017 on the radial growth  
23  
24 of shortleaf pine and on understory ANPP. For shortleaf pine, a 100 mm decrease in growing  
25  
26 season precipitation decreased diameter growth by 5%, a 1°C increase in summer maximum  
27  
28 temperature decreased diameter growth by 7%, and a 1°C increase in minimum October  
29  
30 temperature increased diameter growth by 6%. Except for a correlation between June  
31  
32 precipitation and grass ANPP, understory ANPP was less impacted by climate variability and  
33  
34 effects were inconsistent among treatments. Therefore, we expect a shift to drier, hotter  
35  
36 summers will likely have a greater negative impact on tree growth than cattle forage or deer  
37  
38 browse, resulting in a greater economic contribution from of cattle and deer when considering  
39  
40 multi-purpose management.  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47

48 Although most landowners have done some form of active management, sustaining these  
49  
50 practices will help landowners achieve management objectives and generate income. In contrast,  
51  
52 passive management will lead to forgone revenue from timber harvest and degradation of cattle  
53  
54 forage and a reduction of deer browse. For our study, we considered active management to  
55  
56 include prescribed fire and timber harvest. However, gross returns could have been higher with  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

1  
2  
3  
4 added inputs and more intensive management, e.g., fertilization, herbicide, mid-rotation thinning,  
5  
6 etc.  
7  
8

9 Results based on the survey suggested that most landowners were aware of benefits of  
10  
11 active management. However, the majority (66%) considered cost as major obstacle to managing  
12  
13 their forest or rangeland. Our economic analysis suggest that any form of active management is  
14  
15 financially beneficial over the status quo (control). These findings contrast with the belief system  
16  
17 of landowners and other stakeholders who consider cost as a major impediment to the sustained  
18  
19 adoption of active management in this region (Starr et al. 2019). Because landowners represent a  
20  
21 diverse group with multiple management objectives outreach must focus on clientele needs  
22  
23 (Joshi and Mehmood, 2011).  
24  
25  
26  
27

28 Given the preference for integrated range and forest management, timber or range-only  
29  
30 focused outreach may not meet the diverse management needs of landowners in grassland  
31  
32 timberland transition regions. Multi-disciplinary Extension professionals from forestry, wildlife,  
33  
34 and range management will need to work together in developing a comprehensive land  
35  
36 management plan, which can facilitate experiential learning on the co-management of livestock,  
37  
38 timber, and wildlife (Herrero et al., 2009; Hines et al., 2021).  
39  
40  
41  
42

43 Results based on regression analysis suggest, female landowners considered cost as a  
44  
45 challenge to active management. These findings are consistent with the previous studies that  
46  
47 suggested female landowners own less land and are less likely to conduct active management  
48  
49 (Schelhas et al., 2012). In contrast, landowners owning majority (>50%) land as rangelands and  
50  
51 those having higher education and younger age were less likely to consider cost as obstacle in  
52  
53 adopting active management. In the study region, prescribed burn associations have been well-  
54  
55 established within the rangeland-dominated areas, adding to the awareness of benefits of  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

prescribed fire (Joshi et al., 2019a). Educated and younger age has been found to be positively associated with any form of active management (Joshi and Mehmood 2011, Joshi and Arano 2009).

Our findings have important positive and practical implications for integrated forest and rangeland management. Our study results suggest that the stand with harvested pine, thinned hardwood, and burned every four-year generated ample timber and forage. Such a management regime improves wildlife habitat and reduce financial risk by diversifying investment return. In our survey, landowners prioritizing wildlife management were less likely to consider cost as impediments. Many landowners in the United States have wildlife management objectives (Butler et al. 2021), which are achieved through integrated forest and range management.

While our study was conducted within the grassland-timberland ecoregion, our findings have broader implications because timber production, recreational hunting, and cattle grazing are important land management objectives of landowners and farmers in the USA (Bulter et al., 2021; Ferranto et al., 2012). A couple of limitations are worth noting. First, we did not account for structural changes in the timber market in the past 40 years, which might affect the economic return from timber. Although these stochastic events were not considered in our financial analysis, we acknowledge that these changes impact the financial returns of a long-term investment such as timber management. Second, yearly prescribed fire costs were not available. Therefore, secondary sources were used for analysis. Finally, deer are often limited by forage nutrient concentration and digestibility to account for this we assumed only 25% of forb, legume woody and panicum productivity would be available for deer. However, the actual percentage of available forage will vary as deer perform nutrient demanding biological processes like lactation (Hewitt 2011).

## Conclusion

This research quantified economic return from actively managed forest, savanna, and grassland over 40 years using prescribed fire, harvesting, and thinning in the south-central ecoregion of the USA. The non-burned Control and HT closed-canopy forest treatments required larger area to support cattle and deer because of less of cattle and deer forage production compared to burned woodlands and savanna treatments. Economically, landowners benefit by prioritizing their management objectives before making decisions regarding the adoption of management regimes. Findings suggest that the management associated with the HT4 was suitable for integrated timber, cattle, and deer production, whereas the treatments such as HT2 and HT3 primarily support cattle and deer management. When integrating timber, cattle, and deer, the total annual economic return from the HT4 treatment was the greatest. Results based on regression analysis suggest that majority landowners consider cost as an impediment for adoption of active management in the study region. Female landowners considered cost as a challenge. Therefore, outreach programs identifying information needs of these clientele are recommended.

## Acknowledgement

We thank the Oklahoma Department of Wildlife Conservation, and the researchers at the Kiamichi Forestry Research Station for managing the study area and for help with field work. The study was sponsored by USDA – NIFA (Grant #2018-67014-27504 and WNP00009). Additional funding was provided by Oklahoma Agricultural Experiment Station, McIntire-Stennis project # OKL0 3151, Oklahoma Forestry Services, and the endowment for the Sarkey's Distinguished Professorship.

## Reference

- Adhikari, A., Masters, R.E., Adams, H., Mainali, K.P., Zou, C.B., Joshi, O., Will, R.E., 2021a. Effects of climate variability and management on shortleaf pine radial growth across a forest-savanna continuum in a 34-year experiment. *Forest Ecology and Management* 491.
- Adhikari, A., Masters, R.E., Adams, H.D., Will, R.E., 2022. Radial growth responses of post oak (*Quercus stellata*) to climate variability and management in southeastern Oklahoma, USA. *Canadian Journal of Forest Research* 52, 209-219.
- Adhikari, A., Masters, R.E., Mainali, K.P., Zou, C.B., Joshi, O., Will, R.E., 2021b. Management and climate variability effects on understory productivity of forest and savanna ecosystems in Oklahoma, USA. *Ecosphere* 12, e03576.
- Albertson, F.W., Weaver, J.E., 1945. Injury and death or recovery of trees in prairie climate. *Ecological Monographs* 15, 393-433.
- Anderson, R.C., 1983. The eastern prairie-forest transition-an overview, *Proceedings of the Eighth North American Prairie Conference*. Western Michigan University, Kalamazoo, MI, pp. 86-92.
- Anderson, R.C., 2006. Evolution and origin of the Central Grassland of North America: climate, fire, and mammalian grazers1. *The Journal of the Torrey Botanical Society* 133, 626-647.
- Arnett, E.B., Southwick, R., 2015. Economic and social benefits of hunting in North America. *International Journal of Environmental Studies* 72, 734-745.
- Baen, J., 1997. The growing importance and value implications of recreational hunting leases to agricultural land investors. *Journal of Real Estate Research* 14, 399-414.
- Barker, J.S., Fried, J.S., Gray, A.N., 2019. Evaluating model predictions of fire induced tree mortality using wildfire-affected forest inventory measurements. *Forests* 10, 958.
- Bettinger, P., Boston, K., Siry, J.P., Grebner, D.L., 2010. *Forest management and planning*. Academic press.
- Bulter, B.J., Butler, S.M., Caputo, J., Dias, J., Robillard, A., Sass, E.M., 2021. Family Forest ownerships fo the United States, 2018: Results from the USDA Forest Service, National Woodland Owner Survey.
- Butler, B., Hewes, J.H., Dickinson, B.J., Andrejczyk, K., Butler, S.M., Markowski-Lindsay, M., 2016. USDA Forest Service National Woodland Owner Survey: national, regional, and state statistics for family forest and woodland ownerships with 10+ acres, 2011-2013. *Res. Bull. NRS-99*. Newtown Square, PA: US Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Northern Research Station. 39 p. 99, 1-39.
- Clark, S.L., Hallgren, S.W., Engle, D.M., Stahle, D., 2007. The historic fire regime on the edge of the prairie: a case study from the cross timbers of Oklahoma, in: Masters, R.E., Galley,

- K.E.M. (Eds.), 23rd Tall Timbers Fire Ecology Conference: Fire in Grassland and Shrubland Ecosystems, Tall Timbers Research Station, Tallahassee, Florida, USA., pp. 40-49.
- Cleary, M., Joshi, O., Fairbanks, W.S., 2021. Factors that Determine Human Acceptance of Black Bears. *The Journal of Wildlife Management* 85, 582-592.
- Costanza, R., D'arge, R., Groot, R.d., Farber, S., Grasso, M., Hannon, B., Limburg, K., Naeem, S., O'Neill, R.V., Paruelo, J., Raskin, R.G., Sutton, R., Belt, M.V.D., 1997. The Value of the World's ecosystem services and natural capital. *Nature* 387, 253-260.
- Feltrin, R.P., Will, R.E., Meek, C.R., Masters, R.E., Waymire, J., Wilson, D.S., 2016. Relationship between photosynthetically active radiation and understory productivity across a forest-savanna continuum. *Forest Ecology and Management* 374, 51-60.
- Ferranto, S., Huntsinger, L., Stewart, W., Getz, C., Nakamura, G., Kelly, M., 2012. Consider the source: the impact of media and authority in outreach to private forest and rangeland owners. *Journal of Environmental Management* 97, 131-140.
- Fulbright, T.E., Ortega-S, J.A., 2013. White-tailed deer habitat: Ecology and management on Rangeland, 2nd ed. FCI Print Group.
- Gee, K.L., Porther, M.D., Demarais, S., Bryant, F.C., 2011. White tailed deer: their food and management in the cross timbers., 3rd ed. The Samuel Roberts Noble Foundation, Ardmore, OK:.
- Gore, M., Mishra, B., Joshi, O., 2022. Economic contribution of forest sector in Oklahoma in 2020. Oklahoma Cooperative Extension Service, p. 2 pages.
- Hallgren, S.W., DeSantis, R.D., Burton, J.A., 2012. Fire and vegetation dynamics in the cross timbers forest of south-central north america, 4th Fire in Eastern Oak Forests Conference, pp. 52-66.
- Harper, R.A., Johnson, T.G., 2008. Forest Resource of East Oklahoma, 2008, in: SRS-187, R.B. (Ed.).
- Herrero, M., Thornton, P.K., Gerber, P., Reid, R.S., 2009. Livestock, livelihoods and the environment: understanding the trade-offs. *Current Opinion in Environmental Sustainability* 1, 111-120.
- Hines, S.L., Fulbright, T.E., Ortega-S, A.J., Webb, S.L., Hewitt, D.G., Boutton, T.W., 2021. Compatibility of Dual Enterprises for Cattle and Deer in North America: A Quantitative Review. *Rangeland Ecology & Management* 74, 21-31.
- Hoff, D., Will, R., Zou, C., Lillie, N., 2018a. Encroachment Dynamics of *Juniperus virginiana* L. and Mesic Hardwood Species into Cross Timbers Forests of North-Central Oklahoma, USA. *Forests* 9.



- Hoff, D.L., Will, R.E., Zou, C.B., Weir, J.R., Gregory, M.S., Lillie, N.D., 2018b. Estimating increased fuel loading within the Cross Timbers forest matrix of Oklahoma, USA due to an encroaching conifer, *Juniperus virginiana*, using leaf-off satellite imagery. *Forest Ecology and Management* 409, 215-224.
- Johnson, A.S., Hale, P.E., Ford, W.M., Wentworth, J., French, J.R., Anerson, O.F., Pullen, G.B., 1995. White-tailed deer foraging in relation to successional stage, overstory type and management of southern appalachian forests. *American Midland Naturalist* 133, 18-35.
- Joshi, O., Mehmood, S.R., 2011. Segmenting Southern Nonindustrial Private Forest Landowners on the Basis of their Management Objectives and Motivations for wood-based Bioenergy. *Southern Journal of Applied Forestry* 35, 87-92.
- Joshi, O., Poudyal, N.C., Weir, J.R., Fuhlendorf, S.D., Ochuodho, T.O., 2019a. Determinants of perceived risk and liability concerns associated with prescribed burning in the United States. *Journal of environmental management* 230, 379-385.
- Joshi, O., Will, R.E., Zou, C.B., Kharel, G., 2019b. Sustaining Cross-Timbers Forest Resources: Current Knowledge and Future Research Needs. *Sustainability* 11.
- Joshi, S., Arano, K.G., 2009. Determinants of private forest management decisions: a study on West Virginia NIPF landowners. *Forest Policy and Economics* 11, 118-125.
- Kaur, R., Joshi, O., Will, R.E., 2019. The ecological and economic determinants of eastern redcedar (*Juniperus virginiana*) encroachment in grassland and forested ecosystems: A case study from Oklahoma. *Journal of environmental management*, 109815.
- Kendra, A., 2003. New landowners in Virginia's forest: A study of motivations, management activities, and perceived obstacles. Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University.
- Maher, A.T., Maczko, K.A., Taylor, D.T., Tanaka, J.A., 2020. National and state economic values of cattle ranching and farming-based ecosystem services on federal and private lands in the U.S., in: Miller, S. (Ed.), *Sustainable Rangelands Roundtable Publication*. University of Wyoming, Laramie, Wyoming.
- Masters, R., Waymire, J., 2012. Developing management strategies from research: Pushmataha forest habitat research area, Oklahoma. *Wildlife science: connecting research with management*. Edited by JP Sands, SJ DeMaso, MJ Schnupp, and LA Brennan. CRC Press, Kingsville, Tex, 272-303.
- Masters, R.E., Lochmiller, R.L., Engle, D.M., 1993. Effects of timber harvest and prescribed fire on white-tailed deer forage production. *Wildlife Society Bulletin (1973-2006)* 21, 401-411.
- Masters, R.E., Waymire, J., Bidwell, T.G., Houchin, R., Hitch, K., 2006. Influence of timber harvest and fire frequency on plant community development and wildlife. Tall Timbers Research Station, Oklahoma Department of Wildlife Conservation, Oklahoma Department of Agriculture, Food and Forestry, Oklahoma State University, Oklahoma State University.

- Meehan, M., Sedlvec, K.K., Printz, J., Brummer, F., 2018. Determining carrying capacity and stocking rates for range and pasture in North Dakota. North Dakota State University, North Dakota.
- Nyland, R.D., 2016. Silviculture: concepts and applications. Waveland Press.
- OFS, 2010. Oklahoma Forest Action Plan 2010. Oklahoma Forestry Services. Available online: <http://www.forestry.ok.gov/Websites/forestry/Images/Oklahoma%20Forest%20Resource%20Assessment,%20FINAL%20FOR%20WEB.pdf>
- Oklahoma National Stockyard, 2022. Oklahoma City Steer and Heifer Price. Oklahoma City Stockyards, Oklahoma City, OK.
- Otkin, J.A., Zhong, Y., Hunt, E.D., Basara, J., Svoboda, M., Anderson, M.C., Hain, C., 2019. Assessing the Evolution of Soil Moisture and Vegetation Conditions during a Flash Drought–Flash Recovery Sequence over the South-Central United States. *Journal of Hydrometeorology* 20, 549-562.
- Porter, M.D., Ferrell, S.I., Elmore, D., Bidwell, T.G., 2017. Lease hunting opportunities for Oklahoma landowners. Oklahoma State University. Division of Agricultural Sciences and Natural ....
- Qiao, L., Zou, C.B., Stebler, E., Will, R.E., 2017. Woody plant encroachment reduces annual runoff and shifts runoff mechanisms in the tallgrass prairie, u sa. *Water Resources Research* 53, 4838-4849.
- Rasby, R., 2013. Determining How Much Forage a Beef Cow Consumes Each Day. University of Nebraska, Lincoln, Nebraska.
- Redfearn, D.D., Bidwell, T.G., 2017. Stocking Rate: The key to successful livestock production. Oklahoma State University, Oklahoma.
- Rice, E.L., Penfound, W.T., 1959. The upland forests of Oklahoma. *Ecology*, 593-608.
- Rogers, R., 1983. Guides for thinning shortleaf pine. USDA Forest Service general technical report SE-United States, Southeastern Forest Experiment Station (USA).
- Sahs, R., 2021. Oklahoma Pasture Rental Rates: 2020-21. Oklahoma Cooperative Extension Service. Oklahoma State University. Page 8. .
- Schelhas, J., Zhang, Y., Zabawa, R., Zheng, B., 2012. Exploring family forest landowner diversity: Place, race, and gender in Alabama, United States. *International Journal of Social Forestry* 5, 1-21.
- Schmidt, K.N., Zou, C.B., Kakani, V.G., Zhong, Y., Will, R.E., 2021. Improved productivity, water yield, and water use efficiency by incorporating switchgrass cultivation and native ecosystems in an integrated biofuel feedstock system. *GCB Bioenergy* 13, 369-381.

1  
2  
3  
4 Sedivec, K.K., Printz, J.L., 2014. Ranchers guide grassland management IV. NDSU Extension.  
5

6  
7 Starr, M., Joshi, O., Will, R.E., Zou, C.B., 2019. Perceptions regarding active management of the  
8 Cross-timbers forest resources of Oklahoma, Texas, and Kansas: A SWOT-ANP analysis. Land  
9 Use Policy 81, 523-530.  
10

11 Tian, L., Yuan, S., Quiring, S.M., 2018. Evaluation of six indices for monitoring agricultural  
12 drought in the south-central United States. Agricultural and Forest Meteorology 249, 107-119.  
13

14  
15 Zhang, L., Dawes, W.R., Walker, G.R., 2001. Response of mean annual evapotranspiration to  
16 vegetation changes at catchment scale. Water Resources Research 37, 701-708.  
17

18  
19 Zhong, Y., Zou, C.B., Saenz, A., Stebler, E., Kakani, G., Will, R.E., 2020. Conversion of  
20 encroached juniper woodland back to native prairie and to switchgrass increases root zone soil  
21 moisture and watershed runoff. Journal of Hydrology 584, 124640.  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

Table 1: Basal area and timber production estimated using FVS growth and yield model simulation in southeastern Oklahoma, USA

Treatments	Basal Area (m <sup>2</sup> ha <sup>-1</sup> )			Timber Production (ton ha <sup>-1</sup> )								
				Merchantable			Saw Log			Pulp Wood		
	1984	2024	Change	1984	2024	Change	1984	2024	Change	1984	2024	Change
Control	25.99	29.13	3.14	160.71	203.81	43.09	119.77	153.82	34.05	40.94	49.96	9.02
HT	4.14	38.72	34.58	33.28	178.04	144.75	32.84	79.22	46.38	0.44	98.82	98.37
HT2	5.06	7.36	2.30	40.85	65.73	24.88	40.30	65.36	25.06	0.54	0.37	-0.17
HT3	3.37	6.21	2.84	27.95	50.88	22.93	27.70	50.01	22.31	0.27	0.86	0.59
HT4	3.83	23.46	19.63	31.31	128.64	97.33	31.01	123.38	92.37	0.30	5.26	4.97

Table 2. Annual average dry biomass of understory vegetation (kg ha<sup>-1</sup> y<sup>-1</sup>) produced in southeastern Oklahoma, USA. Grass refers to warm-season grasses. Some panicums mainly cool season *Panicum* and *Dichanthelium* spp.

Sedge	Cattle Forage			Total	Legume	Woody	Deer Forage			Total
	Sedge	Grass					Forbs	Panicum		
Control	5.0	111.0		116.0	8.0	125.0	10.0	15.0		158.0
HT	5.0	102.0		107.0	5.0	151.0	4.0	15.0		175.0
HT2	42.0	2008.0		2050.0	94.0	732.0	108.0	93.0		1027.0
HT3	33.0	2062.0		2095.0	64.0	833.0	46.0	58.0		1001.0
HT4	41.0	1450.0		1491.0	80.0	715.0	47.0	80.0		922.0

Table 3: Total number of cattle and deer supported by various treatments in south central transitional ecoregion of USA.

Treatment	Cattle Stocking Rate (Cattle ha <sup>-1</sup> )	Deer Stocking Rate (Deer ha <sup>-1</sup> )
CONTROL	0.01	0.06
HT	0.01	0.06
HT2	0.13	0.36
HT3	0.13	0.36
HT4	0.09	0.33

Table 4: Gross and net economic return (per hectare) from timber and forage in actively managed ecosystems in south-central transitional ecoregion, USA

Treatment	**End of rotation timber value	Annualized Timber value	Annualized Cattle Forage	Annualized Deer Forage	Annualized Total economic value	*Annual prescribed burn costs	Net return
Control	\$945.65	\$6.92	\$1.26	\$0.73	\$8.91	None	\$8.91
HT	\$1,965.41	\$14.39	\$1.16	\$0.81	\$16.35	None	\$16.35
HT2	\$642.28	\$4.70	\$22.21	\$4.72	\$31.64	\$29.58	\$2.06
HT3	\$577.85	\$4.23	\$22.70	\$4.61	\$31.54	\$19.72	\$11.82
HT4	\$2,411.78	\$17.66	\$16.16	\$4.24	\$38.06	\$14.79	\$23.27

\*Average prescribed fire cost was \$59.16 per hectare.

\*\*40-year forest management regime was assumed to calculate end of the rotation timber value.

The timber value does not include cost.

Table 5. The definitions and the summary statistics of the variables used in the regression model highlighting the factors affecting cost as an obstacle for active management in the grassland-forestland ecoregion, Oklahoma, USA.

Variable	Definition	Mean	Std. Dev.
Cost	Binary variable: 1 if respondent perceives cost is an obstacle in implementing active management, 0 otherwise.	0.66	0.47
Aware	Binary variable: 1 if the respondent was aware that active management can enhance fodder, forage, and timber production in forest or rangeland	0.92	0.27
Interest	Binary variable: 1 if respondent was interested in knowing more about active forest and range management	0.51	0.50
Wildlife Mgt	Likert scale (0=not important, 5=extremely important) variable capturing the importance of wildlife management in the property	2.90	1.56
Land Invest	Likert scale (0=not important, 5=extremely important) variable capturing the importance of land investment as an objective of the property	3.28	1.87
Forest Majority	Binary variable: 1 if the landowner has the majority land as forestland, 0 otherwise	0.12	0.32
Range Majority	Binary variable: 1 if the landowner has the majority land as forestland, 0 otherwise	0.77	0.42
Age	Age of the landowner in a logarithmic scale	4.19	0.20
Gender	Gender of the landowner, 1 if male, 0 as female	0.13	0.34
Income	Income of the landowner in a logarithmic scale	11.29	0.60
Education	Education of the landowner, 1 with a graduate degree, 0 otherwise	0.20	0.40

Table 6. variables used in the regression model highlighting the factors affecting cost as an obstacle for active management in the grassland-forestland ecoregion, Oklahoma, USA.

Variable	Coefficient	Standard Error
Aware	0.668**	0.287
Interest	0.251	0.170
Wildlife Mgt	-0.088*	0.053
Land investment	0.006	0.047
Forest Majority	-0.406	0.277
Range Majority	-0.612**	0.247
Age	-0.679*	0.406
Gender	0.585*	0.306
Income	0.041	0.151
Education	-0.391*	0.202
Constant	3.184	2.444

Note: \* significant at  $P < 0.10$ , \*\* significant at  $P < 0.05$