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Abstract

We use field observations and diagnostic computer simulations (KINEROS2) to estimate the effective slope lengths (ESL) for buffers on disturbed hillslopes in two fragmented basins in northern Vietnam. Grassland, disturbed forest, and intermediate forms of secondary vegetation are the most effective buffering vegetation in the study area because these surfaces tend to have the highest saturated hydraulic conductivity. The ESL (m) is described by the following function of slope (m m$^{-1}$): ESL = 98 + 15 ln(slope). This non-linear relationship predicts comparatively longer buffer lengths at gentle slope gradients than guidelines/practices currently in use. The predicted buffer lengths range from roughly 30 to 100 m for slope gradients ranging from 0.01 to 1.0 m m$^{-1}$. However, for large storms, steeper slopes, and/or more degraded conditions, buffer lengths greater than those predicted by the ESL criteria may be needed to minimize impacts from overland flow. On slopes with particularly large contributing areas, multiple or staggered buffers may be required. For the occurrence of concentrated overland flow, no practical buffer length may be sufficient. The ESL estimations provide a starting point for determining appropriate buffer dimensions needed to infiltrate upslope surface runoff in disturbed montane watersheds at the study site. Final determination of buffer dimensions should consider the physical characteristics of contributing hillslopes, the nature of the material to be filtered (e.g., water, sediment, chemicals, nutrients), and the likelihood of adoption of any buffering practice. Finally, buffers should be regarded as complementary practices to other hillslope conservation activities. Recognizing that the use of long buffer lengths may not be feasible for steep terrain in intensely managed tropical watersheds, we derive a second equation to predict the minimal effective slope length (MESL) for buffers: MESL = 32 + 4 ln(slope). MESL values range from approximately 15 to 30 m over the same slope gradients, but they are less effective at reducing HOF than ESL buffers, particularly for large storms when erosion risk is highest.
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1. Introduction

Forest fragmentation occurs when continuous forest tracts are converted to various replacement cover types interspersed with patches of remnant forest (Laurance and Bierregaard, 1997). Such fragmentation is common throughout current landscapes in much of Southeast Asia as well as in many areas of South America and Africa. Important hydrological processes, such as evapotranspiration and infiltration, often differ on replacement covers, compared with the undisturbed forest (Bruijnzeel, 2001; Giambelluca, 2002). In two fragmented basins near Tanh Minh Village in northern Vietnam, for example, saturated hydraulic conductivity ($K_s$) on most replacement land covers is less than that for forest (Ziegler et al., 2004). The landscape is therefore a mosaic of surfaces differing in the propensity to generate Hortonian overland flow (HOF, caused when rainfall rate exceeds infiltration capacity and surface storage; Horton, 1933). Because of the high degree of spatial heterogeneity in land cover, HOF generated on upslope areas of low $K_s$ can re-infiltrate on downslope surfaces of high $K_s$ (i.e., buffers), potentially reducing both surface erosion on the hillslope and the total depth of surface runoff that enters the stream network.

The concept of vegetation buffers in riparian corridors and lower hillslopes adjacent to streams has different meanings depending on the following: (1) the 'material' or phenomena affected (e.g., water, eroded surface sediment, landslide...
material, chemicals, nutrients, bacteria, species diversity, temperature); (2) the water body or property being protected; and (3) the inherent aquatic-terrestrial linkages (Lynch et al., 1985; Smith, 1992; Jordan et al., 1993; Barling and Moore, 1994; Castelle et al., 1994; Maag et al., 1997; Jacinthe et al., 1998; Lee et al., 2000, 2004; Gomi et al., 2002; Lowrance et al., 2002; Schultz et al., 2004). Implicit in the term buffering is a reduction in the total volume and/or peak flux of material transported during a storm event. Herein, we consider buffering to denote a reduction of the total HOF depth during discrete storm events. We recognize that the degree to which buffering of overland flow occurs on fragmented hillslopes depends, in part, on the extent to which buffers are located below HOF source areas. Importantly, the downslope vegetation must occupy a sufficient slope length to be an effective buffer. The objective in this paper is to establish, via diagnostic overland flow simulations, the effective slope length (ESL) needed to infiltrate shallow unconcentrated HOF generated from upslope sources in Tanh Minh, Vietnam. Others may refer to ESL as the effective ‘width’ (e.g., in reviews by Clinnick, 1985; Norris, 1993; Barling and Moore, 1994). This objective has direct application to establishing/designing hillslope buffers for protecting water quality at the Tanh Minh study site. In a larger context, assessing the slope lengths required to infiltrate HOF generated from upslope areas is useful in improving our conceptual understanding of the degree to which various land-cover surfaces in fragmented landscapes within the region can influence hydrological response—e.g., by influencing the generation and buffering of HOF (Ziegler et al., 2004).

2. Study area

Tanh Minh (roughly 19:00N, 104:45E) is located SSW of Hanoi, in Da Bac District of Hoa Binh Province, northern Vietnam (Fig. 1). The study area is described in more detail elsewhere (Ziegler et al., 2004). Two watersheds comprise the study area (Fig. 2): Watershed 1 (WS1—910 ha) is located on the west side of the study area; the larger WS2 (1228 ha) on the east side. Elevation ranges from roughly 200 to 1000 m asl. Slopes are steep, typically 0.5–1.7 m m\(^{-1}\); they extend to the valley floor and/or stream channel. Parent bedrock is largely sandstone and schist, with some mica-bearing granite present. Soils are predominantly ultisols of the udic moisture regime. Soil depths on hillslopes typically exceed 2 m. The climate is characterized as tropical monsoon; approximately 90% of the annual 1800 mm of rainfall occurs between May and October.

Remnant natural forest patches exist primarily on steep, relatively inaccessible peaks, ravines, and slopes. Some accessible hilltops and ridgelines do, however, host mature secondary forests (Fig. 3d). Mountain slopes are dotted with active swidden fields that are farmed by the Tay villagers, the primary inhabitants of Tanh Minh (Fig. 3e). Juxtaposed with active fields are recently abandoned fields and various stages of secondary vegetation (mixtures of grasses, herbs, bamboo, and small trees) that have emerged on formerly cultivated sites (Fig. 3b and d). Previously, eight major land-cover classes were identified: upland fields (UF), abandoned fields (AF), young secondary vegetation (YSV), grasslands (GL), intermediate secondary vegetation (ISV), forest (F), consolidated surface (CS), and paddy fields (PF) (Ziegler et al., 2004). Vegetation descriptions are listed in Appendix A.

A color map showing the land-cover distribution in Tanh Minh is available elsewhere (Ziegler et al., 2004). Land-cover areas and fragmentation-related data in Table 1 are based on analysis of a 30 m × 30 m land-cover classification and a DEM (described in Ziegler et al., 2004). Consolidated surfaces, such as paths and roads, are not included in Table 1 because they are sub-grid-cell features that collectively occupy less than 1% of the basin area. Basic soil physical properties determined on
hillslope land covers are listed in Table 2 (rice paddies are not listed). Collection locations and methods for these properties are described in a prior paper (Ziegler et al., 2004). Hillslope fields (upland rice, corn, cassava) range in size from approximately 400 m² to >1 ha—and some cultivated hillslope gradients exceed 1 m m⁻¹ (Fig. 3c). A typical cropping cycle can be described briefly as follows (Lan, a Tay villager, pers. commun.): after clearing, a field is cultivated for 2–4 years (depending on the crop yield in the final year), followed by a fallow period of at least 2 years (depending on the needs of the family). This cycle is repeated – again, with the lengths of the cropping and fallow periods determined by

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land cover</th>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Total patches</th>
<th>Land-cover area (ha)</th>
<th>Relative area (%)</th>
<th>Mean patch area (ha)</th>
<th>Mean elevation (m)</th>
<th>Mean slope (m m⁻¹)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Upland field</td>
<td>UF</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>326</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>402</td>
<td>0.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abandoned field</td>
<td>AF</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>330</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>0.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grasslands</td>
<td>GL</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>806</td>
<td>37.7</td>
<td>13.7</td>
<td>426</td>
<td>0.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Young secondary vegetation</td>
<td>YSV</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>610</td>
<td>0.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intermediate secondary vegetation</td>
<td>ISV</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>387</td>
<td>18.1</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>677</td>
<td>0.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forest</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>359</td>
<td>0.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rice paddy</td>
<td>RP</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>0.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>531</td>
<td>2138</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>398</td>
<td>0.19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Consolidated surfaces are omitted, as they are sub-grid-cell features having a total estimated areal extent of <1%.
production and need – two to three times before a site is abandoned for an unspecified period. In some locations, fields extend down to the riparian zone, especially in zero-order catchments. In other locations, fields are bordered on the downslope side by vegetated patches (ranging in slope length from approximately 1–100 m), which potentially function as buffers. Hortonian overland flow is currently a somewhat common surface runoff generation mechanism on disturbed land covers (Ziegler et al., 2004); the HOF contribution to streamflow, however, is probably still small, compared with subsurface pathways. Buffering of overland flow on the hillslope, however, does not appear to be an intentional practice in Tanh Minh. In fact, the key determinants for villagers intentionally manipulating land-cover distribution seem to be need (e.g., planting on lands that are fertile enough to support two to three cycles) and deception—e.g., leaving enough trees in conspicuous locations (i.e., visible from the road) to satisfy government officials that no-forest-cutting policies are being obeyed. Detailed description of the agriculture system in Tanh Minh appears in other works (Rambo, 1996; Le Trong Cuc and Rambo, 1999; Fox et al., 2000, 2001).

3. Hortonian overland flow simulations

3.1. KINEROS2

We used the event-based, physics-based KINEROS2 runoff model (Smith et al., 1995, 1999) to simulate the generation and buffering of HOF during observed storms. KINEROS2 simulates water flow over a cascading system of watershed and hillslope elements (e.g., flow planes, channels, ponds). Overland flow is treated as a one-dimensional flow process, for which discharge per unit width (Q) is expressed in terms of water storage per unit area through the kinematic approximation:

\[ Q = ah^m \]  

where \( \alpha \) and \( m \) are parameters related to slope, surface roughness, and flow condition (laminar or turbulent) and \( h \) is the water storage per unit area. Eq. (1) is used in conjunction with the continuity equation:

\[ \frac{\partial h}{\partial t} + \frac{\partial Q}{\partial x} = q(x,t) \]  

(2)

where \( x \) is the distance downslope, \( t \) the time, and \( q(x,t) \) is the net lateral inflow rate per unit length of channel. Solution of Eq. (2) requires estimates of time- and space-dependent rainfall \( r(x,t) \) and infiltration \( f(x,t) \) rates:

\[ q(x,t) = r(x,t) - f(x,t) \]  

(3)

Infiltrability is defined as the limiting rate at which water can enter the soil surface (Hillel, 1971). Modeling of this process utilizes several input parameters that describe the soil profile: e.g., \( K_s \), integral capillary drive or matric potential \( (G) \), porosity, and pore size distribution index (Brooks and Corey, 1964). The general infiltrability \( (f_c) \) equation is a function of cumulative infiltrated depth \( (I) \) (following Parlanje et al., 1982):

\[ f_c = K_s \left[ 1 + \frac{a}{e^{(a/b)} - 1} \right] \]  

(4)

where \( a \) is a constant related to soil type (assumed to be 0.85 unless otherwise specified) and \( B = (G + h_w)(\theta_s - \theta_i) \), for which \( h_w \) is surface water depth (computed internally) and the second term, unit storage capacity, is the difference of saturated \((\theta_s)\) and initial \((\theta_i)\) volumetric moisture contents (i.e., \( \Delta \theta = \theta_s - \theta_i \)). The expression \( \theta_s - \theta_i \) is calculated as \( \phi(S_{\text{max}} - S_i) \), where \( \phi \) is porosity, and \( S_{\text{max}} \) and \( S_i \) are respectively the maximum and initial values of ‘relative saturation’, defined as \( S = \theta/\phi \), or the fraction of the pore space filled with water. Antecedent soil moisture conditions in KINEROS2 are parameterized by assigning event-dependent values of relative saturation.

3.2. ESL simulations

The ESL simulations are designed to quantify the reduction in HOF generated on an upslope source area by downslope buffers occupying slope lengths ranging from 2 to 160 m. The upslope source area is a 30 m \( \times \) 30 m abandoned field (AF). Similarly, the across-slope dimension of each buffer is 30 m. Fig. 4a shows the buffer arrangements considered. The longitudinal extent of the simulated hillslope varies from 32 to 190 m, depending on size of the downslope buffer. We used the 30 m \( \times \) 30 m dimension for AF because it is a reasonable estimation of the size of individual fields on steep hillslopes in Tahn Mini (personal observation). AF is used for the upslope surface because it has the lowest measured \( K_s \) of the major land covers (Table 2), and thus has the greatest propensity to generate HOF (Ziegler et al., 2004). This represents a worst-case scenario of HOF generation on typical, non-consolidated hillslope surfaces in the study area. The downslope land covers are the four vegetation types that commonly replace hillslope fields: young secondary vegetation, grassland, intermediate secondary vegetation, and forest (Appendix A). The output of each simulation is the overland flow that exits the downslope buffer (Fig. 4b). This value represents the HOF generated on the upslope field and not infiltrated in the downslope buffer; it also

\[ \frac{\partial h}{\partial t} + \frac{\partial Q}{\partial x} = q(x,t) \]  

Table 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Landcover</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>( K_s ) (mm h(^{-1}))</th>
<th>( \rho_b ) (Mg m(^{-3}))</th>
<th>( \phi )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Abandoned field</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>28 ± 10</td>
<td>1.09 ± 0.05</td>
<td>0.56 ± 0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Young secondary</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>32 ± 15</td>
<td>0.96 ± 0.05</td>
<td>0.63 ± 0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vegetation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forest</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>63 ± 31</td>
<td>0.97 ± 0.05</td>
<td>0.61 ± 0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intermediate</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>67 ± 39</td>
<td>1.02 ± 0.04</td>
<td>0.55 ± 0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary vegetation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grasslands</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>93 ± 29</td>
<td>1.09 ± 0.05</td>
<td>0.57 ± 0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upland field</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>103 ± 44</td>
<td>1.09 ± 0.05</td>
<td>0.57 ± 0.02</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\( N \): number of measurements; \( K_s \): saturated hydraulic conductivity; \( \rho_b \): bulk density; \( \phi \): porosity.
includes any HOF generated on the buffer. The time step for all simulations is 1 min, matching the measurement resolution of the rainfall record. We use a simulation time that is one hour longer than the storm duration to ensure that simulated HOF fully infiltrates into or drains from the downslope buffer.

We recorded 1-min rainfall intensities ($I_1$) using a MET-ONE (Grants Pass, OR) tipping bucket rain gauge (1 tip = 0.254 mm) and Campbell (Logan, UT) data logger from 26 March to 29 June 1998. Although short, this period encompasses the transition from the dry to the rainy season in Tanh Minh. Of 49 individual rainfall events recorded during this period, we classify 11 as ‘storms’ using a modification of the Wischmeier and Smith (1978) criteria (Ziegler et al., 2004). The storms are ranked according to maximum 30-min rainfall intensities ($I_{30_{\text{MAX}}}$) in Table 3. Based on similarity in 30-min maximum intensity values ($I_{30_{\text{MAX}}}$), we assigned the 11 storms to the following groups: large (number 1), medium (numbers 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7), small (numbers 8, 9), and very small (numbers 10, 11).

Before simulation, we calibrated KINEROS2 to predict runoff observed from small-scale plot experiments on an abandoned upland field in northern Thailand (Ziegler et al., 2000, 2001). Because we did not have such test data for the Vietnam field site, we used the Thailand runoff-plot data to ensure that KINEROS2 adequately simulated HOF generation response on an agriculture surface that is similar to the Tanh

### Table 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Storm</th>
<th>Classa</th>
<th>Startb (date/time)</th>
<th>Endb (date/time)</th>
<th>Duration (min)</th>
<th>Total (mm)</th>
<th>Average ($mm h^{-1}$)</th>
<th>$I_{1_{\text{MAX}}}$ ($mm h^{-1}$)</th>
<th>$I_{10_{\text{MAX}}}$ ($mm h^{-1}$)</th>
<th>$I_{20_{\text{MAX}}}$ ($mm h^{-1}$)</th>
<th>$I_{30_{\text{MAX}}}$ ($mm h^{-1}$)</th>
<th>$I_{60_{\text{MAX}}}$ ($mm h^{-1}$)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>6/4 17:21</td>
<td>6/5 4:46</td>
<td>686</td>
<td>66.8</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>106.7</td>
<td>85.3</td>
<td>70.9</td>
<td>56.9</td>
<td>38.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>5/19 9:48</td>
<td>5/20 8:16</td>
<td>455</td>
<td>28.7</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>76.2</td>
<td>45.7</td>
<td>37.3</td>
<td>32.0</td>
<td>22.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>5/28 5:03</td>
<td>5/28 7:18</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>30.7</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>73.0</td>
<td>42.7</td>
<td>37.3</td>
<td>31.5</td>
<td>19.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>6/9 16:03</td>
<td>6/10 1:04</td>
<td>542</td>
<td>38.6</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>76.2</td>
<td>45.7</td>
<td>38.9</td>
<td>30.7</td>
<td>22.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>6/7 16:06</td>
<td>6/7 17:31</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>18.3</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>61.0</td>
<td>44.2</td>
<td>37.3</td>
<td>30.5</td>
<td>18.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>5/31 6:16</td>
<td>5/31 2:44</td>
<td>389</td>
<td>21.8</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>121.9</td>
<td>44.2</td>
<td>30.5</td>
<td>26.2</td>
<td>13.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>5/18 7:15</td>
<td>5/18 8:02</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>14.2</td>
<td>17.8</td>
<td>121.9</td>
<td>57.9</td>
<td>35.4</td>
<td>25.4</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>5/5 15:22</td>
<td>5/5 17:20</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>106.7</td>
<td>33.0</td>
<td>22.1</td>
<td>21.3</td>
<td>14.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>5/23 23:31</td>
<td>5/24 5:24</td>
<td>954</td>
<td>42.4</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>45.7</td>
<td>27.4</td>
<td>19.8</td>
<td>19.8</td>
<td>16.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>VS</td>
<td>5/30 23:24</td>
<td>5/31 7:11</td>
<td>468</td>
<td>16.8</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>61.0</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>12.6</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>10.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>VS</td>
<td>6/10 20:45</td>
<td>6/11 4:44</td>
<td>480</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>61.0</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**a** Storms are ranked according to $I_{30_{\text{MAX}}}$ values; class refers to an arbitrary classification of large (L), medium (M), small (S), and very small (VS) storms.

**b** Date/time format is month, day, hour, and minute.

**c** $I_{1_{\text{MAX}}}$, $I_{10_{\text{MAX}}}$, $I_{20_{\text{MAX}}}$, $I_{30_{\text{MAX}}}$, and $I_{60_{\text{MAX}}}$ refer to maximum 1-, 10-, 20-, and 30- and 60-min rainfall intensities.
Minh site. We recognize this is an important limitation, but we believe that this type of “testing” is better than none. The thick line in Fig. 4c shows the KINEROS2 simulation of runoff. Observed runoff values, represented by circles, are the means of four replications. Total error, error in the peak estimate, and root mean squared error for the KINEROS2 predictions were acceptable: <1%, 4.5%, and 16.7%, respectively.

The ESL simulations are performed by replacing parameter values from the Thailand calibration runs with those obtained from field measurements on the six hillslope landcover types in Tanh Minh (Table 4). Some of these values are the field-measured values—i.e., those in Table 4. All simulations assume a particle density of 2.49 g cm$^{-3}$, which is the median of 13 measurements taken on several hillslopes. Other parameters are determined by comparing field observations of surface/vegetation characteristics to published values. Values for pore size distribution index (0.25) and capillary drive, for example, are based on those reported by Rawls et al. (1982) for sandy clay loam, the most commonly found soil texture on Tanh Minh hillslopes. The final capillary drive value (82.58 cm) was modified from the originally assigned value during model calibration. Therefore, it is the only parameter in the final simulations that is determined by calibration using the Thailand data. Additional parameter determination methods are provided in the footnote of Table 4. For all events we use a relative saturation value equal to the field capacity value (0.67 for sandy clay loam soil, Woolhiser et al., 1990).

4. Results

4.1. Buffer effectiveness

Table 4
Parameters used for the buffer simulations with KINEROS2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Landcover</th>
<th>Code</th>
<th>$K_s$ (mm h$^{-1}$)</th>
<th>$C_v$</th>
<th>$\phi$</th>
<th>$n$</th>
<th>$C_s$</th>
<th>Int (mm)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Abandoned field</td>
<td>AF</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Young secondary vegetation</td>
<td>YSV</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>1.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forest</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>1.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intermediate secondary veg.</td>
<td>ISV</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>1.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grasslands</td>
<td>GL</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upland field</td>
<td>UF</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$^a$ Variables are saturated hydraulic conductivity ($K_s$); the coefficient of variation for $K_s$ ($C_v$); porosity ($\phi$); Manning’s $n$, vegetation coverage ($C_v$), total interception depth by the vegetation (Int). Values of $K_s$, $C_v$, and $\phi$ are those from Table 2. Manning’s $n$ is determined from field observations compared with values in Morgan, (1995); $C_v$ values are based on field surveys; Int is inferred by comparing field observations with values from Horton (1919). The following are the same for all land covers (based on field observations): volumetric rock fraction (1%), average microtopography relief (2 mm), average microtopography spacing (0.3 m).

The simulations of HOF and BE are presented for storm numbers 1 and 4 in Fig. 5. Simulated HOF depth for all buffer scenarios increases monotonically with increasing slope angle (not shown). Apparent in the results are the following: (1) a comparatively high depth of simulated HOF is generated during the large storm 1, compared with the medium-sized storm 4; (2) BE increases as buffer slope length increases; (3) intermediate secondary vegetation, natural forests, or grassland are more effective buffers than young secondary vegetation. This latter point is shown clearly in Fig. 5d, as BE for YSV only reaches 85% for buffers >150 m. In comparison, BE > 85% for relatively short slope lengths for the other three types of buffers. The BE patterns for GL, ISV, and F are practically indistinguishable for buffer lengths >20 m. These trends are generally true for all other simulated storms (not shown).

4.2. ESL determination

In our ESL determination, we focus on the BE values determined during the simulation of the six medium-sized storms. Collectively, this group of storms covers a wide range of rainfall phenomena in Tanh Minh (e.g., long-duration events, short high-intensity bursts exceeding 120 mm h$^{-1}$; relatively high hourly maximums). Large storm 1 is used to verify the ESL selections. In Fig. 6, effectiveness values (circles) for all GL buffers and slope angles considered are shown for simulated storm 4. The thick line is simply fit through the BE values for the 0.5 m m$^{-1}$ slope gradient. We identify the ESL to be the length where BE $\geq$ 85%. For this example, the threshold effectiveness occurs at approximately 47 m. In the comprehensive ESL determination, we calculate BE values for all six medium-sized storms, 11 slope angles, and 18 buffer lengths. Again, the value identified in Fig. 6 represents only one of these cases.
The results of this comprehensive analysis of ESL are summarized in Fig. 7. The thick line defines the predicted ESL for slope angles up to 1 m m$^{-1}$. The thin solid line is simply 30 m longer than the ESL length, reflecting the length of the simulated abandoned field upslope. The ESL (m) is approximated with the following logarithmic regression equation:

$$\text{ESL} = 98 + 15 \ln(\text{slope})$$

(6)

where slope angle is m m$^{-1}$, $R^2_{adj} = 0.95$. Eq. (6) predicts ESL values ranging from 29 to 98 m over the slope-angle range 0.01–1.0 m m$^{-1}$ (note: for flatter slopes one should use slope = 0.01 m m$^{-1}$).

### 4.3. Comparison with other ESL indices

A comparison of our simulation-based ESL (thick, solid line) with data from other regions is shown in Fig. 8. The closed circles are case-study values reported by Haupt (1959), van Groenewoud (1977), Chalmers (1979), Balmer et al. (1982), and Plamondon (1982). The thin, solid lines are derived from summary data reported by Lee et al. (2004) for mostly non-tropical forests in the USA and Canada: Boreal, Pacific (PAC), Northeast (NE), Midwest (MW), Rocky/Intermountain (Rocky), and Southeast (SE). For clarity, the similar PAC, NE, and MW data are presented as one line; the SE data, which plot closely along the T–S line, are not shown. Collectively, the USA/Canada data are derived from the guidelines of 60 management jurisdictions in those two countries (Lee et al., 2004), and therefore, reflect contemporary buffer practices. The broken T–S line is the relationship presented by Trimble and Sartz (1957) for estimating buffer ‘width’ (m) from slope gradient (m m$^{-1}$); it can be represented as

$$\text{width} = 60 \text{slope} + 8.0$$

(7)
Eq. (7) has been used as a general guideline in Australia for assigning buffer width (Climnick, 1985; Barling and Moore, 1994). In general, the T–S line plots below our ESL and most of the summarized values from the other indices (lines) and experimental data (closed circles).

Different from all the other slope-specific relationships is our use of the natural log function to specify ESL. Again, this is based on HOF simulations, not in situ observations. This curve specifies comparatively longer buffers for smaller slope angles than the other methods. We feel this is appropriate because hillslope erosion in the tropics initially increases rapidly as slope increases from gentle to moderate slopes (p. 35, Morgan, 1995); observations supported that this was also generally the case at Tanh Minh.

5. Factors affecting ESL determination

Herein we focus on infiltration of simulated HOF generated during observed storms to establish an effective slope length for hillslope buffers in the Tanh Minh study area. In doing so, we...
make assumptions regarding the following inter-related phenomena that affect buffering: (1) physical properties of buffers; (2) antecedent soil moisture and hydrologic conditions within the buffer; (3) topography and soil depth; (4) type of overland flow. These factors and their influence on our determination of an ESL via diagnostic modeling are discussed in the following sub-sections.

5.1. Physical characteristics

The collective processes affecting the filtering of sediments by a vegetated buffer are not entirely the same processes that reduce overland flow transport in our KINEROS2 simulations. Filtering in general is achieved both through the infiltration of water entering the buffer from upslope and via the physical blocking of flowing water by the vegetation comprising the buffer (Phillips, 1989; Meyer et al., 1995). The former process may also be facilitated by the latter. Entrained sediment is deposited in the buffer, for example, because infiltration-induced reduction in flow decreases sediment transport capacity. Similarly, the vegetation itself forms a physical barrier to flowing water, such that particle settling occurs once settling velocity exceeds flow velocity. The influence of blocking is related to vegetation height, stiffness, percentage cover, above/below ground biomass, and vegetation density.

Our KINEROS2 simulations address infiltration, which, via Eq. (4), is primarily a function of saturated hydraulic conductivity. Parameterized physical characteristics of the buffer vegetation affect overland flow in the KINEROS2 model indirectly by influencing canopy interception loss and ponding depth. The assignment of Manning’s $n$ and average microtopographic relief/spacing surface parameters do however directly influence flow characteristics. Had our analyses focused on the filtering of some specific material rather than reducing HOF, a different value for ESL may have emerged (e.g., a buffer for filtering coarse-sediment would likely have been shorter). A model like KINEROS2, however, lacks the complexity to simulate specific filtering processes, unless they are functions of the transport capacity of flowing water (cf. Dillaha and Hayes, 1991; Srivastava et al., 1998). Other models may be more appropriate in this respect (e.g., Munoz-Carpena et al., 1999; also see Flanagan et al., 1986, 1989; Hayes and Dillaha, 1992; Lin et al., 2002).

5.2. Antecedent conditions

Prevailing hydrologic conditions influence buffer effectiveness (Munoz-Carpena et al., 1999). For example, if a riparian buffer is saturated by an elevated water table or by the capillary fringe (O’Loughlin, 1981), both rainfall and run-on water will not infiltrate in this zone. In our buffer simulations, we assume no influence of the water table on the downslope buffers, as KINEROS2 does not model this process explicitly.

Important, however, is our handling of antecedent moisture. For wet-versus-dry conditions, less water is infiltrated before the occurrence of ponding, after which infiltration rate is governed by the saturated hydraulic conductivity of the soil. During wetter conditions, therefore, buffer effectiveness should be reduced because: (1) the total volume of HOF that can be infiltrated by the buffer is reduced and (2) more HOF will likely be transported into the buffer from the upslope source. This effect can be seen clearly in Fig. 9, where simulated HOF from storm 1 for various antecedent moisture conditions is shown.

To ensure ample HOF generation in our ESL simulations, we use an initial soil moisture value equivalent to field capacity.

Fig. 8. Effective slope length (ESL) and minimum effective slope length (MESL) are compared with data/guidelines from other studies or reviews. The dashed line is the relationship of Trimble and Sartz (1957). The thin lines represent the compiled data for contemporary practices in several regions with the USA and Canada (Lee et al., 2004): Boreal, MW (Midwest), NE (Northeast), PAC (Pacific), ROCKY (Rocky and intermountain), and SE (Southeast; plotted along the T–S line for clarity). The closed circles are specific buffer lengths that were identified in field-based studies (Haupt, 1959; van Groenwoud, 1977; Chalmers, 1979; Balmer et al., 1982; Plamondon, 1982).

Fig. 9. KINEROS2-predicted HOF for four 30-m buffer covers for varying degrees of antecedent soil moisture during storm 1. Soil moisture is represented as the KINEROS2 relative saturation value for a sandy clay loam soil. Values for wilting point, field capacity, and saturation conditions are from Woolhiser et al. (1990). Dimensions of the abandoned field are 30 m $\times$ 30 m; the downslope buffers are of equal dimension. The four scenarios represent the range of $K_s$ values found on downslope land covers in Tanh Minh ($\approx$30–90 mm h$^{-1}$).
Vertessy et al. (2000) caution that initial soil moisture is one of the most important parameters affecting the outcome of simulated runoff (Stephenson and Freeze, 1974), for which the influence may also be dependent on storm size (Merz and Bardossy, 1998). Our interpretations of buffer effectiveness account for this influence. If a different value of initial soil moisture were used, the magnitude of the simulated HOF values would change—e.g., decrease in the case of using the wilting point value. We assume, however, that the response patterns of BE that we use to determine the ESL, would be similar.

5.3. Topography and soil depth

Our analyses are based on simulations of planar hillslopes with fixed soil depths. As a result, we ignore additional inputs from return flow emerging at breaks in topography or saturation overland flow (SOF) occurring at hillslope convergence points and/or shallow soil locations. In part, we ignore these overland flow generation processes to focus on Hortonian overland flow, which from prior work we know occurs during some storms (Ziegler et al., 2004). In our parameterization of the soil profile for the KINEROS2 simulations, we use a soil depth of 2 m (based on observations); this depth prevents any modeled source or buffer element from becoming saturated during the storms considered. In addition, the few locations in Tahn Minh where we observed either return flow or SOF were at hillslope positions that were connected directly to the stream system (e.g., concave hollows of zero-order basins). At these locations, the types of buffers we are simulating herein would have limited opportunity to infiltrate overland flow. Riparian-type buffers, which do not fall within the scope of this paper, may however be effective in filtering sediments (cf. Castelle et al., 1994; Gilliam, 1994).

5.4. Shallow unconcentrated versus concentrated overland flow

One of the most important factors controlling buffer effectiveness is the nature of overland flow entering the buffer: i.e., shallow unconcentrated overland flow (SUOF) versus concentrated overland flow (COF). Concentrated flow can pass through downslope buffers because the total depth of run-on water passes over a smaller spatial area (cf. Dillaha et al., 1989; Dosskey et al., 2002). COF typically moves within rills that channel water around potentially restricting features. Flow velocity can be considerably higher than for SUOF. In some instances, the concentration of overland flow by the plant cover may accelerate erosion within the buffer (De Ploey et al., 1976). Welsch (1991) noted that COF should be converted to SUOF before entering a riparian buffer to provide a more effective system.

In our simulations, we assume all overland flow is SUOF, the type simulated on solitary planes by KINEROS2. Field observations demonstrate that our treatment of overland flow in the $K_s$-based simulations is not a perfect representation of actual conditions. For example, one questions whether SUOF is prevalent on irregular-shaped, vegetated hillslopes – and in particular, for distances up to 30 m, the length of the simulated upslope field. Additionally, our simulations for idealized hillslopes might over-estimate HOF because of the artificial ‘smoothness’ imposed; natural slopes with even small irregularities would tend to cause more runoff to re-infiltrate on hillslopes. We observed COF generation in Tahn Minh during sustained periods of high rainfall intensity on some abandoned fields; however, it was most prevalent at hillslope concentration points (e.g., discharge locations from paths and rock outcrops).

For the ESL determination, our consideration of a very short rainfall record may lead us to underestimate the buffer length required to infiltrate surface runoff from large annual events. These large events tend to facilitate generation of COF. It was simply not tractable to simulate all conditions. In some respect, our use of a low-$K_s$ upslope surface and a relatively high initial soil moisture value (field capacity), represent a worst-case scenario for overland flow generation. Nevertheless, in the case of concentrated overland flow, buffer effectiveness would be less than our simulations indicate—even the filtering ability of exceptionally long buffers can be compromised by COF (cf. Dillaha et al., 1989; Magette et al., 1989). The reported ESL values should facilitate reduction of overland flow augmented by other sources (e.g., return flow), so long as the flow does not concentrate.

One notable example of overland flow passing through downslope buffers in Tahn Minh involves the occurrence of two grass species, Miscanthus japonicus (Thunb.) And. (Gramineae) and Saccharum spontaneum L. (Gramineae). These grasses ($\approx$1.0–2.5 m tall) are often found on former hillslope fields in isolated clumps with minimal vegetation growing in the shaded areas between. Overland flow circumvents the grass clumps (area $\leq 1$ m$^2$) by flowing within well-formed rills as COF. Even for the case of SUOF entering from above, the existing rill system may concentrate flow, preempting any opportunity for infiltration to occur. In contrast, the grass species Microstegium vagans (Nees ex Steud.) A. Camus (Gramineae) forms a thick, uniform cover that blocks runon water and limits rill formation, thereby limiting the concentration of overland flow within the buffer.

6. Minimum effective slope length (MESL) for a buffer

From a practical standpoint, the comparatively long ESL values determined by Eq. (6) may not be accepted by farmers who already have limited lands for cultivation. Non-adoption of seemingly beneficial conservation practices for reasons related to cost, practicality, convenience, and understanding is common in upland areas of Southeast Asia (Garrity et al., 1998; Fahlen, 2002). Thus, there is utility in exploring the effectiveness of shorter buffers. In the example shown in Fig. 6, we identify a lower threshold of buffer effectiveness at 65%—i.e., 17 m. In a second set of analyses we determine the minimum effective slope length (MESL) in the same manner as the ESL determination, but using the criteria of BE $\geq 65\%$. MESL values (m) are approximated by the following logarithmic regression equation:

$$\text{MESL} = 32 + 4 \ln(\text{slope})$$  

(8)
As before, slope angle is $m \ m^{-1}$. $R^2_{adj}$ is 0.69. Eq. (8) predicts a buffer length of 14 m for a slope gradient of 0.01 $m \ m^{-1}$, and 23–32 m, for slope angles ranging from 0.10 to 1.0 $m \ m^{-1}$ (Fig. 7).

Several field studies report the effectiveness of buffer lengths on the order of 20–30 m (Wylie, 1975; Erman et al., 1977; Graynoth, 1979; Davies and Neilson, 1994). In their respective reviews, Clinnick (1985) and Barling and Moore...
(1994) concluded that the most commonly recommended slope length for stream buffers is 30 m. Lee et al. (2004) report that mean buffer widths in the USA and Canada vary from about 15 to 30 m, depending on the water body protected and the associated forest type. Castelle et al. (1994) note that a minimum effective buffer slope length of 15 m is needed to protect wetlands and streams under most conditions (cf. Herron and Hairsine, 1998).

The simulated effectiveness of 20 and 30 m buffers in Tahn Minh during the medium storm no. 4 is shown in Fig. 10a, where the filtering achieved by various lengths of a forest buffer is compared. Slope angle in this example is 0.8 m m\(^{-1}\). Only negligible amounts of HOF generated during three rainfall bursts of storm no. 4 pass through the 30-m buffer, demonstrating that this length is near the threshold at which simulated HOF from all but the largest observed storms in Tanh Minh can be infiltrated. Thus, for medium-sized or smaller storms, the MESLs provide reasonable protection, even for this relatively steep gradient. However, it is during the rare, larger storms that filtering of overland flow is most crucial. For the largest storm (storm no. 1, Fig. 10b), which generated 7.9 mm of simulated HOF on the 0.8 m m\(^{-1}\) slope, longer buffer lengths are required to achieve adequate reduction in simulated HOF generated on the 30-m upslope abandoned field.

Herron and Hairsine (1998) recognize that disproportionately large buffers may be needed for highly disturbed sites. In Tanh Minh, our simulations suggest that long buffers are needed for infiltrating HOF generated on relatively small, disturbed upslope source areas. Disturbances on tropical soils in general may produce more overland flow than disturbances in temperate locations with similar topography, largely due to the higher decomposition rates and thinner organic horizons (cf. Sidle et al., this issue). Smaller buffer strips may therefore be sufficient in other locations with comparatively deep organic horizons with high infiltration capacities.

### 7. Implementation

Our ESL/MESL values represent initial estimates of appropriate slope lengths for hillslope buffers at the Vietnam field site. The derivation of these values was greatly affected by our parameterization of the physical situation at Tahn Minh. Those using such an approach outside of this study area should first consider ‘on-ground’ assessments to account for differences in surface conditions (cf. Lin et al., 2002; Tomer et al., 2003). A thorough understanding of the hillslope hydrological and geomorphological processes is needed to design the buffers to handle the magnitude of expected flows. Site assessments should consider all relevant bio-geo-hydro-climatic factors, including the following:

- Precipitation and soil variables affecting runoff generation (intensity/duration relationships for rainfall; spatial variation in saturated hydraulic conductivity, soil depth, bulk density, aggregation, porosity, and extent of preferential flow for soil).
- Surface conditions on the hillslope that affect ponding, infiltration, or movement of surface water (e.g., woody debris, microtopography, terracing, surface sealing, rock cover, litter depth/condition).
- Surface evidence that elucidates flow pathways—i.e., is it designed solely to infiltrate overland flow or must other ‘filtering functions’ be considered (e.g., sediments, nutrients, chemicals, bacteria).

### 8. Summary

Through diagnostic computer simulations of overland flow generation with the KINEROS2 runoff model using field data, we determine the effective slope length (ESL) required by vegetated buffers to infiltrate overland flow on disturbed hillslopes in two fragmented basins of northern Vietnam. The ESL values are estimated from slope gradient (applicable range = 0.01–1.0 m m\(^{-1}\)) using the following equation: ESL = 98 + 15 ln(slope). Specification of buffer slope length using a logarithmic curve is more appropriate for our tropical site than using a linear-based function of slope angle because it assigns longer buffers at lower slope angles where overland flow and erosion processes begin to be significant on degraded hillslopes. For areas with less disturbance or locations where long buffers cannot be implemented, we estimate the minimum effective slope length (MESL = 32 + 4 ln(slope)) needed for hillslope buffers on the same range of slopes. Our diagnostic analyses, however, suggest that such shorter buffers would be considerably less effective during large storm events than those determined by the ESL criteria.
Although the ESL approximations are intended to be a guide for developing buffers on disturbed hillslopes at the Vietnam study site, they may be applicable to similar landscapes in other disturbed montane tropical areas. However, one should understand the assumptions and limitations of our approach. The ESL determinations originate from computer simulations focusing on the infiltration of shallow, unconfined Hortonian overland flow by three types of buffering vegetation common to disturbed hillslopes in the Vietnam study area (grassland, forest, and intermediate secondary vegetation). Furthermore, we considered only one fixed-sized overland flow source (a 900-m² abandoned field). We focus on Hortonian flow because it is currently an important mechanism for overland flow generation on disturbed hillslopes in the study area. Buffer effectiveness depends on slope angle, physical characteristics of the downslope buffer (e.g., length, vegetation coverage, surface roughness, $K_s$), storm characteristics (e.g., sustained intensity, antecedent soil moisture), and the type and volume of overland flow entering the buffer (unconcentrated versus concentrated flow). Because our simulations of shallow unconcentrated flow are not able to account for all of these factors explicitly, the identified ESL values may not even be appropriate for all sites within the study area. For example, our estimated ESL would not likely be appropriate for hillslopes with abrupt changes in topography, soil depth variations, or other phenomena that are conducive to return flow generation. In addition, greater volumes of overland flow generated on source areas larger than the one we considered herein would likely require longer buffers than indicated by our ESL approximations.

The final determination of buffer size (and hillslope placement) should consider site-specific observations of all phenomena that affect the generation, movement, and infiltration of overland flow. Additionally, buffers determined by ESL-criteria should be used in conjunction with other hillslope conservation techniques. Large overland flow source areas occurring on long slopes, for instance, may require multiple and staggered buffers. In the case of concentrated overland flow, such as that generated during exceptionally large events or that entering the hillslope from a road or another type of compacted surface, effectiveness of any practical length of buffer would likely be compromised.

Finally, in the context of understanding the hydrological consequences of landscape fragmentation, even relatively small buffers (e.g., on the order of our MESL estimates) have the ability to infiltrate some of the HOF generated on upslope source areas of limited size. This has important implications for how land-cover juxtaposition and degree of fragmentation affect overland flow generation and movement on fragmented hillslopes.
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Appendix A. Vegetation descriptions for several land covers

Upland field (UF): Active fields, including banana (Musa coccinea Andr. (Musaceae), Musa paradisiacal L. (Musaceae)), and cassava (Manihot esculenta Crantz (Euphorbiaceae)), corn (Zea mays L. (Gramineae)), and rice (Oryza sativa L. (Gramineae)).

Weedy volunteer vegetation include Ageratum conyzoides L. (Compositae), Eupatorium odoratum L. (Compositae), Euphorbia hirta L. (Euphorbiaceae), Crassocephalum crepidioides (Bth.) S. Moore (Compositae), Imperata cylindrica (L.) P. Beauv. var. major (Nees) C.E. Hubb. ex Hubb. & Vaugh. (Gramineae), Melia aderazach L. (Meliaceae), Rohippa indica (L.) Hier (Cruciferae), Saccharum spontaneum L. (Gramineae), Setaria palmifolia (Korn.) Staff var. palmifolia (Gramineae), Solanum verbascifolium L. (Solanaceae), and Urena lobata L. sps. lobata var. lobata (Malvaceae). Bare ground is approximately 30–50%.

Abandoned field (AF): Short grasses, herbs, and shrubs occurring on abandoned fields or lands where grazing may limit tall vegetation growth. Species include Helicteres angustifolia L. (Sterculiaceae), Imperata cylindrica, Microstegium vagans (Nees ex Steud.) A. Camus (Gramineae), Miscanthus japonicus (Thunb.) And. (Gramineae), Paspalum conjugatum Beerg. (Gramineae), Rohippa indica, Saccharum spontaneum, Litsea cubeba (Lour.) Pers. var. cubeba (Lauraceae), and Mallotus albus M.-A. (Euphorbiaceae).

Young secondary vegetation (YSV): Evergreen broadleaf bush mixed with nua (Neohouzeoua dullooa (Gamb.) A. Camus (Gramineae, Bambusoideae)) bamboo occurring in areas where forest was once cleared. Representative species include Acacia pennata (L.) Willd. (Leguminosae, Mimosoideae), Cypers nutans Vahl (Cyperaceae), Rauvolfia cambdiana Pierre ex Pit. (Apocynaceae), Eupatorium odoratum, Ficus sp. (Moraceae), Microstegium vagans, Saccharum spontaneum, and Urena lobata.

Grassland (GL): Tall grasslands occurring where forest has been cleared and, perhaps, the land overworked during farming. Three species dominating this land cover, Imperata cylindrica, Thysanolaena latifolia (Roxb. ex Horn.) Honda (Gramineae)
and *Saccharum spontaneum*, often reach heights exceeding 2–3 m and have extensive root systems that help them regenerate quickly after fire. Other common species are *Eupatorium odoratum*, *Microstegium vagans*, and *Urena lobata*.

Intermediate secondary vegetation (ISV): One-story ‘forest’ dominated by two bamboo species: *nua* and *giang* (*Ampelocalamus patellaris* (Gamb. Emend. Stap.) Stap. (Gramineae, Bambusoideae)). Other representative species include *Alpinia blepharocalyx* K. Sch. (Zingiberaceae), *Vernicia Montana* Lour. (Euphorbiaceae), *Cyperus nutans*, *Livistona saribus* (Lour.) Chev. (Palmaceae), *Pteris vittata* L. (Pteridaceae), and *Styrax tonkinensis* (Pierre) Pierre ex Guill. (Styracaceae). The understory is composed primarily of bamboo litter and shoots emerging from extensive root systems.

Forest (F): Disturbed evergreen broadleaf forest, attaining heights of 25–30 m. The discontinuous upper (25–30 m) and complex secondary (8–25 m) stories include the following representative tree species: *Heteropanax fragrans* (Roxb.) Seem. (Araliaceae), *Vernicia montana*, *Alphonsea tonkinensis* A. DC. (Annonaceae), *Melicope pteleifolia* (Champ. ex Bt.) T. Hart. (Rutaceae), *Garcinia planchonii* Pierre (Guttiferae), *Ostodes paniculata* Bl. (Euphorbiaceae), *Breynia retusa* (Denn.) Alst. (Euphorbiaceae), *Archidendron clypearia* (Jack) Niels. ssp. *clypearia* var. *clypearia* (Leguminosae, Mimosoideae), and *Schefflera hepathylla* (L.) Frod. (Araliaceae). A bushy understory (2–8 m) and the forest floor includes *Breynia retusa* (Denn.) Alst. (Euphorbiaceae), *Bridelia hermandii* Gagnep. (Euphorbiaceae), *Cyperus nutans*, *Dioscorea daepaerator* Prain & Burk. (Dioscoreaceae), *Rauvolfia cambodiana*, *Ficus variegata* Bl. (Moraceae), *Livistona saribus*, *Miscanthus japonicus*, *Ostodes paniculata* Bl. (Euphorbiaceae), *Phrynium capitatum* Lour. (Marantaceae), *Psychotria rubra* (Lour.) Poir. (Rubiacaeae), and *Selaginella monospora* Spring (Selaginellaceae).
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