Rockfall in protection forests: Sylvicultural measures Tine Ferk¹, Gal Fidej¹, Simon Mutterer², Clemens Blattert², Ulrike Hiltner³, Jurij Diaci¹ 1 Chair of Silviculture, University of Ljubljana 2 Sustainable Forestry, Swiss Federal Institute WSL 3 Forest Ecology, ETH Zürich Study site: Ljublelj pass Study goal: Karavanke Testing management systems that are 1000 - 1400 m a.s.l. conducive to the protective function with Anemono trifoliae-Fagetum ForClim (climate-sensitive forest Protection forest succession gap model) and Rockyfor3D - rockfall simulation model RockyFor3D **ForClim** 3 silviculture scenarios: No management (NoMan) Growing Plenter stock $(m^3 ha^{-1})$ (Ple) Shelterwood (Shelter) Legend Mean of the maximum kinetic enegry [kJ] - Plenter 24,42 Each one tested with and without the effect of climate change Shelter_Cc (CC) Shelter Nocc Period: 2020 - 2220 NoMant cc NoMan_Nocc —No forest —Shelter —Shelter co Reference The mean kinetic energy measured in pixels of a linear polygon following a road on a mountain pass. Average value Number of cells with positive value 兰 1.20 Distance [m] 2 1.00 —No forest —Plenter —Plenter cc € 0.80 e 0.40 Conclusions: Management has a positive effect on the protective forest function. The plenter forest system seems to be best suited for the protective function. ONEforest The shelterwood system seems to work well, but has the disadvantage that it leads to different situations over time (the final cut leaves a small density of trees) Distance [m] OF LJUBLJANA | Faculty —No management —No management cc