Canadian Journal of Forest Research
Revue canadienne de recherche forestière

Risk aversion and risk seeking in multi-criteria forest management: a Markov decision process approach

Journal:	<i>Canadian Journal of Forest Research</i>
Manuscript ID	cjfr-2016-0502.R3
Manuscript Type:	Article
Date Submitted by the Author:	09-Mar-2017
Complete List of Authors:	Buongiorno, Joseph; University of Wisconsin Madison Department of Forest and Wildlife Ecology Zhou, Mo; West Virginia University , School of Natural Resources Johnston, Craig; University of Wisconsin-Madison, Forest & Wildlife Ecology
Keyword:	uneven-aged management, risk aversion, economics, multiple criteria, Markov decision process

RISK AVERSION AND RISK SEEKING IN MULTI-CRITERIA FOREST MANAGEMENT:
A MARKOV DECISION PROCESS APPROACH

Joseph Buongiorno^{1*}, Mo Zhou², Craig Johnston¹

¹ Department of Forest and Wildlife Ecology, University of Wisconsin-Madison, Madison, USA

² School of Natural Resources, West Virginia University, Morgantown, USA

* Corresponding author: Russell Labs, 1630 Linden Drive, Madison, WI 53706, USA

E-mail: jbuongio@wisc.edu

RISK AVERSION AND RISK SEEKING IN MULTI-CRITERIA FOREST MANAGEMENT: A MARKOV DECISION PROCESS APPROACH

Abstract

Markov decision process models were extended to reflect some consequences of the risk attitude of forestry decision makers. One approach consisted in maximizing the expected value of a criterion subject to an upper bound on the variance, or symmetrically, minimizing the variance subject to a lower bound on the expected value. The other method used the certainty equivalent criterion, a weighted average of the expected value and variance. The two approaches were applied to data for mixed softwood-hardwood forests in the southern United States, with multiple financial and ecological criteria. Compared with risk neutrality or risk seeking, financial risk aversion reduced expected annual financial returns and production, and led to shorter cutting cycles that lowered the expected diversity of tree species and size, stand basal area, stored CO₂e, and old growth area.

Keywords: uneven-aged management, risk aversion, economics, multiple criteria, Markov decision process, quadratic programming.

INTRODUCTION

Uncertainty about the future affects forestry decisions due to potential losses or gains associated with economic fluctuations, climate change, and attendant disturbances. Accordingly, there is an expanding literature on the role of risk and uncertainty in forest management (Kant and Alavalapati, 2014, pp. 307-369), including the risk preferences of private landowners (Andersson and Gong, 2010; Lönnstedt and Svensson, 2000), and of the public towards forest resources (Ananda and Herath, 2005).

Most of this literature has dealt with the management of even-aged, single-species forests, for which a common message is that optimal decisions assuming risk neutrality become sub-optimal with differing risk attitudes. In particular, financial risk aversion leads to shorter rotations (Caulfield, 1988; Couture and Reynaud, 2008); a finding that appears to be robust across methodologies (Pukkala and Kangas, 1996; Gong, 1998, Alvarez and Koskela 2006). Ollikainen (1990) also shows that, facing uncertain interest rates, forest owners who are lenders tend to harvest less than borrowers and according to Gong and Löfgren (2003) lenders' decisions depend on the variance of future wealth. Risk preferences affect other aspects of forestry, including land-use (Parks, 1995; Delacote, 2007), and the diversification of age classes and stand structures (Tahvonen and Kallio, 2006; Roessiger et al., 2011).

This paper deals with the management of complex, uneven-aged, multi-species forests, with diverse financial and ecological objectives, of which even-aged management is a special case. The methods extend Markov decision process (MDP) models in forestry (e.g. Buongiorno, 2001; Lembersky and Johnson, 1975; Martell, 1980; Zhou and Buongiorno, 2011). MDPs have been effective in modeling forest ecosystems subject to the uncertainty of forest growth and

wood markets. In particular, linear programming solutions of MDPs allow for multiple economic and ecological goals with the objective function and/or constraints (Buongiorno and Zhou, 2015). However, most of the published applications consider only the expected value of criteria and ignore their variance. Applications of risk-sensitive MDPs in natural resource management are rare. Ermon et al. (2011) suggest their application in fishery management. In forestry, Brunette et al. (2015) deal with intertemporal utility, but without considering variations in the returns.

The objective of this study was to propose models of risk-sensitive MDPs extending the linear-programming (LP) formulation of risk-neutral MDPs in multiple-use forestry. Two risk measures were used: the variance, or the certainty equivalent of the financial or ecological criteria. One model maximized the expected value of a criterion while keeping its variance at a satisfactory level, or symmetrically, minimized the variance of a criterion while constraining the expected value of other objectives. The certainty equivalent formulation took the weighted average of the expected reward and its variance as an approximation of the expected utility function to explore various risk attitudes. The case study of uneven-aged loblolly pine and hardwood forests in the southern United States showed that compared to risk neutrality, financial risk aversion led to shorter cutting cycles, reduced expected annual financial returns and production, and also lowered the expected diversity of tree species and size, stand basal area, stored CO₂e, and old growth area.

METHODS AND DATA

Constrained variance

Most applications of Markov decision process models (MDPs) in forestry have assumed risk neutrality of the decision maker, interpreted with an objective function that expresses the expected undiscounted or discounted value of a particular criterion. Not discounting, or equivalently, assuming a zero discount rate, can be justified as treating present and future generations equally, encouraging long-term investments, and as a precaution against irreversible decisions (Fischer and Kuzivanova, 2014; Goklany, 2002). For example, the policy that maximizes the undiscounted expected financial annual return over an infinite horizon can be obtained by solving the following linear program (Hillier and Lieberman, 2010, p.913; Manne, 1960):

$$\begin{aligned} \max_{z_{ik}} \quad & E(R) = \sum_{i,k} z_{ik} r_{ik} \\ \text{subject to} \quad & \\ 84 \quad & \sum_k z_{jk} - \sum_{i,k} z_{ik} p(j|i, k) = 0 \quad \forall j \\ & \sum_{i,k} z_{ik} = 1 \\ & z_{ik} \geq 0 \quad \forall i, k \end{aligned} \tag{1}$$

Where:

$E(R)$ = expected annual return (\$/ha/y),
 r_{ik} = immediate return in state i with decision k , state i is a combination of stand and market states, and decision k is a harvest that changes the stand state,
 z_{ik} = probability of state i and decision k ,
 $p(j|i, k)$ = probability of ending in state j in one year, given state i and decision k .

After solving problem (1) the best policy, i.e. the decision for each stand and market state is:

$$X_{ik} = \frac{z_{ik}}{\sum_k z_{ik}} \quad (2)$$

where X_{ik} is the probability of decision k conditional on state i , which is always 0 or 1 (Hillier and Lieberman, 2010, p. 787).

Risk aversion means that, in addition to the expected value of the annual return, the decision maker is also sensitive to its variance. Specifically, for two policies with equal expected outcomes, risk-averse decision makers prefer the alternative that has the lowest variance. In this application, the variance, V , of a stream of annual returns per unit of land area, R , was:

$$V(R) = E(R^2) - [E(R)]^2 \quad (3)$$

where E was the expected value. With the notations used in model (1) the variance of the annual return became:

$$V(R) = \sum_{i,k} z_{ik} (r_{ik})^2 - [\sum_{i,k} z_{ik} r_{ik}]^2 \quad (4)$$

According to Markowitz's portfolio selection theory (Markowitz, 1952), efficient harvest policies for rational risk-averse decision makers must be such that they minimize the risk (expressed by the variance) for any expected value of returns, $E(R)^*$. Or, equivalently, the decisions must maximize the expected value for any particular level of risk, $V(R)^*$. Such a policy was obtained by modifying model (1) into the following quadratic program:

$$\max_{z_{ik}} E(R) = \sum_{i,k} z_{ik} r_{ik}$$

subject to :

$$\sum_k z_{jk} - \sum_{i,k} z_{ik} p(j|i, k) = 0 \quad \forall j$$

$$\sum_{i,k} z_{ik} = 1 \quad (5)$$

$$z_{ik} \geq 0 \quad \forall i, k$$

and :

$$\sum_{i,k} z_{ik} (r_{ik})^2 - [\sum_{i,k} z_{ik} r_{ik}]^2 \leq V(R)^*$$

Solving problem (5) parametrically with increasing values of the variance $V(R)^*$ defined the efficient frontier and the corresponding set of solutions such that no other solution existed with a higher expected annual return and the same variance of return.

Symmetrically, the same efficiency frontier could be obtained by switching objective function and constraint in model (5) to minimize variance of returns subject to a constraint on their expected value.

Multiple constraints

The model (5) can be modified and extended in several ways by changing objective function and/or constraints. For example the policy that minimized the risk (variance) of financial annual returns, subject to lower bounds on the expected value of multiple criteria was obtained by solving:

$$\min_{z_{ik}} V(R) = \sum_{i,k} z_{ik} (r_{ik})^2 - [\sum_{i,k} z_{ik} r_{ik}]^2$$

subject to :

$$\sum_k z_{jk} - \sum_{i,k} z_{ik} p(j|i, k) = 0 \quad \forall j$$

$$\sum_{i,k} z_{ik} = 1 \quad (6)$$

$$z_{ik} \geq 0 \quad \forall i, k$$

and :

$$\sum_{i,k} z_{ik} c_{ikm} \geq C_m^*, \quad \forall m$$

where C_m^* was the lower bound acceptable for the expected value of criterion m . Alternatively, a symmetric version of model (6) would maximize the expected value of a criterion, subject to constraints on the variance of multiple objectives.

Certainty equivalent

An alternative approach to maximizing the expected value of a criterion subject to constrained variance, or minimizing variance subject to constrained expected value, was to use an objective function that combined expected value and variance. A classical utility function of this kind is the certainty equivalent exponential utility function, of which the quadratic approximation is (Ding et al. 2009; Freund 1956; Levitt and Ben-Israel 2001):

$$U(X) = E(X) - \frac{\beta}{2} V(X) \quad (7)$$

where U is the utility of a particular criterion, X , of expected value E and variance V . In our context, for the financial criterion, $U(X)$ was the amount of “certain” annual income that the decision maker would be willing to receive in exchange for the returns expected from the forest. The parameter β indicates the risk attitude of the decision maker. A positive β means risk aversion, i.e. a conflict between expected value and variance, while a negative β suggests a risk-

seeking attitude where, for a given expected value, additional variance increases utility, and $\beta=0$ expresses risk neutrality where only expected value matters. β is a constant measure of risk preference assumed independent of the wealth of the decision maker.

In the context of the problem described by the MDP model (1), the utility of the stream of annual financial returns became:

$$U(X) = \sum_{i,k} z_{ik} r_{ik} - \frac{\beta}{2} \left(\sum_{i,k} z_{ik} (r_{ik})^2 - \left[\sum_{i,k} z_{ik} r_{ik} \right]^2 \right) \tag{8}$$

Levitt and Ben-Israel (2001) use the objective function (7) to explicitly model risk attitude in MDPs using the Bellman optimality principle and its related dynamic programming numerical solutions. Here instead we pursued the linear programming approach expressed by model (1), which with the certainty equivalent objective (8), became:

$$\begin{aligned} \max_{z_{ik}} \quad & U(R) = \sum_{i,k} z_{ik} r_{ik} - \frac{\beta}{2} \left(\sum_{i,k} z_{ik} (r_{ik})^2 - \left[\sum_{i,k} z_{ik} r_{ik} \right]^2 \right) \\ \text{subject to} \quad & \\ 151 \quad & \sum_k z_{jk} - \sum_{i,k} z_{ik} p(j|i, k) = 0 \quad \forall j \tag{9} \\ & \sum_{i,k} z_{ik} = 1 \\ & z_{ik} \geq 0 \quad \forall i, k \end{aligned}$$

With $\beta=0$ model (9) reduces to model (1) maximizing expected annual returns to express risk neutrality.

Stand growth and market models

The forests considered in the following applications were uneven-aged mixed loblolly pines and hardwoods in the southern United States. We used the Markov chain model of forest stand

growth in Zhou and Buongiorno (2006). In this model, each stand state is represented by a string of six digits such as (010, 001), where the first three stand for the basal area (0 for low, 1 for high, defined in Table 1) of pulpwood, small sawtimber and large sawtimber of pines, and the last three for hardwoods. Six tree classes with two levels of basal area make up $2^6 = 64$ possible stand states. The yearly harvest changes the stand state instantaneously by reducing the basal area in one or more tree groups. Furthermore, to take catastrophic risk into consideration, Zhou and Buongiorno (2006) assume a mean annual rate of hurricanes categorized 4 and above to be 0.025 based on historical records. Due to limited information to quantify vulnerability of forest states to hurricanes, they further assume that regardless of the current state, such a hurricane reduces the stand basal area in the six tree groups to its lowest level (state 1). Consequently the transition probability from any state, s , to state 1 is changed to: $p(1|s) \times (1 - 0.975) + 0.025$ and the other probabilities become $p(s'|s) \times 0.975$ for any state, s' , other than state 1.

For simplicity, to reduce the size of the problem, and as the data showed a positive correlation between the price of softwoods and hardwoods, the market state was categorized as low, medium, or high, according to the level of a single stumpage price index. The index was the weighted average of the real stumpage price of softwoods and hardwoods from 1977 to 2014 (Frank W. Norris Foundation, 1977-2014), the growing stock volume serving as weights. Table 2 shows the definition of the three market states (low, medium, high) based on this index, the price of softwoods and hardwoods in each state, and the annual transition probabilities between states based on the data from 1977 to 2014. With this assumption, the prices of hardwoods and softwoods and the price of large and small sawtimber were perfectly correlated.

With 64 stand states and three price levels, there were 192 stand-market states. The transition probability between each pair of stand-market states was the product of the transition probabilities between the stand states and between the market states.

Management criteria

The expected immediate financial reward depended on the volume of harvest due to a decision, and on the market state. The other criteria considered in the following applications were the tree size and species diversity measured with Shannon's index, the stand basal area (m^3/ha), the CO_2 equivalent (CO_2e) stored in trees (t/ha), the fraction of the landscape in old growth state over a large forest area, and the expected cutting cycle in years (Zhou and Buongiorno, 2006). For each criterion, the expected value and the variance were computed from the probability of a stand-market state and decision, z_{sd} , and the level of the criterion resulting from the decision, r_{sd} .

RESULTS

Risk aversion

Model (5) was applied to calculate the efficiency frontiers for different criteria, i.e. the maximum expected value of a criterion subject to pre specified upper bounds on its variance (Figure 1). For example, with the financial objective (Figure 1a), for decision makers unwilling to tolerate more than \$500/ha/year of standard deviation in annual returns, the highest possible expected annual return was \$140/ha/year. Or, symmetrically, an average return of \$140/ha/year could not be obtained with a standard deviation less than \$500/ha/year.

For financial returns the efficiency frontier was approximately linear for standard deviations between 0 and 1079 \$/ha/year. Within that range, increasing the expected return by \$1/ha/year required accepting an increase in standard deviation of approximately \$3.1/ha/year. Allowing the standard deviation to exceed \$1,079/ha/year could not increase the annual expected return beyond 326 \$/ha/year, the maximum achievable with unconstrained variance. The efficiency frontiers in Figure 1 can be used by decision makers to express their risk aversion. Assume for example that, using Figure 1(a), they set their upper bound on financial risk at \$500/ha/y of standard deviation, with a corresponding maximum expected annual return of \$140/ha/y. Table 3 shows the effects of this level of financial risk aversion on the expected value and standard deviation of other criteria, next to their level for financially risk neutral decision makers. The expected values of annual return and production were markedly lower with financial risk aversion than with risk neutrality. This was obtained with an average cutting cycle approximately one year shorter with the financially risk averse solution than with the risk neutral. This shorter cutting cycle induced lower expected values of the ecological criteria, especially species diversity, basal area, and stored CO₂e. In this example higher diversity of tree size and species could not reduce the variance of returns due to the perfect positive correlation between the price of softwoods and hardwoods, and that of large and small sawtimber (Table 2). The corresponding financially risk-averse and risk-neutral policies, i.e. the decisions depending on the stand and market state are in Table 4. With risk aversion 161 stand-market states called for a harvest (53 with low or medium price, and 54 with high price), against 126 with risk neutrality (30 with low price, 43 with medium price, and 53 with high price)¹.

¹ Due to numerical errors and the presence of non-linear constraints, a few of the decision variables, X_{ik} in equation (2), were not 0 or 1, but fractions close to 0 or 1 which were rounded off to obtain the policy tables 4 and 7.

Multiple constraints

As an example of application of risk aversion with multiple constraints (model (6)), Table 5 shows the results of the solution that minimized the variance of financial annual returns, subject to keeping the expected value of all criteria at least at 50 percent of their unconstrained maxima. In the optimum solution, annual returns and the fraction of forest in old growth were at their 50 percent lower bound, while other criteria exceeded it. In particular diversity of tree species and size were at 93 and 95 percent of their maximum unconstrained value. Compared with the risk-averse solution in Table 3 that maximized annual returns subject only to a standard deviation of \$500/ha/y, most expected values were higher. The only exception was expected production which was marginally lower with the multiple constraints (Table 5) than with the single constraint of \$500/ha/y on the standard deviation of annual returns (Table 3). The expected fraction of old growth was markedly higher with the multiple constraints (Table 3), as was the standard deviation.

Certainty equivalence

Application of the certainty equivalent model (9) requires choosing a particular value of the risk aversion parameter, β . For the financial criterion, Figure 2 shows how the expected value, standard deviation, and the certainty equivalent annual returns changed when the certainty equivalent $U(X)$ was maximized with values of β varying from -0.001 (risk seeking) to 0.001 (risk aversion).

With risk neutrality ($\beta=0$), the certainty equivalent return was the same as the expected annual return of \$326/ha/y, and a corresponding standard deviation was \$1079/ha/y. Positive

values of β indicating rising risk aversion steadily decreased expected value, variance, and certainty equivalent annual return. With $\beta=0.001$ the expected return was 82 percent less than with risk neutrality, the standard deviation 81 percent less, and the certainty equivalent return was 89 percent less.

In contrast, progressively negative values of β characteristic of risk seeking decreased expected returns while increasing the variance and the certainty equivalent return. For β less than or equal to -0.005 the expected value remained approximately constant at 13 percent less than with risk neutrality, and the standard deviation at 21 percent more than with risk neutrality. In contrast, the certainty equivalent income increased steadily from \$326/ha/y with risk neutrality to \$1,134/ha/y for a risk seeker with $\beta=-0.001$.

Table 6 shows the effects on all management criteria of maximizing the certainty equivalent annual return with moderate levels of financial risk aversion ($\beta=0.0005$), and financial risk seeking ($\beta=-0.0005$). The certainty equivalent financial annual return was seven times higher with risk seeking, the standard deviation was twice as large, and the expected value was 42 percent higher. The expected diversity of tree species and size were similar, but the standard deviation of size diversity was 50 percent higher with risk seeking. Expected basal area and CO₂e were 20 to 30 percent higher with risk seeking and their standard deviations were two to two and a half times higher. With risk aversion there was, on average, practically no part of the landscape left in old growth, against 2 percent with risk seeking, but with a standard deviation seven times as large. Expected annual production was 22 percent less, but standard deviation 23 percent more with risk seeking. This, and the expected cutting cycle that was more than twice as long with risk seeking suggested that the lesser volume harvested contained on average more high-value sawlogs than pulpwood.

The policies that led to these results are in Table 7. Overall, with the risk-averse policy ($\beta=0.0005$), 144 stand-market states called for a harvest, 47 at low market level, 48 at medium, and 49 at high, compared with only 58 with the risk seeking policy (12 at low market, 8 at medium, and 38 at high), in agreement with the longer cutting cycle expected with the risk-seeking policy (Table 6).

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

Two methods were used to extend MDP models that classically deal with the expected value of forestry decision criteria to also recognize their variance. One approach, based on Markowitz's portfolio theory consisted in maximizing the expected value of a criterion subject to an upper bound on the variance, or symmetrically, minimizing the variance subject to a lower bound on the expected value. This paper showed how this principle could be applied to MDPs with criteria such as the annual return per unit of forest land, or the amount of CO₂e stored in a stand of trees. The approach used the central variable of the linear-programming MDP formulation, the probability of a decision given a system state (here combining the state of a forest stand and the state of the market). The other method used the certainty equivalent criterion, essentially a weighted average of the expected value and variance. The two approaches were applied to data for mixed softwood-hardwood forests in the southern United States. Markowitz's constrained method gave the efficient expected value-variance frontier for annual financial returns, and other criteria. The effects of choosing different points on the financial efficiency frontier were derived. They showed that higher financial risk aversion besides reducing expected annual financial returns and production also reduced expected species

and size diversity, stand basal area, stored CO₂e, old growth area, and length of cutting cycle. This model was extended to predict the effect of multiple constraints on the expected values of ecological criteria. In practice it can be challenging to set specific bounds of multiple, often non commensurable conflicting, objectives that accurately represent decision makers' preference (Tamiz et al. 1998). Buongiorno and Zhou (2017) propose methods combining goal programming and MDP that minimizes deviations from desired levels of multiple objectives for risk-neutral landowners. It would be fruitful to adapt such methods for risk-sensitive decision makers. The methods proposed here could also be used with finer data, such as prices distinguished by tree species or size to study the effect of differentiation on risk, if warranted by strong negative correlations, and at the cost of an increase in model size. Improvements could also be made to model the effect of catastrophes, their probability, the resulting stand states, and the attendant costs and benefits of harvesting and restoring a stand after such events.

Applications of the certainty equivalent model revealed the sensitivity of the financial criterion to the values of the risk aversion parameter, β . With moderate values of β , financial risk seeking led to higher expected values of most criteria, but larger standard deviations, with cutting cycles twice as long as under risk aversion.

There is scant reason to prefer either of the two approaches investigated here. For strictly risk-averse decision makers, constrained variance is more direct. For a single criterion in particular, the expected value-variance efficiency frontier is helpful in choosing a trade-off point between the two. The certainty equivalent method has the advantage of dealing with risk seeking as well as risk aversion. Although it was applied here only to financial returns, certainty equivalent values could similarly be developed for other criteria. Admittedly, a large percentage of landowners, especially private ones, are usually considered risk averse (Henderson 2007,

Lönnstedt and Svensson, 2000). Nevertheless, it is still worth studying risk-seeking behavior for risk attitude is known to change and has profound effects on timber harvests (Uusivuori 2002). Moreover, risk seeking may be appropriate to depict risk preference of some absentee landowners who are financially less dependent on the land than those living on the land (Petrzelka et al. 2013, P.157).

Regardless of method, in practical decision making and especially in multiple-use forests, multiple criteria must be considered simultaneously. In that respect, both the constrained variance and the certainty equivalent approach combined with the linear programming formulation of MDPs are compelling for the ease of introducing multiple constraints on expected value or variance of criteria, or both. Although the programs become non-linear with variance-dependent objective function or constraints, they are quadratic and thus simple to solve numerically. The two approaches could also be augmented with goal programming, allowing versatile formulations of non-commensurable and conflicting objectives while fulfilling decision makers' needs of optimizing or satisficing (Buongiorno and Zhou, 2017). More difficult would be dealing with the variance of discounted rather than average criteria (Ruszczyński, 2010; Shen et al. 2013), a problem worthy of further research.

Inevitably, the proposed methods are subject to the inherent limitations of MDPs, especially the "curse of dimensionality" which forces some simplifications to render models more computationally tractable. In addition, variance, the measure of risk used in the first method, has been criticized for not being "coherent" (Artzner et al. 1999), while the certainty equivalent model assumed constant risk preference thus ignoring wealth effects (Friedman and Savage 1948). Future efforts should be directed towards solving these issues in the MDP framework.

337

338 ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

339 The research leading to this paper was supported in parts by a joint venture 294 agreements
340 between the University of Wisconsin and the USDA Forest Service Southern Forest Research
341 Station (12- JV-11330143-065, by the Davis College of Agriculture, Natural Resources &
342 Design, West Virginia University, under the US Department of Agriculture (USDA) McIntire–
343 Stennis Funds WVA00105, and by USDA McIntire-Stennis fund WIS01899 at the University of
344 Wisconsin- Madison.

345

346 REFERENCES

- 347 Alvarez, L.H., and Koskela, E. 2006. Does risk aversion accelerate optimal forest rotation under
348 uncertainty? *Journal of Forest Economics* **12**(3): 171-184.
- 349 Ananda, J., and Herath, G. 2005. Evaluating public risk preferences in forest land-use choices
350 using multi-attribute utility theory. *Ecological Economics* **55**(3): 408-419.
- 351 Andersson, M., and Gong, P. 2010. Risk preferences, risk perceptions and timber harvest
352 decisions—an empirical study of nonindustrial private forest owners in Northern Sweden. *Forest*
353 *Policy and Economics* **12**(5): 330-339.
- 354 Artzner, P., Delbaen, F., Eber, J. M., & Heath, D. (1999). Coherent measures of risk.
355 *Mathematical finance*, 9(3), 203-228.

- 356 Brunette, M., Couture, S., and Laye, J. 2015. Optimising forest management under storm risk
357 with a Markov decision process model. *Journal of Environmental Economics and Policy* **4**(2):
358 141-163.
- 359 Buongiorno, J. 2001. Generalization of Faustmanns Formula for Stochastic Forest Growth and
360 Prices with Markov Decision Process Models. *Forest Science* **47**(4): 466-474.
- 361 Buongiorno, J., and Zhou, M. 2015. Adaptive economic and ecological forest management under
362 risk. *Forest Ecosystems* **2**(4). doi:10.1186/s40663-015-0030-y
- 363 Buongiorno, J. and Zhou, M. 2017. Multi-criteria forest decision making under risk with goal-
364 programming Markov decision process models. *Forest Science* (Forthcoming).
- 365 Caulfield, J.P. 1988. A stochastic efficiency approach for determining the economic rotation of a
366 forest stand. *Forest Science* **34**(2): 441-457.
- 367 Couture, S., and Reynaud, A. 2008. Multi-stand forest management under a climatic risk: do
368 time and risk preferences matter? *Environmental Modeling & Assessment* **13**(2): 181-193.
- 369 Delacote, P. 2007. Agricultural expansion, forest products as safety nets, and deforestation.
370 *Environment and Development Economics* **12**(02): 235-249.
- 371 Ding, X.-S., Chen, X., Chang, J.-H., Zhang, X., Lui, D., Fushimi, M., and Tong, X. 2009.
372 Certainty Equivalent in Portfolio Management. 8th International Symposium on Operations
373 Research and Its Applications (ISORA'09). <http://www.aporc.org/LNOR/10/ISORA2009F17.pdf>
374 (last accessed November 23, 2016).

- 375 Ermon, S., Conrad, J., Gomes, C.P., and Selman, B. 2011. Risk-sensitive policies for sustainable
376 renewable resource allocation. P. 1942-1948 in IJCAI, Proceedings of the 22nd International Joint
377 Conference on artificial Intelligence, Barcelona, Catalonia, Spain, July 16-22, 2011.
- 378 Fischer, S., and Kuzivanova, V. 2014. When discount rates make zero sense.
379 <http://home.cc.umanitoba.ca/~hudsoni/NRI/DiscountRate.htm>
380 (last accessed March 6, 2017).
- 381 Frank W. Norris Foundation (1977-2014). Timber Mart South, Athens, Gorgia, USA.
382 <http://www.timbermart-south.com/>
- 383 Freund, R.J. 1956. The introduction of risk into a programming model. *Econometrica* **24**: 253-
384 263.
- 385 Friedman, M., and Savage, L. J. (1948). The utility analysis of choices involving risk. *Journal of*
386 *political Economy* **56**(4): 279-304.
- 387 Gokalny, I.M. 2002. From precautionary principle to risk-risk analysis. *Nature Biotechnology*
388 **20**(11):1075.
- 389 Gong, P. 1998. Risk preferences and adaptive harvest policies for even-aged stand management.
390 *Forest Science* **44**(4): 496-506.
- 391 Gong, P., and Löfgren, K.-G. 2003. Risk-aversion and the short-run supply of timber. *Forest*
392 *Science* **49**(5): 647-656.
- 393 Henderson, J. E. 2007. Liability, institutions, and determinants of landowner access policies for
394 fee-based recreation on private lands. Unpublished dissertation, Louisanna State University,
395 Baton Rouge, 268 p.

- 396 Hillier F., S., and Lieberman, G.J. 2010. Introduction to operations research, 9th Edition.
397 McGraw-Hill, Boston, 1061p.
- 398 Kant, S., and Alavalapati, J.R.R. 2014. Handbook of forest economics. Routledge, New York,
399 559p.
- 400 Lembersky, M.R., and Johnson, K.N. 1975. Optimal Policies for Managed Stands: An Infinite
401 Horizon Markov Decision Process Approach. *Forest Science* **21**(2): 109-122.
- 402 Levitt, S., and Ben-Israel, A. 2001. On modeling risk in Markov decision processes. P. 27-40 in
403 Optimization and Related Topics. A. Rubinov and B. Glover, Eds, Springer, Dordrecht, 456 p.
- 404 Lönnstedt, L., and Svensson, J. 2000. Non-industrial private forest owners' risk preferences.
405 *Scandinavian Journal of Forest Research* **15**(6): 651-660.
- 406 Manne, A.S. 1960. Linear programming and sequential decisions. *Management Science* **6**(3):
407 259-267.
- 408 Markowitz, H. 1952. Portfolio selection. *The journal of finance* **7**(1): 77-91.
- 409 Martell, D.L. 1980. The optimal rotation of a flammable forest stand. *Canadian Journal of Forest*
410 *Research* **10**(1): 30-34.
- 411 Ollikainen, M. 1990. Forest taxation and the timing of private nonindustrial forest harvests under
412 interest rate uncertainty. *Canadian Journal of Forest Research* **20**(12): 1823-1829.
- 413 Parks, P.J. 1995. Explaining "irrational" land use: risk aversion and marginal agricultural land.
414 *Journal of Environmental Economics and Management* **28**(1): 34-47.

- 415 Petrzelka, P., Ma, Z., and Malin, S. 2013. The elephant in the room: Absentee land owner issues
416 in conservation and land management. *Land Use Policy* **30**:157-166.
- 417 Pukkala, T., and Kangas, J. 1996. A method for integrating risk and attitude toward risk into
418 forest planning. *Forest Science* **42**(2): 198-205.
- 419 Roessiger, J., Griess, V.C., and Knoke, T. 2011. May risk aversion lead to near-natural forestry?
420 A simulation study. *Forestry* **84**(5): 527-537.
- 421 Ruszczyński, A. 2010. Risk-averse dynamic programming for Markov decision processes.
422 *Mathematical Programming* **125**(2): 235-261.
- 423 Shen, Y., Stannat, W., and Obermayer, K. 2013. Risk-sensitive Markov control processes. *SIAM*
424 *Journal on Control and Optimization* **51**(5): 3652-3672.
- 425 Tahvonen, O., and Kallio, M. 2006. Optimal harvesting of forest age classes under price
426 uncertainty and risk aversion. *Natural Resource Modeling* **19**(4): 557-585.
- 427 Tamiz, M., Jones, D., and Romero, C. 1998. Goal programming for decision making: An
428 overview of the current state-of-the-art. *European Journal of operational research* **111**(3): 569-
429 581.
- 430 Uusivuori, J. (2002). Nonconstant risk attitudes and timber harvesting. *Forest Science* **48**(3):
431 459-470.
- 432 Zhou, M., and Buongiorno, J.. 2006. Forest landscape management in a stochastic environment,
433 with an application to mixed loblolly pine-hardwood forests. *Forest Ecology and Management*
434 **223**: 170-182.

435 Zhou, M., and Buongiorno, J. 2011. Effects of stochastic interest rates in decision making under
436 risk: A Markov decision process model for forest management. *Forest Policy and Economics*
437 **13**(5): 402-410.

438
439
440

Draft

Figure 1: Efficient frontier for risk aversion in selected criteria. Each point on the frontier is the maximum annual expected value of the criterion subject to an upper bound on its standard deviation.

Figure 2: Effects of the risk aversion parameter, β , of the certainty equivalent model on the expected value, standard deviation, and certainty equivalent value of annual financial returns. $\beta > 0$ indicates risk aversion, $\beta < 0$ risk seeking, and $\beta = 0$ risk neutrality of decision maker.

455 Table 1. Low and high levels of basal area by tree species and size used to define stand states.
 456

Basal area	Pines			Hardwoods		
	Pulpwood	Small sawtimber	Large sawtimber	Pulpwood	Small sawtimber	Large sawtimber
	-----m ² ha ⁻¹ -----					
Low (0)	≤2.5	≤4.3	≤3.6	≤2.9	≤1.2	≤1.7
High (1)	>2.5	>4.3	>3.6	>2.9	>1.2	>1.7

457

458

Draft

Table 2. Price index, I_t , defining the market states, mean price level by stand state, and transition probability between stand states.

	Market state		
	Low	Medium	High
Price index	$I_t < 26.7$	$26.7 < I_t \leq 38.8$	$I_t > 38.8$
Pines price (\$ t ⁻¹)			
Large sawtimber	28.6	39.5	54
Small sawtimber	14.3	19.8	27
Pulpwood	10.2	10.2	10.2
Hardwoods price (\$ t ⁻¹)			
Large sawtimber	16.5	20.3	25.7
Small sawtimber	8.3	10.2	12.9
Pulpwood	6.1	6.1	6.1
Market state	Annual transition probability between states		
Low	0.71	0.25	0.04
Medium	0.27	0.52	0.21
High	0.04	0.21	0.75

Table 3: Expected value and standard deviation of management criteria for financially risk averse or risk neutral decision makers. The risk averse solution maximized expected annual return subject to a standard deviation less than or equal to \$500/ha/y, while the risk neutral maximized unconstrained expected annual return.

Criterion	Unit	Risk averse		Risk neutral	
		Expected value	Standard deviation	Expected value	Standard deviation
Return	\$/ha/y	140.1	500	326.0	1079
Species diversity	index	0.83	0.10	0.92	0.08
Size diversity	index	1.83	0.06	1.84	0.08
Basal area	m ³ /ha	14.5	2.32	15.9	3.0
Stored CO ₂ e	t/ha	111.0	31.64	127.8	31.2
Old growth	fraction	0.00	0.01	0.01	0.12
Production	m ³ /ha/y	5.3	14.46	6.3	18.1
Cutting cycle	year	6.8		7.9	

Table 4: Best decision by stand and market state for financially risk averse or risk neutral decision makers. The risk averse solution maximized expected annual return subject to a standard deviation less than or equal to \$500/ha/y while the risk neutral maximized unconstrained expected annual return.

Stand state #	Stand composition ¹	Risk averse (SD<=\$500/ha/y)			Risk neutral		
		market state			market state		
		Low	Medium	High	Low	Medium	High
		-----Decision ² -----					
1	000,000	-	-	-	-	-	-
2	000,001	-	-	1	-	-	-
3	000,010	-	-	1	-	-	-
4	000,011	2	2	3	-	-	-
5	000,100	-	-	-	-	-	-
6	000,101	2	2	5	5	5	5
7	000,110	3	3	5	-	-	-
8	000,111	4	7	7	4	4	7
9	001,000	-	-	-	-	1	1
10	001,001	2	9	9	-	2	2
11	001,010	3	-	9	-	3	3
12	001,011	4	11	11	-	4	4
13	001,100	5	9	9	-	5	5
14	001,101	6	10	13	13	5	5
15	001,110	11	11	11	-	7	7
16	001,111	8	15	15	-	4	7
17	010,000	1	1	-	-	-	1
18	010,001	2	2	17	-	-	2
19	010,010	3	3	17	-	-	3
20	010,011	4	4	19	-	19	4
21	010,100	5	5	17	-	-	5
22	010,101	6	6	21	21	21	5
23	010,110	7	7	21	19	-	7
24	010,111	8	8	23	20	23	7
25	011,000	9	9	-	17	17	1
26	011,001	10	10	25	18	18	2
27	011,010	11	11	25	19	19	3
28	011,011	12	12	27	20	20	4
29	011,100	13	13	25	21	21	5
30	011,101	14	14	29	-	-	-
31	011,110	15	15	27	19	23	7
32	011,111	16	16	31	20	23	7
33	100,000	1	1	1	-	-	-

34	100,001	2	2	33	2	33	33
35	100,010	3	3	3	-	-	-
36	100,011	-	35	35	-	-	-
37	100,100	5	5	5	5	5	5
38	100,101	6	6	37	5	5	5
39	100,110	35	35	35	35	35	35
40	100,111	36	36	39	36	36	36
41	101,000	-	-	9	-	33	33
42	101,001	34	41	41	41	33	33
43	101,010	11	11	41	-	35	35
44	101,011	36	43	43	36	36	36
45	101,100	41	41	41	-	5	5
46	101,101	-	45	-	-	5	5
47	101,110	15	15	15	-	35	35
48	101,111	44	47	47	-	36	36
49	110,000	33	33	17	-	-	33
50	110,001	34	34	49	18	49	33
51	110,010	35	35	19	-	-	35
52	110,011	36	36	51	-	-	36
53	110,100	37	37	21	21	21	5
54	110,101	-	-	-	-	-	5
55	110,110	39	39	23	-	-	35
56	110,111	-	-	-	52	52	36
57	111,000	41	41	25	49	49	33
58	111,001	-	-	-	-	-	-
59	111,010	43	43	27	51	51	35
60	111,011	44	44	59	52	52	36
61	111,100	45	45	29	21	21	5
62	111,101	46	-	61	54	54	5
63	111,110	47	47	31	55	55	35
64	111,111	48	48	63	52	52	36
Harvests		53	53	55	30	43	53
		Total		161	Total		126

¹Basal area in pulpwood, small sawtimber, and large saw timber of pines (first three digits), or hardwoods (last three digits) 1 = higher than current average, 0 = lower than current average.

²Stand state # resulting from the best harvest decision, “-” indicates no harvest.

Table 5: Expected value and standard deviation of management criteria for decision makers minimizing the variance of financial annual returns subject to reaching at least half of the maximum unconstrained expected value of all criteria.

Criteria		Expected value (1)	Standard deviation	Maximum unconstrained expected value (2)	(1)/(2)
Financial Return	\$/ha/y	163	586	326	0.50
Tree species diversity	index	0.89	0.09	0.96	0.93
Tree size diversity	index	1.86	0.10	1.97	0.95
Basal area	m ³ /ha	16.0	3.4	21.7	0.74
CO ₂ e	t/ha	122.9	30.0	218.6	0.56
Old growth	fraction	0.17	0.37	0.33	0.50
Production	m ³ /ha/y	5.1	15.3	7.5	0.68
Cutting cycle	year	8.4			

Table 6: Expected value and standard deviation of management criteria, according to financial risk attitude, obtained by maximizing certainty equivalent annual income.

Criterion	Unit	Risk averse $\beta=0.0005$		Risk seeking $\beta=-0.0005$	
		Expected value	Standard deviation	Expected value	Standard deviation
Financial return	\$/ha/y	202	645	287	1301
Certainty equivalent	\$/ha/y	98		710	
Tree species diversity	index	0.88	0.10	0.89	0.09
Tree size diversity	index	1.82	0.06	1.86	0.10
Basal area	m ³ /ha	14.6	2.2	17.2	4.4
CO ₂ e	t/ha	116	26.2	147	66.7
Old growth	fraction	0.00	0.02	0.02	0.15
Production	m ³ /ha/y	6.1	16.5	4.7	20.3
Cutting cycle	year	6.6		14.2	

Table 7: Decisions by stand and market state that maximized the certainty equivalent annual returns for risk averse and risk seeking decision makers.

Stand state #	Stand composition ¹	Risk averse ($\beta=0.0005$)			Risk seeking ($\beta=-0.0005$)		
		market state			market state		
		Low	Medium	High	Low	Medium	High
		-----Decision ² -----					
1	000,000	-	-	-	-	-	-
2	000,001	-	-	-	-	-	-
3	000,010	-	-	-	-	-	-
4	000,011	-	2	3	-	-	-
5	000,100	-	-	-	-	-	-
6	000,101	2	5	5	2	-	-
7	000,110	-	5	5	-	-	-
8	000,111	4	7	7	4	4	4
9	001,000	1	-	-	-	-	1
10	001,001	2	-	9	-	-	1
11	001,010	3	9	9	9	-	3
12	001,011	4	10	11	-	4	3
13	001,100	5	-	9	-	-	5
14	001,101	6	10	13	10	-	5
15	001,110	7	-	13	-	-	5
16	001,111	8	15	15	-	-	5
17	010,000	-	1	1	-	-	-
18	010,001	2	2	2	-	-	-
19	010,010	-	3	3	-	-	-
20	010,011	4	4	4	-	-	-
21	010,100	5	5	5	-	-	-
22	010,101	6	6	6	18	18	18
23	010,110	7	7	7	-	-	19
24	010,111	8	8	8	20	20	-
25	011,000	17	9	9	-	-	1
26	011,001	18	10	10	-	-	1
27	011,010	19	11	11	-	-	3
28	011,011	20	12	12	-	-	3
29	011,100	21	13	13	-	-	5
30	011,101	-	-	-	-	-	5
31	011,110	23	15	15	-	-	5
32	011,111	-	-	-	28	-	5
33	100,000	-	-	-	-	-	-
34	100,001	2	2	33	-	-	-

35	100,010	-	-	33	-	-	-
36	100,011	-	-	-	-	-	-
37	100,100	5	5	5	-	-	-
38	100,101	6	6	37	-	-	-
39	100,110	35	35	35	35	35	35
40	100,111	36	36	36	36	36	36
41	101,000	33	-	-	-	-	33
42	101,001	34	41	41	-	-	33
43	101,010	35	41	41	-	-	35
44	101,011	36	43	43	-	36	36
45	101,100	37	41	41	-	-	5
46	101,101	38	45	-	-	-	5
47	101,110	39	43	41	-	-	35
48	101,111	40	44	47	-	-	36
49	110,000	33	33	33	-	-	-
50	110,001	18	34	34	-	-	-
51	110,010	35	35	35	-	-	-
52	110,011	36	36	36	-	-	-
53	110,100	21	37	37	-	-	-
54	110,101	-	38	-	-	-	-
55	110,110	51	39	39	-	-	-
56	110,111	52	40	40	52	52	52
57	111,000	49	41	41	-	-	1
58	111,001	-	-	-	-	-	1
59	111,010	51	43	43	-	-	35
60	111,011	52	44	44	-	-	36
61	111,100	-	45	-	-	-	5
62	111,101	-	-	-	58	-	5
63	111,110	55	47	47	-	-	5
64	111,111	56	48	48	60	-	5
Harvests		47	48	49	12	8	38
			Total	144		Total	58

¹Basal area in pulpwood, small sawtimber, and large saw timber of pines (first three digits), or hardwoods (last three digits) 1 = higher than current average, 0 = lower than current average.

²Stand state # resulting from the best harvest decision, “-” indicates no harvest.