# Re-evaluating Forest Harvesting BMP efficiencies for the Chesapeake Bay Program's Watershed Model

Written by Lorenzo Cinalli (USFS) and Alanna Crowley (MD DNR)

**Summary:**

The Timber Harvest Task Force was convened by the Forestry Workgroup and Land Use Workgroup and is evaluating opportunities to improve the modeling of the water quality impacts of forest harvesting in the Phase 7 Watershed Model. We conducted an initial evaluation of the literature and consulted experts to determine if there was a need to re-evaluate 1. The loading rates of harvested forests, 2. The nutrient and sediment removal efficiencies of forest harvesting BMPs, and 3. The credit duration of forest harvesting BMPs. Based on our research, we determined that there is insufficient research to support modifying the loading rates of harvested forests, but **we recommend exploring changes to the efficiency rate and credit duration for the Forest Harvesting Practices BMP.**

## Introduction:

The Chesapeake Bay Program is currently updating its modeling and analysis tools, including the Chesapeake Assessment Scenario Tool (CAST), which is a publicly available model of the Chesapeake Bay watershed used to estimate changes in long-term nutrient and sediment loads due to changes in point sources, land use, and land management. Harvested forest is one land use type modeled in CAST. With the implementation of forest harvesting BMPs, harvest managers have the capability to prevent significant soil erosion, reducing the total sediment and nutrient loads in waterways that could otherwise result from an unsustainable harvest. The Bay Program uses BMP "efficiencies" to quantify the percentage of a pollutant that is removed when a BMP is applied.

Timber harvest is one of the many purviews under the Bay Program's Forestry Workgroup (FWG). To best advise the Forestry Workgroup on their recommendations for Phase 7 of the watershed model, we conducted a literature review of materials related to forest harvesting, timber harvest BMPs, and sediment and nutrient loads, as well as reaching out to forest harvest experts. During this literature review, we searched for information relevant to altering the base loading rates of harvested forests, the efficiency rate for timber harvest BMPs, as well as the credit duration for forest harvesting BMPs.

## Current Base Loads and Efficiencies:

Between 2006-2007, the University of Maryland led a project to review and refine effectiveness estimates for forest harvesting BMPs implemented and reported within the Chesapeake Bay Watershed (CBW). As a part of this project, Pamela Edwards (USDA Forest Service) and Karl Williard (Southern Illinois University) were asked to review applicable literature and propose an

efficiency for model calibration based on the literature and their experience. Edwards and Williard examined three studies that contained data of timber harvest with and without BMPs from comparable plots to calculate an efficiency rate of the BMPs. Edwards and Williard averaged the efficiency rates from these studies to form a recommended average efficiency rate for CAST.

They recommended that the Effectiveness Estimates be set to a conservative **60% for total suspended solids (TSS), 50% for total nitrogen (TN), and 60% for total phosphorus (TP).** These recommendations were formally adopted in the 2009 report "Developing Best Management Practice Definitions and Effectiveness Estimates for Nitrogen, Phosphorus and Sediment in the Chesapeake Bay Watershed", by Dr. Thomas Simpson and Sarah Weammert. Forest harvesting BMPs were assigned a credit duration of one year, so these efficiencies are applied to loading rates for a duration of one year.

**Research Methodology:**

We conducted a literature review of materials related to forest harvesting and sediment, nitrogen, and phosphorus loads. We examined relevant studies published within the last 15 years, between 2009 - 2024. We examined studies that took place either in full or partially within the Chesapeake Bay Watershed and neighboring states, as well as eastern mixed deciduous and pine forests. In addition, we consulted with several experts, who assisted in guiding our research. These include Dr. C. Rhett Jackson from the University of Georgia, Dr. Michael Aust from the University of Virginia Tech, and Moriah Van Voorhis from the North Carolina Forest Service, who we want to thank for their assistance.

**Results: Literature Review Summary**

In conducting our literature review, we were unable to find any published literature that compared an actual BMP scenario with a No-BMP scenario. In most cases, BMP efficiencies were estimated based on a modeled No-BMP scenario. In one case (Dangle et al., 2019), only total loads with BMPs were reported, with no indication of an efficiency estimate. In this case, we averaged the reported loads in the new study, and compared them with the average of the No-BMP scenarios from the older studies referenced in the 2009 report to determine an estimated efficiency rate. In some cases, a range of efficiency updates for a variety of BMPs were given. In these cases, we used the average efficiency rate given.

Literature that reported efficiency rates and base loads also reported similar loads over multiple years of BMP usage.

Sediment:

There was insufficient literature to reevaluate base TSS loading rates of harvested forests (in the absence of BMPs).

Based on the literature, we found an average 85% efficiency rate for BMP sediment retention. This represents a 17% difference from the previously reported average reported in the 2009 report, and a 25% difference from the CAST efficiency rate. Some of the literature reviewed found that when forest harvest BMPs were utilized, the impacts of harvest on sediment loads were not statistically significant. As a result, they were unable to calculate a reliable efficiency rate. In these cases, we report in the findings column the words they used to describe their results.

| **Table 1**. Forest Harvest BMP Sediment Removal Efficiency | |
|---|---|
| Reference | Efficiency |
| Hawks, Bolding et all, 2022 | 64% |
| Hawks, Aust, et all 2022 | 83% |
| Lakel et all, 2009 | 97% |
| A.J. Lang et al, 2022+ | 88.20% |
| Dangle et al, 2019* | 100.00% |
| Cristan et al, 2019+ | 75.6% |
| Witt et al, 2016 | “Low impact” |
| Maine FS, 2021 | “No measurable difference” |
| Average | 85% |
| Edwards & Willard Average | 67% |
| Current CAST efficiency | 60% |

*The study’s efficiency numbers were estimated through comparing reported BMP loads to reported No-BMP loads in other studies with comparable geography.

+The study reported a range of BMP efficiencies for different environments, which was then averaged out to calculate an average efficiency

Nitrogen:

There was insufficient literature to reevaluate base TN loading rates of harvested forests in the absence of BMPs.

The literature reviewed found that when forest harvest BMPs were utilized, the impacts of harvest on TN were not statistically significant. As a result, they were unable to calculate a reliable efficiency rate. In these cases, we report in the findings column the words they used to describe their results.

| **Table 2.** Forest Harvest BMPs Nitrogen Removal Efficiency | |
|---|---|
| Reference | Findings |
| DaSilva et al, 2012 | “No significant increase” |
| Marchman et al, 2013 | “Statistically insignificant” |

| | |
|---|---|
| Boggs et al, 2015 | “No significant increase” |
| Witt et al, 2016 | “Low impact” |
| Edwards & Williard Average | 51% |
| Current CAST efficiency | 50% |

Phosphorus:

There was insufficient literature to reevaluate base TP loading rates of harvested forests in the absence of BMPs.

The literature reviewed found that when forest harvest BMPs were utilized, the changes in TP were not statistically significant. As a result, they were unable to calculate a reliably efficiency rate. In these cases, we report in the findings column the words they used to describe their results.

| **Table 3**. Forest Harvest BMP Phosphorus Removal Efficiency | |
|---|---|
| Reference | Findings |
| Boggs et al, 2015 | “No significant increase” |
| DaSilva et al, 2012 | “No significant increase” |
| Marchman et al, 2013 | “Statistically insignificant” |
| Edwards & Williard Average | 72% |
| Current CAST efficiency | 60% |

**Results: Expert Consultation**

When reaching out to experts, they acknowledged that there have not been many new timber harvest BMP research and studies published, and that most BMPs are comparable to BMPs done pre-2000. They also uniformly expressed that the current BMP efficiencies in CAST were not representative of BMP efficiencies. They suggested that BMPs captured over 95% of sediments, that phosphorus loads were highly associated with sediment loads and thus similar, and that very little nitrogen was entering waterways with proper BMP usage.

**Recommendations/Summary:**

For base loads, there was insufficient literature looking at base loads of harvested forests without forest harvest BMPs. **We do not recommend further exploring reevaluating base loads of harvested forests.**

For TSS, there is consensus from both the literature and from the experts that the efficiency rates in CAST are underreporting BMP effectiveness. We determined an average of 85% efficiency in reducing sediment loads with BMP implementation, which is in line with what was

reported by experts. Currently, CAST reports a 60% efficiency rate for TSS. **We recommend further exploring changing the efficiency rate for TSS.**

For TN, the literature reported that with BMP implementation, there were minimal impacts in TN loads after forest harvests. This was supported by the experts interviewed, who advised that very little nitrogen enters waterways with BMP implementation. Currently, CAST reports a 50% efficiency rate for TN. **We recommend further exploring changing the efficiency rate for TN.**

For TP, the literature reported that with BMP implementation, there were minimal impacts in TP loads after forest harvests. This was supported by the experts interviewed, who advised that phosphorus loads and efficiencies were highly correlated with sediment loads, and thus are similarly low. Currently, CAST reports a 60% efficiency rate for TP. **We recommend further exploring changing the efficiency rate for TP.**

There was evidence that efficiencies are maintained throughout multiple years after BMP implementation. **We recommend further exploring changing the credit duration.**

**Cited Research Studies:**


A.J. Lang, W.A. Coats, T.A. Gerow Jr., W.A. Swartley. (April 19, 2022). “Estimates of soil erosion and best management practice effectiveness at forestry stream crossings in North Carolina” *Journal of Soil and Water Conservation*

Johnny Boggs, Ge Sun, and Steven McNulty. (August 13, 2015). “Effects of Timber Harvest on Water Quantity and Quality in Small Watersheds in the Piedmont of North Carolina”

Cristan, R.; Aust, W.M.; Bolding, M.C.; Barrett, S.M. Estimated Sediment Protection Efficiences for Increasing Levels of Best Management Practices on Forest Harvests in the Piedmont, USA. *Forests* **2019**, *10*, 997.

Dangle, C.; Bolding, M.; Aust, W.; Barrett, S.; Schilling, E. Best management practices influence modeled erosion rates at forest haul road stream crossings in Virginia. J. Am. Water Resour. Assoc. 2019, 55, 1169–1182.

DaSilva, Abram; Xu, Y. Jun; Ice, George; Beebe, John; Stich, Richard. 2012. Effectiveness of timber harvesting BMPs: monitoring spatial and temporal dynamics of dissolved oxygen, nitrogen, and phosphorus in a low-gradient watershed, Louisiana. In: Butnor, John R., ed. 2012. Proceedings of the 16th biennial southern silvicultural research conference. e-Gen. Tech. Rep. SRS-156. Asheville, NC: U.S. Department of Agriculture Forest Service, Southern Research Station. 82-89.

Edwards, P., Williard, K. (2009). “Forest Harvesting Practices Definition and Nutrient and Sediment Reduction Efficiencies For use in calibration and operation of the Chesapeake Bay Program’s Phase 5.0 Watershed Model”

Hawks, B. S., Aust, M. W., Bolding, B. M., Barrett, S. M., Schilling, E., fielding, J. A.H. (March 1, 2022). “Linkages between Forestry Best Management Practices and erosion in the southeastern U.S.” *Journal of Environmental Management*

Brent S. Hawks, M. Chad Bolding, W. Michael Aust, Scott M. Barrett, Erik B. Schilling, Stephen P. Prisley, Increased levels of forestry best management practices reduce sediment delivery from Piedmont and Upper Coastal Plain clearcut harvests and access features, southeastern states, USA,Forest Ecology and Management,Volume 529,2023,120697,ISSN 0378-1127, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.foreco.2022.120697

Lakel, William A., III; Aust, Wallace M.; Aust, M.; Bolding, Chad; Dolloff, C. Andrew; Keyser, Patrick; Feldt, Robert. 2010. Sediment trapping
by streamside management zones of various widths after forest harvest and site preparation. Forest Science 56(6):541-551.

Maine FS. (June 2022). “Maine Forestry Best Management Practices (BMP) Use and

Effectiveness—Data Summary 2020-2021". Department of Agriculture, Conservation and Forestry: Maine Forest Service

Witt, Emma L.; Barton, Christopher D.; Stringer, Jeffrey W.; Kolka, Randall K.; Cherry, Mac A. 2016. Influence of variable streamside management zone configurations on water quality after forest harvest. Journal of Forestry. 114(1): 41-51.