Response to Policy regarding Discharge

Q. Water yield (base) has been demonstrated to increase in literature. You presented a different perspective with your interpretations; why?

I hope everyone understood that total water yield did increase at all six treatment sites in response to harvest. Specific discharge (discharge per unit area, m³/ha or mm) increased by 1% and 26% in the sites where with 100% of the stream channel was buffered; 44% and 65% in the FP sites, and 55% and 54% in the sites with no buffer (Table 8-4 on page 8-20). Total water yield changed in response to buffer treatment type and the proportion of the basin that was harvested. One change that I did highlight, and that we did not necessarily expect, were the decreased base-flows observed in the 100% sites. It may be that the base-flow response is what you are referring to.

If your question is why we observed decreased base-flow in the 100% sites but not the FP or 0%; the answer is that we can't be sure, but summertime flow reduction in sites with more riparian trees may reflect increased evapotranspiration in the riparian zone following harvest. A recent study showed that groundwater evapotranspiration (ET) can be spatially restricted to riparian areas and account for 6 - 18% of the total ET in a headwater basin (Tsang et al., 2014). Thus, it is possible that riparian plants were light-limited prior to harvest and that the increased light availability associated with adjacent harvest increased ET enough to decrease streamflow during relatively dry periods (discussed on page 8-27).

If your question is why we observed base flow decreases that seem to contrast with some of the previous literature, the answer is that the literature is not consistent on the topic of seasonal response and we are using methods that make it easier to identify base-flow decreases. While many studies have reported increased low flow water yield or an increase in the number of "low flow" days following harvest (Harr et al., 1982; Harris, 1977; Hubbart et al., 2007), other researchers have reported reduced summer base-flows (Harr, 1980) or increased low flow for a period of time followed by decreases (Hicks et al., 1991; Keppeler and Ziemer, 1990). While the direction of change in annual water yield is fairly easy to predict, seasonal responses are hard to generalize and vary with a number of factors including the type of vegetation, geology, and hydrologic regime (Brown et al., 2005; Jones and Post, 2004; Moore and Wondzell, 2005). In addition, our analytical methodologies continue to improve. Many older studies used an ANOVA or ANCOVA approach to look for change, which is unlikely to be as powerful as the methods we used, e.g., seasonal regression models advocated by Watson and colleagues (2001) especially when paired with the frequency pairing approach advocated by Alila and colleagues (Alila et al., 2010; Alila et al., 2009; Green and Alila, 2012; Kuras et al., 2012).

I hope that helps. Please feel free to follow-up if you'd like additional information.

References:

- Alila, Y., Hudson, R., Kura, K., P., Schnorbus, M., and Rasouli, K., 2010, Reply to comment by Jack Lewis et al. on Forests and floods: A new paradigm sheds light on age-old controversies: Water Resour. Res., v. 46, no. 5, p. W05802.
- Alila, Y., Kura, K., P., Schnorbus, M., and Hudson, R., 2009, Forests and floods: A new paradigm sheds light on age-old controversies: Water Resour. Res., v. 45, no. 8, p. W08416.

- Brown, A. E., Zhang, L., McMahon, T. A., Western, A. W., and Vertessy, R. A., 2005, A review of paired catchment studies for determining changes in water yield resulting from alterations in vegetation: Journal of Hydrology, v. 310, no. 1–4, p. 28-61.
- Green, K. C., and Alila, Y., 2012, A paradigm shift in understanding and quantifying the effects of forest harvesting on floods in snow environments: Water Resour. Res., v. 48, no. 10, p. W10503.
- Harr, R. D., 1980, Streamflow after patch logging in small drainages within the Bull Run Municipal Watershed, Oregon: Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Pacific Northwest Forest and Range Experiment Station.
- Harr, R. D., Levno, A., and Mersereau, R., 1982, Streamflow changes after logging 130-year-old Douglas fir in two small watersheds: Water Resources Research, v. 18, no. 3, p. 637-644.
- Harris, D. D., 1977, Hydrologic changes after logging in two small Oregon coastal watersheds, 2037.
- Hicks, B. J., Beschta, R. L., and Harr, R. D., 1991, Long-Term Changes in Streamflow Following Logging in Western Oregon and Associated Fisheries Implications: Water Resources Bulletin, v. 27, no. 2, p. 217-226.
- Hubbart, J. A., Link, T. E., Gravelle, J. A., and Elliot, W. J., 2007, Timber Harvest Impacts on Water Yield in the Continental/Maritime Hydroclimatic Region of the United States: Forest Science, v. 53, no. 2, p. 169-180.
- Jones, J. A., and Post, D. A., 2004, Seasonal and successional streamflow response to forest cutting and regrowth in the northwest and eastern United States: Water Resources Research, v. 40, no. 5, p. W05203.
- Keppeler, E. T., and Ziemer, R. R., 1990, Logging effects on streamflow: Water yield and summer low flows at Caspar Creek in northwestern California: Water Resources Research, v. 26, no. 7, p. 1669-1679.
- Kuras, P. K., Alila, Y., and Weiler, M., 2012, Forest harvesting effects on the magnitude and frequency of peak flows can increase with return period: Water Resour. Res., v. 48, no. 1, p. W01544.
- Moore, R. D., and Wondzell, S. M., 2005, Physical hydrology and the effects of forest harvesting in the Pacific Northwest: a review: Journal of the American Water Resources Association, v. 41, no. 4, p. 763-784.
- Tsang, Y.-P., Hornberger, G., Kaplan, L. A., Newbold, J. D., and Aufdenkampe, A. K., 2014, A variable source area for groundwater evapotranspiration: impacts on modeling stream flow: Hydrological Processes, v. 28, no. 4, p. 2439-2450.
- Watson, F., Vertessy, R., McMahon, T., Rhodes, B., and Watson, I., 2001, Improved methods to assess water yield changes from paired-catchment studies: application to the Maroondah catchments: Forest Ecology and Management, v. 143, no. 1-3, p. 189-204.