#### **Competition between regenerating oaks and invasive plants in irregular shelterwood harvests** The role of forest soils

#### Eli Ward



Assistant Scientist in Forest Ecosystem Ecology The Connecticut Agricultural Experiment Station



How do forest disturbances, management practices, and/or environmental stressors alter the relationships between plant community composition and soil conditions? Do these changes align with forest management goals?



Forest Health Monitoring Workshop

Research overview

## FOREST MANAGEMENT & ENVIRONMENTAL CHANGE

Forest disturbances, management practices, environmental stressors

Urbanization & Urban Forest Restoration Forest management practices

Forest pest and pathogen invasions







Research overview

### FOREST MANAGEMENT & ENVIRONMENTAL CHANGE

Forest disturbances, management practices, environmental stressors

Urbanization & Urban Forest Restoration Forest management practices

Forest pest and pathogen invasions







#### Irregular Shelterwood Harvests (Establishment cuts) Yale-Myers Forest



Irregular Shelterwood Harvests (Establishment cuts) \*Regeneration Harvest

![](_page_5_Picture_1.jpeg)

#### **Goals:**

- **Regenerate oaks** (and in doing so, other tree species)
- Increase structural and compositional diversity within the stand
- Increase structural and ageclass diversity at the landscape scale

#### Light Soil resources

## Promote diverse assemblages of regenerating trees, including oaks

#### Light Soil resources

#### Understory plant invasions\*

\*When there is sufficient propagule pressure

#### Understory plant invasions

## Tree regeneration and forest development

How do forest soil conditions mediate the competitive dynamics between invasive plants and regenerating oaks?

![](_page_8_Picture_3.jpeg)

#### Understory plant invasions

# Tree regeneration and forest development

How do forest soil conditions mediate the competitive dynamics between invasive plants and regenerating oaks?

#### Soil **nitrogen** availability

#### Soil carbon availability

# (1) How do irregular shelterwood harvests influence surface soil conditions (0-10 cm)? (2) How do differences in soil conditions alter the competitive dynamics between regenerating oaks and understory invasive plants?

#### How do irregular shelterwood harvests influence surface soils conditions?

![](_page_11_Figure_1.jpeg)

![](_page_11_Figure_2.jpeg)

![](_page_12_Figure_1.jpeg)

![](_page_13_Figure_1.jpeg)

![](_page_13_Picture_2.jpeg)

Surface soil nitrogen availability

![](_page_14_Figure_1.jpeg)

![](_page_14_Picture_2.jpeg)

(1) How do irregular shelterwood harvests influence surface soil conditions (0-10 cm)?
(2) How do differences in soil conditions alter the competitive dynamics between regenerating oaks and understory invasive plants? How do differences in soil conditions alter the competitive dynamics between regenerating oaks and understory invasive plants?

![](_page_16_Figure_1.jpeg)

#### **Three-year experiment (2020-2023):**

2 Recent Irregular Shelterwood Harvests (both harvested in Fall 2019) 1 Unharvested reserve How do differences in soil conditions alter the competitive dynamics between regenerating oaks and understory invasive plants?

![](_page_17_Figure_1.jpeg)

#### Jabba the Cut

#### **Princess Sophia**

![](_page_18_Picture_2.jpeg)

Deeper, moister soils Surrounded by wet, lowlands More hemlock and a mixture of black, white, and red oak

Drier, thinner soils Rocky outcrops and ravines Predominantly red oak and hemlock

#### Differences in initial, post-harvest soil conditions

Jabba the Cut

![](_page_19_Picture_2.jpeg)

![](_page_19_Figure_3.jpeg)

#### Differences in initial, post-harvest soil conditions

## Higher soil disturbance and nitrogen availability

![](_page_20_Figure_2.jpeg)

#### Princess Sophia

![](_page_20_Picture_4.jpeg)

#### Differences in the growth and mortality of the planted oaks

Species - QUAL - QURU

![](_page_21_Figure_2.jpeg)

#### Differences in the growth and mortality of the planted oaks

Species - QUAL - QURU

![](_page_22_Figure_2.jpeg)

![](_page_23_Figure_1.jpeg)

![](_page_24_Figure_1.jpeg)

Japanese honeysuckle had a higher growth rate in Jabba the Cut, which had higher soil moisture and carbon

However, all the invasive plant species had higher survival rates in Princess Sophia, which had higher levels of soil disturbance and nitrogen availability

| Survival (%)       |         |      |      |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|--------------------|---------|------|------|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| Stand              | Species |      |      |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| -                  | CEOR    | LOJA | ROMU |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Jabba<br>the Cut   | 35%     | 34%  | 39%  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Princess<br>Sophia | 44%     | 49%  | 45%  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

![](_page_25_Figure_3.jpeg)

Stand 🔵 Jabba 🛑 Sophia

![](_page_26_Figure_1.jpeg)

#### Some early conclusions:

- Irregular shelterwoods increased soil nitrogen availability and reduced surface soil carbon
- Both oak species grew better with higher soil moisture and carbon
- Differences between the two stands were more pronounced for red oak
- Red oak had very slow growth and poor survival in the drier stand with higher soil compaction and nitrogen availability
- Japanese honeysuckle also grew better with higher soil moisture and carbon
- The survival rates of the invasive plants were consistently higher in the stand with elevated soil disturbance and nitrogen availability
- Invasive plants may have a competitive advantage over regenerating oaks in stands with higher soil disturbance and nitrogen availability

## What does *forest soil health* mean for promoting tree regeneration?

![](_page_28_Picture_1.jpeg)

![](_page_28_Picture_2.jpeg)

![](_page_28_Picture_3.jpeg)

e Connecticut Agricultural Experiment Station

*The Connecticut Agricultural Experiment Station* Email: elisabeth.ward@ct.gov Website: https://portal.ct.gov/CAES-WardE

#### Jabba the Cut

#### Princess Sophia

| $\mathcal{N}$ |              |       |            |           |             |              |                 |                           |               | No Contraction |       |               |  |
|---------------|--------------|-------|------------|-----------|-------------|--------------|-----------------|---------------------------|---------------|----------------|-------|---------------|--|
| V             | Species      | TPA   | Total # of | Avg DRH   | Volume/acre | Total Volume | Sector Constant |                           | Species       | # of stems     | MBf   |               |  |
| V             | Species      | 11 /1 | Stems      | nvg. DDii | (MBf)       | (MBf)        | ( may           |                           | Red Oak       | 238            | 45.0  |               |  |
| Ø             | TT11-        | 15.0  | 106        | 10        | 24.5        | 45.1         | and the         | Contraction of the second | Black Oak     | 49             | 6.2   |               |  |
| Kin           | Hemlock      | 15.0  | 196        | 18        | 24.5        | 45.1         |                 |                           | Scarlet Oak   | 0              | 0.0   |               |  |
|               | Black<br>Oak | 8.7   | 110        | 18        | 14.0        | 24.6         |                 | <b>A</b>                  | White Oak     | 10             | 0.9   |               |  |
|               | White        | 87    | 110        | 15        | 9.4         | 12.6         |                 |                           | Sugar Maple   | 27             | 2.3   |               |  |
|               | Oak          | 0.7   | 110        | 15        | 5.1         | 12.0         |                 |                           | Red Maple     | 37             | 3.2   | 24 22         |  |
|               | Red Oak      | 4.3   | 54         | 18        | 6.5         | 11.8         |                 |                           | Black Cherry  | 5              | 0.3   | - Alexandream |  |
|               | White        |       |            |           |             |              |                 |                           |               | Ash            | 4     | 0.8           |  |
|               | Pine         | 3.3   | 41         | 15        | 3.9         | 7.3          | THE REAL        |                           | Black Birch   | 44             | 3.1   |               |  |
|               | Red          |       |            |           |             |              |                 |                           | Yellow Birch  | 0              | 0.0   |               |  |
|               | Maple        | 6.2   | 78         | 14        | 5.9         | 6.2          |                 |                           | Paper Birch   | 2              | 0.2   |               |  |
|               | Black        |       |            |           |             |              |                 |                           | Shagbark      |                |       |               |  |
|               | Birch        | 3.3   | 41         | 15        | 3.3         | 3.7          |                 |                           | Hickory       | 0              | 0.0   |               |  |
| a f           | Yellow       | 2.2   | 20         | 14        | 2.2         | 2.1          |                 |                           | Other Hickory | 0              | 0.0   |               |  |
|               | Birch        | 2.3   | 29         | 14        | 2.3         | 2.1          |                 | Ju -                      | Beech         | 4              | 0.3   |               |  |
|               | Ash          | 0.2   | 3          | 15        | 0.3         | 0.5          |                 | A                         | Tulip Poplar  | 1              | 0.0   |               |  |
|               | Black        | 0.5   | 6          | 14        | 0.4         | 0.4          |                 |                           | White Pine    | 31             | 5.5   |               |  |
|               | Shagharl     | 0.5   | 0          | 14        | 0.4         | 0.4          |                 |                           | Red Pine      | 0              | 0.0   |               |  |
|               | Hickory      | 0.1   | 1          | 13        | 0.1         | 0.1          |                 |                           | Hemlock       | 289            | 31.9  |               |  |
|               | TOTAL        | 53.1  | 669        | 169       | 70.6        | 114.3        |                 | ]                         | TOTAL         | 741            | 99.84 |               |  |

Applying the "soil health" concept in forests

## What does *forest soil health* mean for promoting tree regeneration?

Continued capacity of soil to function as a vital living ecosystem that sustains plants, animals, and humans by performing five essential functions:

- Regulating water
- Sustaining plant and animal life
- Filtering and buffering potential pollutants
- Cycling nutrients
- Providing physical stability and support

![](_page_30_Figure_8.jpeg)

Source: https://www.nrcs.usda.gov/conservation-basics/natural-resource-concerns/soils/soil-health

![](_page_31_Figure_1.jpeg)

![](_page_32_Figure_1.jpeg)

![](_page_33_Figure_1.jpeg)

![](_page_34_Figure_1.jpeg)

![](_page_35_Figure_1.jpeg)

![](_page_36_Figure_1.jpeg)

![](_page_37_Figure_1.jpeg)

## How will understory plant communities and tree regeneration respond to ash tree mortality from emerald ash borer invasion?

![](_page_38_Figure_1.jpeg)

How will overstory tree mortality from forest pest and pathogen invasions alter understory plant composition and tree regeneration?

![](_page_39_Picture_1.jpeg)