Hubbard Brook Experimental Forest
Student Activities

HBEF Activity 2
Watershed Experiments
This activity was adapted from Activity 3 of the Long Term Ecological Research: Teacher's Manual of Classroom Activities*.

Introduction

When research at the Hubbard Brook Experimental Forest began about 50 years ago, the northeastern states were experiencing a drought and many communities were suffering from water shortages. Knowing that plants (especially trees) take up large volumes of water from the soil, scientists wondered whether it might be a good idea to cut down the trees around drinking water reservoirs. They came up with a hypothesis that could be tested through long-term research: if trees were cut down and therefore not taking up water, more water would flow into the reservoirs.

As you may have learned in the virtual tour in Activity 1, the Hubbard Brook flows through New Hampshire's White Mountain National Forest and drains a range of small mountains. The tributaries of Hubbard Brook form a set of discrete watersheds, separated by mountain ridges. Because these watersheds share many characteristics in common (for example, similar size and vegetation), they provide an ideal setting for conducting ecosystem experiments.

In laboratory experiments, scientists use *controls* to determine whether the treatments they impose cause any changes. For example, a scientist studying the effect of salt on plants would expose treatment plants to salt and compare their growth to control plants growing without

> **Control**: A treatment that reproduces all aspects of an experiment except the variable of interest. Controls and treatments are the same before an experiment.

salt. Similarly, scientists at Hubbard Brook devised experimental treatments for three watersheds to see whether different ways of cutting trees would affect the amount of water reaching the stream. When scientists manipulate the world outside of the laboratory, they are conducting a field experiment.

In one watershed, researchers cut all the trees in the middle of winter and left them lying on the snow so that the soil was not disturbed. In another watershed, all the trees were cut and entirely removed. In a third watershed, researchers divided the forest into 25-meter-wide strips. In the first year, they cut and removed all the "merchantable" materials (leaving branches and tree tops) in every third strip. In subsequent years, they returned and cut the adjacent strips. This treatment was designed to look at less damaging ways of cutting a watershed. And finally, the last watershed was left intact, similar to a control. However, unlike laboratory studies, the ecosystem experiments did not have true controls. Although the different watersheds were similar in size and vegetation, they were not exact replicates. (It is virtually impossible to have true replicates or controls in nature because of variations in soil, plants, etc.) Thus, the watershed that was left intact is referred to as the "*reference*" rather than the control watershed.

> **Reference**: Similar to control, referring to a treatment that reproduces *many* of the aspects of an experimental design, while excluding the variable of interest. A reference and a treatment are designed to be as *similar as possible*, but may have several differences.

Table 1. Hubbard Brook Watershed Treatments.

Watershed	Size (hectares)	Treatment
2	15.6	Clearcut in winter 1965-66. Trees left on the ground. Herbicides applied in 1966, 1967, 1968.
3	42.4	Reference (no treatment).
4	36.1	Strip-cut in 3 phases, in 1970, 1972, 1974. Trees removed from watershed.
5	21.9	Whole-tree harvested during the dormant season of 1983-1984.

To measure the changes in water flowing out of the different watersheds, scientists installed special gauges on forest streams, called "weirs." Weirs are permanent concrete structures consisting of a large basin with a v-notch cut on the side of the downstream end. The stream flows directly into the basin where it slows down and becomes less turbulent, and then flows out over the v-notch. By constantly measuring how high the stream is at is passes over this v-notch, and entering this height into a known formula, researchers can determine streamflow volume. A picture of a weir in the HBEF is below.

In this activity, you will be looking at some of the original streamflow data collected at Hubbard Brook to determine the short-term and long-term results of a forest tree-cutting experiment. You will be examining data from Watersheds 2 and 3. Watershed 2 is the treatment (cut) watershed and Watershed 3 is the reference watershed. All trees in Watershed 2 were cut in December 1965 and left on top of the snow. In the summers of 1966, 1967, and 1968 an herbicide was applied to the entire watershed to prevent the regrowth of any vegetation. Watershed 3 was not disturbed. This field experiment was the first study to examine how forest cutting might influence streamflow and subsequent reservoir levels.

Protocol 1

Examine the spreadsheet on the computer or the hard copy handed out by your teacher. This spreadsheet includes the streamflow and precipitation data collected from Watersheds 2 and 3 at the Hubbard Brook Experimental Forest over a 30-year period. Notice the headings at the top of the columns. The first column is labeled "year." Data from 1958-1988 are presented. Streamflow data from the different watersheds (columns B and C) are presented as annual streamflow in mm per standard area per year. These values have been adjusted to account for the difference in size between the watersheds.

For each watershed, mean annual precipitation values are also provided (columns D and E). As you can imagine, the amount of rain usually varies from year to year, and the amount of rain that falls on the watershed obviously influences how much water comes out in streamflow. Initially, you will be graphing the streamflow data in Watersheds 2 and 3 for the years before the clearcutting treatment (1958-1965). Scientists refer to this as "baseline" data. You will then graph streamflow data in both watersheds for the five years following the treatment (1966-1970) and will assess the streamflow response of Watershed 2. Lastly, you will graph the remaining data (1971-1988) from both watersheds.

You (and your partner, if you are working in pairs) should examine the data. What is the best way to graph them? What will you use as your x-axis? Y-axis? You are interested in determining the watershed baseline and then the response following the clearcutting treatment. Your teacher may lead a classroom discussion about the best way to graph these data.

1) Graph streamflow in Watershed 2 (the treatment watershed) from 1958 – 1965. These are the baseline data.

2) Do the same with Watershed 3. Decide if you want to graph the two watersheds together or on separate pages.

3) Do you see any trends in annual streamflow in the watersheds? How do the watersheds compare to each other (e.g., does one watershed always have higher streamflow values, or is there variability between years and watersheds)? What do these baseline (before cutting) data tell you about the watersheds' streamflow? When doing field experiments, scientists try to have an understanding of how the ecosystem is working before the treatment. In interpreting the results of the field experiment, it is essential to compare the watershed streamflow *after* the treatment (clearcut) to the streamflow *before* the experiment, for both watersheds. (What mistakes might you make if you did not have data from before the clearcutting?) Think about why it is important to monitor the reference watershed (Watershed 3) as well as the treatment watershed (Watershed 2) both before and after the treatment.

4) Continuing on the same graph(s), you should now include data from the next five years (1966-1970). Do you see any changes in watershed streamflow? By about how much did streamflow change? Are these changes in one or both watersheds? How do the two watersheds compare to each other in the five years following the treatment? If there is a

change, what year marks the change? The original hypothesis of this experiment was that if we clearcut and applied herbicide to a watershed, more water would flow out of it. Did this happen? Can you make any conclusions?

5) Now put the remaining data on the same graphs (1971-1988). What do you see now? What has happened to the streamflow in both watersheds, and how do they compare to each other? Do you see any differences between the short-term data (1966-1970) and the long-term data (1966-1988)? Does this information change your interpretation of the results? Do the reference and treatment graphs follow the same pattern? How do you explain what is happening?

6) Graph average annual precipitation in Watershed 2 and Watershed 3. Your teacher may ask you to transfer the graph to a transparency and superimpose it on the graph from step 5, and if you made separate graphs, step 6. Does the precipitation information change your interpretation of the results?

7) Using a graph, what is another way you might compare these two watersheds' annual streamflow? Consider graphing the difference between the two watersheds (i.e., Watershed 2 annual streamflow – Watershed 3 annual streamflow). What can you learn from this graph?

8) You have probably noticed that there are differences between the short-term and long-term WS2 streamflow data. Why might this have happened? Your teacher may lead the class in a discussion of possible reasons.

Given all of the streamflow data you have seen, what can you say about the original hypothesis? Does cutting all the trees in a watershed increase streamflow? Think about short- and long-term response. What does this experiment say about the need for long-term research? If the research had stopped five years after the clearcut, do you think your (and other people's) perceptions of clearcutting effects on streamflow would be different than they are now? If communities are trying to increase reservoir levels, is clearcutting nearby forests a good way to do it?

Suggestions for Further Study

Other Watersheds

You could do the same graphing steps using the data for Watershed 4, where trees were strip cut over the course of a four-year period. Visit the HBEF website, where you should be able to find the Watershed 4 streamflow information by clicking on the "data" button and following links to "stream." Getting data off of the HBEF website can be difficult: the data need to be downloaded and reformatted for database software. You may need to ask your teacher for help, or click on the "email" link of the HBEF website to ask the HBEF data manager for assistance.

Given the results you saw when an entire watershed was clearcut, how much of an increase in streamflow would you expect to see in Watershed 4 after one-third of the trees had been cut? After 2/3 of the trees had been cut? After ALL of the trees had been cut?

Compare your predictions to the actual results. How are they different from your prediction? What could explain this difference?

Societal Influences on Research

Consider the following question: Why did clearcutting and herbiciding a forest to get more water for human use seem like a great idea in 1955? How would society react to clearcutting and herbiciding a forest to increase water supply today? How have changing societal values influenced the research being conducted at Hubbard Brook and elsewhere? How does current research at Hubbard Brook differ from the research that was conducted in the 1950s and 1960s?

Acid Rain

Hubbard Brook is very famous because it was here that scientists first discovered acid rain. The knowledge gained from Hubbard Brook acid rain research was instrumental in the development of the federal Clean Air Act and subsequent amendments. The Clean Air Act and its amendments called for a reduction in acid rain-causing emissions from coal-fired power plants and other pollution sources. Because Hubbard Brook is a long-term ecological research site, scientists have had the opportunity to continue studying the effects of acid rain on northeastern forests after the passage of the Clean Air Act. And, unfortunately, while research shows that precipitation is generally becoming slightly less acidic, current studies indicate that acid rain and its effects are still a big problem.

In March 2001, Hubbard Brook scientists issued a news release urging the public to continue to work to reduce acid rain. "The science on this issue is clear," says Dr. Gene Likens, director of the Institute of Ecosystem Studies in Millbrook, New York, and one of the scientists who discovered acid rain at Hubbard Brook. "Current emission control policies are not sufficient to recover sensitive watersheds in New England. The deeper the emissions cuts, and the sooner they are achieved, the greater the extent and rate of ecological recovery from acid deposition." Dr. Likens' work is a powerful example of how scientists can influence policy at the national level. You may want to visit recent HBEF acid rain publications, located at: http://www.hbrook.sr.unh.edu/hbfound/hbfound.htm.

You may want to do more research on the Clean Air Act and acid rain using internet sources, including the Hubbard Brook website. Check out the Environmental Protection Agency's (EPA) acid rain website at http://www.epa.gov/airmarkets/arp/, or the National Atmospheric Deposition Program (NADP) at http://nadp.sws.uiuc.edu/. The National Science Teachers Association is another good source for acid rain materials, at http://www.nsta.org/.

Acknowledgements

Some of the material in the introduction was adapted from *Long Term Ecological Research: teacher's manual of classroom activities**. The activities in this manual introduce high school students to the National Science Foundation's Long Term Ecological Research (LTER) program and the variety of research being conducted at LTER sites. The activities also are designed to teach basic ecological principles and inquiry skills, and to make students aware of the value of long-term research as a basis for conservation management and regional planning decisions.

Thanks to Kate Macneale, Amey Bailey, Ellen Denny, and Tom Siccama for reviewing the activities and providing helpful comments. Additional thanks go to the US Forest Service for providing the data used in Activity 2 and to Tom Siccama and Yale University for providing the data used in Activity 3.

* Krasny M, Berger C, and Welman TA. 2001. Long Term Ecological Research: teacher's manual of classroom activities. http://www.dnr.cornell.edu/ext/LTER/lter.asp