

Soil Management for Urban Trees

Dr. Susan D. Day Forest Resources & Environmental Conservation, Virginia Tech

Brief Agenda

- Soils and Stormwater Management
- How distributed is your stormwater management?
- Soil Surface Treatments and Site Complexity
- Soil Rehab with SPR



What is good for trees is good for stormwater

The fallback solution

American Elms

Worcester, Mass. 1912

Tree + ? = stormwater

management?







How close is your urban forest stormwater system?

17 million people live in the watershed—low-density urbanized land



Six States + the District of Columbia

Sustainable Land Development?

Prime farmland soil was graded down 3 ft to redirect stormwater to bioinfiltration swale

At "peak" time of year (May) 3 years later, tree dieback, thin turf, thin canopies, nutrient deficiencies





Surface Treatments

Surface Treatments have traditionally been thought of in terms of moisture retention and weed suppression



- At 5-10 cm macroaggregates were reduced by 44%
- Lost 35% of total soil organic carbon (o-10 cm)
- Lost 47% of mineral-bound carbon
- Subsurface drainage reduced from about 3" an hour to less than 1/2" an hour.

Photo: Jeannette E. Spaghetti (CC)

What is my action threshold for addressing compaction?



You can't interpret soil bulk density without soil texture

Bulk density = 1.4 g·cm⁻³

sandy loam—no worries silty clay loam—watch out



Will not correct your soil pH problems

Not for use around large trees

Will reduce compaction, increase tree growth improve permeability, increase soil carbon stores and set long-term soil formation processes on track

Photo: Jeannette E. Spaghetti (CC)

Soil Profile Rebuilding— A rehabilitation technique

Apply 4 inches of compost to graded subsoil

Backhoe to 2 ft, scoop up and drop to create compost veins to 2 ft.



- Return topsoil as usual (4" min.) and till 8"
- Plant trees or other woody veg
- Treat surface to reduce erosion and maintain infiltration

Loam Soil—Soil Bulk Density g/cm³

| | | Typical Practice | Profile Rebuilding | |
|-------|--|------------------------------|---------------------------------------|--|
| 8 cm | Low Resistance (Topsoil) | 1.51 | 1.28 | |
| 18 cm | High Resistance (Compacted subsoil) | 1.91 (9 mos) 1.76 (5 yrs) | 1.35 (9 mos) — 1.49 (5 yrs) | |
| 33cm | Medium Resistance (Subsoil) | 1.76 | 1.69 | |
| 53 cm | | 1.77 | 1.75 | |

| | | Typical Practice | Profile Rebuilding |
|-------|--|---|---------------------------------------|
| 8 cm | Low Resistance (Topsoil) | 1.51 | 1.28 |
| 18 cm | High Resistance (Compacted subsoil) | 1.91 (9 mos) 1.7 6 (5 yrs) | 1.35 (9 mos) — 1.49 (5 yrs) |
| | * | | |

Canopy Area approximately doubled compared to controls after 7 years in designed experiments







Site-level Effects Subsurface Permeability 10-40 cm (Ksat)





Journal Articles for SPR

Chen, Y., Day, S. D., Shrestha, R. K., Strahm, B. D., Wiseman, P. E., 2014. Influence of urban land development and soil rehabilitation on soil—atmosphere greenhouse gas fluxes. *Geoderm*a 226, 348-353.

Chen, Y., Day, S. D., Wick, A. F., McGuire, K. J., 2014. Influence of urban land development and subsequent soil rehabilitation on soil aggregates, carbon, and hydraulic conductivity. *Science of the Total Environment.* 494–495, 329-336.

Chen, Y., Day, S. D., Wick, A. F., Strahm, B. D., Wiseman, P. E., Daniels, W. L., 2013. Changes in soil carbon pools and microbial biomass from urban land development and subsequent post-development soil rehabilitation. *Soil Biology and Biochemistry* 66, 38-44.

Layman, R.M., Day. S.D., Mitchell, D.K., Chen, Y., Harris, J.R., Daniels, W.L. 2015. Below ground matters: Urban soil rehabilitation increases tree canopy and speeds establishment. Under review at *Urban Forestry & Urban Greening*

urbanforestry.frec.vt.edu

Soil Profile Rebuilding: An Alternative to Soil Replacement by Susan Downing Day, Associate Professor, Depts. of Forest Resources & Environmental Conservation and Horticulture, Virginia Tech

Urban foresters know poor soils can lead to an endless cycle of dieback and tree replacement. Even if trees do establish, growth can be underwhelming and tree health disappointing. Increasingly, project managers have been turning to soil replacement, where existing soils are excavated and removed and replaced with "recycled" or blended soils. These soils present their own challenges, however. For example, many imported blends rely on high sand contents to improve drainage, resulting in low water-holding capacity and drought stress for unirrigated plantings. Resulting sharp transitions in soil texture introduce the possibility of creating a "bath tub" effect in situations where it is impossible to replace all the soil and new soils are confined to the immediate vicinity of

There is an alternative to soil replacement that is especially appropriate where there are extended open soil (unpaved) areas such as in street medians-soil rehabilitation. Soil rehabilitation can help restore important ecosystem func-

tions such as stormwater transmission and vegetation support to existing native soils. In soil management, urban foresters and designers need confidence that they will get the results they desire and that soil improvements will persist for the long term. Researchers at Virginia Tech developed specifications for Soil Profile Rebuilding (SPR), a soil rehabilitation technique, and have been evaluating performance for nearly a decade. This process can improve tree establishment,

The Theory behind SPR SPR works by creating veins of compost deep in the soil profile that hold soil channels open for root penetration. The introduction of organic matter coupled with root activity can create conditions that will lead to formation of soil aggregates over time-leading to long-term soil quality enhancement.

Want more info?

- Recent Article CityTrees (Sept/Oct)
- Download Specifications urbanforestry.frec.vt.edu/SRES
- Details under production

This site is a good candidate for SPR because soil is compacted and has an impermeable layer that can likely be broken up by the burdless subspillers accesses. Note linearlance arrival neural indicates off will be hind, which will not be altered by the rehability This site is a good candidate for SPR because soil is compacted and has an impermeable layer that can likely be broken up by the backhoe subsoiling process. Note limestone gravel mixed in soil indicates pH will be high, which will not be altered by the rehabit tion process. Surface gravel should be removed if possible and underground infrastructure clearly marked. Photo by Susan D. Day City Trees

30

Thank you

Collaborators: J. R. Harris, Joseph Dove, Qingfu Xiao, E.G. McPherson, N. Bassuk, Brian Strahm, Abbey Wick, W. Lee Daniels, P. Eric Wiseman, Kevin McGuire, Tess (Wynn) Thompson, and Vincent Verweij

Graduate Students: Rachel Layman, Yujuan Chen, Julia Bartens, and David Mitchell

Soil Profile Rebuilding Specifications available at urbanforestry.frec.vt.edu/SRES

Partial support provided by the

USDA-Forest Service National Urban and Community Forestry Advisory Council, Tree Research & Education Fund, the Institute for Critical Technology and Applied Science at Virginia Tech, and the USDA's McIntire-Stennis program



