Toward modeling traffic-induced forest road erosion: field investigations and process-based model conceptualization

Amanda Alvis

A dissertation

submitted in partial fulfillment of the

requirements for the degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

University of Washington

2024

Reading Committee: Erkan Istanbulluoglu, Chair

Charles Luce

Julie Dieu

Program Authorized to Offer Degree: Civil & Environmental Engineering ©Copyright 2024

Amanda Alvis

University of Washington

Abstract

Toward modeling traffic-induced forest road erosion: field investigations and process-based model conceptualization

Amanda Alvis

Chair of the Supervisory Committee: Erkan Istanbulluoglu Civil & Environmental Engineering

Though abundant anecdotal and empirical evidence of increased erosion on forest roads due to traffic exists, the literature lacks a holistic treatment of the ways in which traffic and other important contextual covariates influence runoff and erosion on forest roads. The main goal of my dissertation is to examine the relationship between forest road erosion, traffic, and potential erosion control treatments through literature synthesis, small-scale field experiments, and the conceptualization of a comprehensive process-based model. In Chapter 2, I discuss current hypotheses of how traffic affects forest road erosion, what data are required to validate those hypotheses, and present the motivation for developing a process-based model of forest road erosion. In Chapter 3, I evaluate the efficiency of multiple roadside ditch line erosion control treatments using ditch line roughness, discuss the theory behind using roughness as an efficiency metric, describe the methodology of the experiment, and present results from the experiment. In Chapter 4, I use unoccupied aerial vehicle (UAV) structure-frommotion (SfM) technology to examine how wheel ruts evolve on mainline logging forest roads following maintenance of the road surface. The implications of said rut formation on the road surface drainage system and erosion potential are discussed in detail. Finally, in Chapter 5, I lay the theoretical foundation for a process-based model that includes mathematical conceptualizations of traffic-induced local sediment production as well as road-segment-scale sediment transport.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Pa	ıge
List of F	Figures	iv
List of 7	Tables	ix
Chapter	1: Introduction	1
1.1	Background and motivation	1
1.2	Organization of dissertation	2
Chapter	2: How does traffic affect erosion of unpaved forest roads?	4
2.1	Introduction	5
2.2	Traffic-induced, erosion-enhancing processes	7
	2.2.1 Crushing	8
	2.2.2 Pumping	10
	2.2.3 Scattering	13
	2.2.4 Flow rerouting	15
2.3	Important contextual covariates for traffic effects	17
	2.3.1 Rainfall intensity	18
	2.3.2 Road topography and topology	19
	2.3.3 Aggregate quality	22
	2.3.4 Subgrade strength	24
2.4	A framework for future research	25
2.5	Conclusion	31
Chapter	3: Using additional roughness to characterize erosion control treatment effectiveness in roadside ditch lines	34
3.1	Introduction	35

3.2	Mathe	matical theory \ldots \ldots \ldots \ldots \ldots \ldots \ldots \ldots	40
	3.2.1	Shear stress partitioning	40
	3.2.2	Transport capacity of ditch flow	45
	3.2.3	Indicators of erosion control treatment effectiveness	45
3.3	Field s	study	46
	3.3.1	Study area	46
	3.3.2	Experiment	48
	3.3.3	Data analysis	51
3.4	Result	s	53
	3.4.1	Inferences from field observations	53
	3.4.2	Erosion control treatment effectiveness in context of climate	58
3.5	Discus	sion	61
3.6	Conclu	nsion	68
	4 5		71
Chapter	· 4:	Temporal evolution of forest road rutting and flow pathways	(1 70
4.1	Introd		(2 - 2
4.2	Metho	ds and data	76 - 0
	4.2.1	Field study area	76
	4.2.2		77
	4.2.3	TLS and UAV DEM post-processing	30
	4.2.4	UAV DEM elevation change analysis	35
	4.2.5	Drainage system analysis	38
	4.2.6	Erosion potential analysis	92
4.3	Result	s	94
	4.3.1	Extent and rate of rutting	94
	4.3.2	Metrics of the drainage system	96
	4.3.3	Erosion potential of the road surface	98
4.4	Discus	sion	98
4.5	Conclu	1sion	02
Chapter	· 5: (Conceptualization of a process-based forest road erosion model	05
5.1	Currer	t state of forest road erosion modeling	05
5.2	Conce	ptual model for coupling sediment production and transport on a road	
0.2	surface	e	08

	5.2.1	Spatially-lumped model domain	108
	5.2.2	Tri-layer conceptualization	109
	5.2.3	Layer flux equations	113
	5.2.4	Incorporation of scattering and rutting	116
5.3	Prelin	ninary model results and discussion	121
5.4	Concl	usion \ldots	125
Append	ix A:	Shear stress partitioning ratios, appendix for Ch. 3	142
A.1	Gener	al form with velocity term	143
A.2	Gener	al form with no velocity term	144
A.3	Parab	olic channel approximation with reduced dimensionality	147

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure Number

2.1	(a) Schematic of the crushing process. On a typical road surface aggregate (left) when vehicles drive over the road (center) the larger sediment breaks down into finer sediment (right). Image not to scale. (b) Image of forest road with evidence of crushing (circled in yellow).	9
2.2	(a) Schematic of the pumping process. Larger sediment over finer sediment (left) gets pushed down due to the weight of the vehicles (center), which forces the finer sediment upwards (right). Image not to scale. (b) Image of forest road with evidence of pumping, light colored deposits of fine sediments around edges of holes (circled in black)	11
2.3	The road surface develops an armor layer of larger sediments (left). Once the road is disturbed by traffic (center), the armor layer is scattered, exposing fine sediments below (right). Image not to scale.	14
2.4	Image of a forest road with evidence of scattering	15
2.5	(a) Image of a rutted forest road. (b) Image of a rutted forest road with water flowing in one of the ruts rather than off to the ditch line.	16
2.6	Image of an extremely rutted road that receives little traffic	18
2.7	Schematic of a typical forest road and its surroundings	20
2.8	(a) Schematic of a road cross section. The surfacing (top layer) is the aggregate used to cover the forest road, and the subgrade (bottom layer) is the packed excess fill material from road excavation as well as the native material. (b) Schematic of a road cross section where the integrity of the subgrade has been compromised, causing surfacing deformation. This example demonstrates a case where the subgrade was improperly compacted (i.e., weak) when the road was installed, and repeated outside stressors (traffic) caused further subgrade compaction that deformed the road surface. Images not to scale	25

2.9	A limiting factor diagram for conceptualizing the relationship between erosion, energy, and supply. When the energy (T_c) is less than the supply (S) , the erosion (E) depends on energy, and data from this road would plot along the energy limited line. When T_c surpasses S , E is equal to the supply, and data would fall along the supply limited line. Three examples of a forest road in different states are shown: 1) An energy limited road surface; 2) a road surface that is on the cusp between energy and supply limited; and 3) a supply limited road surface	28
2.10	Preliminary data from western Washington field study showing the total an- nual mass of sediment (kg) vs. total annual flow x slope (m^3) for three different traffic levels. These data show that for high traffic sites (i.e., high supply sites; purple circles in figure), total annual mass of sediment (surrogate for erosion) is linearly related to total annual flow x slope (surrogate for transport capac- ity), whereas low traffic sites (i.e., low supply sites; green squares) show no significant dependence	29
3.1	The theoretical effect of additional immobile roughness elements on shear stress and its partitioning.	44
3.2	(a) Example experimental setup showing the roadside ditch line and water truck, and (b) example photos of each ditch line treatment tested	47
3.3	Examples of (a) average ditch cross-section measurements with a fitted parabola and shape factor and (b) a conductivity plot for two sensors from the salt tracer experiment. Δt is the time it takes for the salt tracer to get from the upper sensor to the lower sensor (average rate taken as 1/2 area under the curve) and is determined from the plot, and Δd is known.	52
3.4	(a) Empirical cumulative distribution function of flow data from one of our siltstone lithology field sites in western Washington with vertical lines denoting two of the flows used in the small-scale experiment in liters per minute (57 lpm and 151 lpm). For this site, 57 lpm flows exist in the 99th percentile and 151 lpm flows exist in the 100th percentile. (b) The corresponding tipping bucket flow hydrograph for the 2020 and 2021 water years.	54
3.5	Roughness values (Manning's n) for each ditch condition and their relationship to flow.	55
3.6	(a) Sediment concentration values for each ditch condition and their relation- ship to flow. (b) Sediment transport values for each ditch condition based on sediment concentration and flow width. (c) Strip plot showing the spread of sediment transport values for each ditch treatment. The nominal flow rates	
	for each sediment transport value are denoted by different colors	57

3.7	(a) Measured sediment transport values as a function of total shear stress, (b) measured sediment transport values as a function of grain shear stress, and (c) measured sediment transport values as a function of grain shear stress with a log-scale y-axis.	59
3.8	(a) Exceedance probabilities of grain shear stress, τ_g , for multiple n_t values calculated from Eq. 3.2 using observed ditch line flow hydrographs. Higher n_t values decrease grain shear stress. The critical shear stress threshold for a d_{50} of 1 mm is denoted by the vertical line. (b) Fractional reduction in grain shear stress, ϕ , for multiple ditch erosion control treatments. Erosion control treatments with n_t values that vary with flow provide less reduction in grain shear stress are shown as points. (c) Exceedance probabilities of sediment transport capacity, T_c , for multiple n_t values. An exceedance probability of 5% is denoted by the horizontal line. (d) Theoretical fractional reduction in sediment transport capacity, θ , for multiple ditch erosion control treatments.	
3.9	Experimental fractional reductions in sediment transport are shown as points. Drawings showing side views of: (a) The rocked ditch as flow increases. Once the flow gets to 151 lpm, the water far overtops the rocking, causing the fraction of the flow cross-sectional area being slowed by the immobile roughness to decrease. (b) The grassed ditch as flow increases. The highest flow causes the vegetation to bend, effectively smoothing the cross section. (c) The initial installation of straw wattles, where the flow went under or through the wattles, as they were brand new. (d) The wattles after they had been in the field for a year without any maintenance, causing them to become clogged with sediment. At all flow rates, the space behind the wattles fills up with water then overtops, producing a reservoir-and-dam effect, which slows the water down.	62 65
4.1	Schematic of a crowned road segment showing the flow pathways for (a) an idealized (i.e., perfectly smooth) road surface and (b) a rutted road surface.	73
4.2	Example photos of (a) an un-rutted road with flow heading to the ditch line from the center of the road; (b) water traveling down-road in a wheel rut instead of being directed to the roadside ditch; and (c) a heavily rutted road with channelized, sediment-laden flow heading down-road	74
4.3	Map of field site locations in Washington state. Inset A shows MEL-14, the field site in the siltstone lithology and inset B shows KID-13, the field site in the volcanic lithology.	78
4.4	Example orthoimage (left) and color-shaded relief map (right) for the first UAV SfM survey at the (a) KID-13 and (b) MEL-14 sites.	83

vi

4.5	Example elevation change maps for the time series of the (a) original and (b) filtered surveys at MEL-14 during the second wet season (Wet2). The gray dashed lines in (b) denote the location of the cross section in Figure 4.6.	84
4.6	Cross-sectional profiles (location denoted by gray dashed line in Figure 4.5b) of unoccupied aerial vehicle (UAV)-derived digital elevation model (DEM) time series' at MEL-14 during the second wet season (Wet2). The development of ruts is denoted by the black arrows on either side of the road crown	86
4.7	Empirical cumulative distribution function (eCDF) of elevation change at MEL-14 during the second wet season (Wet2). As the length of time between surveys increases, the variance of the elevation change also increases, indicating more heterogeneity in the micro-topography of the road surface. The 5th percentile of elevation change (denoted by the black dash-dotted line) is used as a measure of cumulative rut incision for a given survey time period	87
4.8	Time series maps of road surface drainage area at MEL-14 during the second wet season (Wet2). As time progresses, the drainage pathways increase in length and move farther down-road before veering off to the sides, which demonstrates the impacts of ruts on the road surface.	89
4.9	Relationship between cumulative rut incision depth in centimeters with respect to time since grading in months for (a) KID-13 and (b) MEL-14. Both KID-13 and MEL-14 demonstrate a nonlinear relationship between the variables.	95
4.10	Relationship between the normalized drainage area center of mass and time since grading for (a) KID-13 and (b) MEL-14. Values falling below the ideal center of mass (CM_{ideal}) indicate a down-road shift due to rutting	97
4.11	Relationship between fraction of total drainage exiting through the lowest boundary of the road segment and time since grading for (a) KID-13 and (b) MEL-14.	97
4.12	Relationship between the normalized index of erosion potential, ε_i , (Eq. 4.6) and time since grading at (a) KID-13 and (b) MEL-14. The dot-dashed gray line on both panels shows the threshold where the normalized index of erosion potential switches from a decrease to an increase as compared to the initial road surface.	99
5.1	Schematic of spatially-lumped modeling domain within an 80 m by 9 m ex- perimental road segment.	109
5.2	Tri-layered conceptualization used to model processes occurring vertically within the road prism.	110
5.3	Updated tri-layered conceptualization used to model processes occurring within the road prism.	117

The current modeling domain as defined in Landlab showing (a) the initial road surface and (b) the road surface after running the in-progress sediment	
displacement component. Wheel ruts develop on either side of the road crown.	119
A cross-sectional profile of the road surface and ditch line before (gray dash- dotted line) and after (black line) running the in-progress sediment displace- ment Landlab component.	119
Fine sediment storage depth in the transport available fines (TAF) layer over time for three traffic levels (mean $n_{\Delta t} = 5$, 10, 20 truck passes per day). The TAF layer was initialized at 27.5 mm to avoid a model spin-up period	123
Cumulative reference transport capacity depth and cumulative actual transport depth over time for three traffic levels (mean $n_{\Delta t} = 5$, 10, 20 truck passes per day).	123
Sediment load per meter of road for each water year of the model run for three traffic levels (mean $n_{\Delta t} = 5$, 10, 20 truck passes per day)	124
	The current modeling domain as defined in Landlab showing (a) the initial road surface and (b) the road surface after running the in-progress sediment displacement component. Wheel ruts develop on either side of the road crown. A cross-sectional profile of the road surface and ditch line before (gray dash-dotted line) and after (black line) running the in-progress sediment displacement Landlab component

LIST OF TABLES

Table Number		Page
3.1	Descriptions and locations for each ditch treatment tested	48
3.2	Statistical analysis results of trend lines shown that relate total roughness and	
	flow	56
4.1	Survey seasons, dates, types, and times since baseline at each field site	81
4.2	Maximum rut incision in centimeters for all three seasons at both field study	
	sites	95
5.1	Parameter estimations used in the spatially-lumped model runs	122

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I have to open this with an apology: I'm sorry. I have no doubts that I am missing someone (or multiple someones) in these acknowledgements, but I promise that does not mean I am not grateful!

First and foremost, I would like to express my deepest gratitude to my advisor, Dr. Erkan Istanbulluoglu. Working with you has expanded my understanding of the world, scientifically and personally. I doubt you envisioned the sheer number of emails you were going to receive from me, and I am immensely grateful that you answered most (if not all) of them. Thanks for taking a chance on a hydrologically-intrigued physicist from the Midwest almost 8 years ago. I also could not have undertaken this journey without the support from my supervisory committee: Dr. Steven Walters, Dr. David Shean, Dr. Charlie Luce, and Dr. Julie Dieu. Steven, thank you for agreeing to be the GSR on my committee and for teaching me all I know about GIS. David, thank you for your reminders that the application of my drone surveys is "super freaking cool"; they have done wonders for my confidence in my work. Charlie, thank you for the endless conversations about road erosion and constantly making me feel like the work I do is valued. Julie, thank you for making fun of my skinny jeans and "city-girl shoveling" in the field (because, honestly, I needed that wake-up call) and for always, ALWAYS answering every question I throw at you, no matter how silly.

All of the work presented in my dissertation was made possible by public funding through the Cooperative Monitoring, Evaluation, and Research (CMER) Committee within the Washington State Department of Natural Resources Adaptive Management Program. I am deeply indebted to my colleagues on the CMER Roads Prescription-Scale Effectiveness Monitoring Project: Erkan Istanbulluoglu (again), Charlie Luce (again), Julie Dieu (again), Alexander Prescott, Tom Black, and Jenelle Black. Your endless help and support have made my dissertation not only possible but enjoyable, too! I feel so lucky to be part of this team filled with some of the smartest people I have ever met. From long days in the field to countless virtual meetings to drinking wine on the patio of a motel, you all have made this journey incredible.

I am extremely grateful for the camaraderie I found among other students (graduate and otherwise!) and faculty in Civil & Environmental Engineering at UW. Specifically, I want to thank Sai Nudurupati for being the mentor I needed in my first years of graduate school; Michelle Hu for being my GSAB co-chair, saner counterpart, and dear friend; and Lauren Wittkopf for being the most excellent undergraduate research assistant I could possibly have asked for. I also want to thank Dr. Nirnimesh Kumar for believing in me as a scientist before I believed in myself. I miss you every day, and I wish you could be here.

Of course, I wouldn't be where I am today without my family and friends. Your love and support have meant the world to me. To Mom: Thank you for showing me that being a rad scientist doesn't preclude you from embracing your femininity. To Dad: Thank you for instilling in me a love of writing, goofiness, and terrible puns. To the A(nxious) Team (Andy, Abby, and Adam): not everyone can say that their siblings are their best friends, and I'm elated because I can. Thank you for being there for me for my whole life, but especially these past 8 years. To my incredible in-laws (mothers, siblings, et al.): How did I get lucky enough to marry into one of the coolest families of all time that also supports me in all of my endeavors?? To my friends (who I won't even try to name because there are so many of you): I can finally travel and hang out and play video games again. Let's do something fun. (Also, I promised Matthew Hinze a special shout-out because he sat with me for days as I did Pomodoro timers, cursed at my code, and asked "what's another word for _____?" countless times. You made this last month more fun than it had any right to be.)

Last, but certainly not least: Sebastian Alvis. My husband. My best friend. My whole entire heart. Words aren't enough to express my gratitude for everything that you've done and everything that you are. 9 years ago in November, we started dating, and a month later we were applying for grad schools in the same places because we knew that we didn't want to do long distance and that we were it for each other. This dissertation, this LIFE, wouldn't be possible without you. I love you. Thank you.

DEDICATION

To everyone who took the road less traveled by.

Chapter 1

INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background and motivation

Erosion of unpaved forest roads, and the relative impacts thereof, has been a topic of research for decades (*Bilby et al.*, 1989; *Boston*, 2016; *Dubé et al.*, 2010; *Foltz and Burroughs*, 1990; *Luce and Black*, 1999; *Megahan and Kidd*, 1972b; *Ramos-Scharrón and Macdonald*, 2005; *Reid*, 1981; *Reinhart et al.*, 1963; *Sheridan and Noske*, 2007; *Trimble and Sartz*, 1957; *Ziegler et al.*, 2001a). Throughout the years, we have learned that the majority of forest road erosion occurs on high-traffic, near-stream (HTNS) forest roads, specifically those associated with timber production. In Oregon and Idaho, *Black et al.* (2013) found that 90% of sediment delivered to nearby streams came from less than 10% of drainage points, with the majority of those drainage points existing on HTNS roads.

Though abundant anecdotal and empirical evidence of increased erosion of forest roads due to traffic exists (e.g., *Luce and Black*, 2001a; *Reid and Dunne*, 1984; *Sheridan et al.*, 2006; *Sugden and Woods*, 2007; *Ziegler et al.*, 2001b), the substantial literature lacks a comprehensive treatment of the ways in which traffic and other important contextual covariates influence erosion and runoff. To address sediment production from forest roads in a more efficient way, we need to advance our understanding of the erosion processes and potential mitigation strategies.

One way to do this is to improve upon the current collection of forest road erosion models. Most forest road erosion models rely on empirical equations based on limited field data and require a more objective and process-based incorporation of traffic and other important contextual covariates. The main goal of this dissertation is to examine the relationship between forest road erosion, traffic, and potential erosion control treatments to help inform future models through literature synthesis, small-scale field experiments, and the conceptualization of a comprehensive process-based model.

1.2 Organization of dissertation

The chapters outlined below are part of a continuing collaborative effort funded by the Cooperative Monitoring, Evaluation, and Research (CMER) Committee within the Washington State Department of Natural Resources Adaptive Management Program to examine the effectiveness of forest road best management practices in western Washington.

Chapter 2 provides the extensive underlying motivation for Chapters 3, 4, and 5. In this chapter, I and my collaborators review the existing literature regarding interactions between traffic and road erosion, including a discussion of knowledge gaps, and we propose the need for a process-based modeling framework. We also present a limited factor framing that relates the ratios of erosion-sediment supply and transport capacity-sediment supply, similar to the Budyko hypothesis used in hydrometeorology.

Chapter 3 discusses using roughness as a metric to evaluate roadside ditch line erosion

control treatment efficiency. We present a small-scale field experiment that measured various hydraulic parameters of roadside ditch lines to examine roughness as an efficiency metric. This chapter provides the basis for the parameterization of a roadside ditch line in future versions of a process-based model presented in Chapter 5.

Chapter 4 discusses using unoccupied aerial vehicle (UAV) structure-from-motion (SfM) technology to examine how wheel ruts evolve on mainline logging roads following road grading and the implications of said rut formation on the road surface drainage system and erosion potential. This chapter provides potential parameterization information for the road surface in future versions of a process-based model presented in Chapter 5.

Chapter 5 lays the theoretical foundation for a process-based model that incorporates local processes of sediment production, as well as road-segment-scale sediment transport. Sediment production is proposed to be driven by four traffic-induced erosion-enhancing processes: crushing, pumping, scattering, and rutting. This chapter includes proof-of-concept examples and a discussion of future model versions.

Chapter 2

HOW DOES TRAFFIC AFFECT EROSION OF UNPAVED FOREST ROADS?

This chapter has been published as:

Alvis, A. D., Luce, C. H., & Istanbulluoglu, E. (2023). How does traffic affect erosion of unpaved forest roads?. *Environmental Reviews*, 31(1): 182-194. https://doi.org/10.1139/er-2022-003

Abstract

The relationship between traffic and forest road erosion has been studied for decades, and the answer to the question "what happens when traffic is present on these unpaved forest roads?" is simple: erosion increases. However, the answer to the question "why does it increase?" is complex and requires us to consider forest road erosion through an integrated lens. Fully understanding how traffic affects forest road erosion will allow us to control forest road erosion effectively. In this synthesis, we look at forest road erosion literature and focus the discussion on the interactions between traffic and erosion. Specifically, we explore four main hypotheses that have been proposed to explain how traffic affects erosion. These hypotheses are discussed in detail, including what data and information are required to evaluate them. In addition to the specific traffic-erosion interactions, we review important factors that interact with traffic to enhance erosion. Finally, we propose a framework that describes forest road erosion as a combination of all limiting factors. This framework can help guide future data collection needs, allow us to form a more holistic understanding of forest road erosion, and ultimately improve predictions of erosion from forest roads.

2.1 Introduction

Erosion from forest roads is a long-standing environmental problem (e.g., *Bilby et al.*, 1989; *Kochenderfer*, 1970; *Lane and Sheridan*, 2002; *Megahan and Kidd*, 1972a; *Packer*, 1967; *Sheridan and Noske*, 2007; *Trimble*, 1959; *Trimble and Sartz*, 1957), with ongoing contention over how best to prevent road-derived sediments from entering streams (e.g., *Aust et al.*, 2015; *Boston*, 2012; *Brown et al.*, 2015). Forest streams are generally cleaner than their counterparts in urban, suburban, and agricultural settings, making the impacts of turbid water from forest roads readily apparent. The set of standard best practices for managing sediment from roads includes protecting ditches with vegetation, placing sturdier rock on road surfaces, limiting traffic, and placing roads as far from streams as practical. Even so, locations exist where roads must cross or are located close to streams, and some of these near-stream roads carry substantial traffic. In these locations, options for erosion control are more limited, resulting in impacts that, from a practical standpoint, seem unavoidable. However, where protected fish species are affected, this unavoidability is better framed as an issue of economics and tradeoffs.

Erosion control solutions are commonly presented as two potential options: paving the road surface and limiting traffic on the road. These solutions been applied to varying locations where the value of both timber and fisheries are high (e.g., *Cederholm and Reid*, 1987). However, these two practices are expensive for forest land managers (e.g., *Edwards et al.*, 2016). Framing the management choices as stopping traffic or paving roads is too coarse, and more gradations in treatment choices need to be articulated. Certainly, we could express degrees of traffic limitation, such as an acceptable number of loaded trucks per unit time (e.g., *Croke and Hairsine*, 2006) or condition traffic on other factors, such as precipitation (e.g., *Dent et al.*, 2003). Similarly, engineering approaches like reduced tire pressure (e.g., *Foltz*, 1994; *Foltz and Elliot*, 1997), geotextiles placed in the subgrade (e.g., *Visser et al.*, 2017), and harder rock (e.g., *De Witt et al.*, 2020) have all been shown to help reduce sediment production and erosion on forest roads.

Unfortunately, the substantial literature covering the interactions between traffic and erosion lacks a holistic treatment of the various ways in which traffic influences sediment and runoff production from forest roads. Research does indicate that the presence of traffic increases forest road erosion (e.g., *Luce and Black*, 2001a; *Reid and Dunne*, 1984; *Sheridan et al.*, 2006; *Sugden and Woods*, 2007; *Ziegler et al.*, 2001a) though in a broad sense and with little quantitative accounting for context. Multiple hypotheses have been put forth regarding what traffic-induced processes are driving sediment production and erosion, including pumping, scattering, rutting, and crushing. However, these hypotheses are typically—often individually—invoked as a potential explanation of erosion (e.g., *Foltz et al.*, 2000; *Reid and Dunne*, 1984; *Swift*, 1984a), sometimes without a detailed mechanism being defined or providing quantitative expectations of effect. Some authors have gone further than others, but research is still missing how these mechanisms interact with one another and how they are affected by other treatments for sediment reduction. If we want to address sediment production from high traffic roads in a more fine-tuned and efficient way, it is necessary to advance our understanding of these different effects on roads. The hypotheses that have been put forth need more specific definition, particularly so that quantitative models can be constructed to guide the data collection needed to test the models and hypotheses.

In this synthesis, we focus on the relationship between traffic and erosion by examining the current state of the literature and including a discussion of hypotheses and knowledge gaps. Additionally, we present a potential contextual framing for the erosion process with respect to traffic and other factors and discuss how we can further our understanding of erosion on unpaved forest roads. We begin by focusing on the specific ways in which traffic affects erosion from roads; we then discuss the ways in which erosion is enhanced by the interactions between traffic and contextual climate, topographic, and road characteristics; and we complete the discussion with a conceptualization that generalizes forest road erosion in terms of sediment supply and transport energy to quantify contextual interactions and expectations for treatments.

2.2 Traffic-induced, erosion-enhancing processes

Traffic is one of the most frequently cited drivers of erosion on unpaved forest roads. Disturbance of the road surface by heavy vehicles—leading to an increase in fine sediment supply and changes in the energy available for sediment transport—has been observed in many studies (e.g., *Bilby et al.*, 1989; *Coker et al.*, 1993; *Luce and Black*, 2001a; *MacDonald et al.*, 2001; *Reid et al.*, 2016; *Reid*, 1981; *Swift*, 1984a; *Van Meerveld et al.*, 2014; *Ziegler et al.*, 2001b). These studies investigate the effects of traffic on erosion from a broad perspective, generally noting that erosion is highly correlated with the presence of traffic. This general understanding has motivated the development of hypotheses regarding the mechanics of traffic-induced erosion processes.

Observations and anecdotal evidence of the influence of traffic on erosion are multitudinous, but more information is needed to understand how and why traffic has such an influence, particularly if erosion caused by traffic is to be accurately represented in a model. Researchers have hypothesized multiple traffic-induced erosion processes: 1) crushing, 2) pumping, 3) scattering, and 4) flow rerouting. However, available datasets to evaluate these hypotheses are limited. In the next few sections, we address these processes in more depth and present a discussion of what we know and what we have yet to learn.

2.2.1 Crushing

Crushing occurs when a heavy vehicle, such as a loaded logging truck, drives over an aggregate-covered road surface, and the aggregate breaks down. The downward force exerted by the vehicle onto a brittle material causes breakage, increasing the supply of fine sediment available for transport (Figure 2.1a). Shifting of grains against one another under heavy loading causes chipping and abrasion of particles, which we lump conceptually in the term crushing. Crushing is posited to be influenced by aggregate quality, as well as frequency