NRW Carbon Positive Project

Condition based estimate of greenhouse gas emissions and carbon sequestration for NRW peatland habitats

J. Williamson, A. Burden, C. Evans Report No 276

About Natural Resources Wales

Natural Resources Wales' purpose is to pursue sustainable management of natural resources. This means looking after air, land, water, wildlife, plants and soil to improve Wales' well-being, and provide a better future for everyone.

Evidence at Natural Resources Wales

Natural Resources Wales is an evidence based organisation. We seek to ensure that our strategy, decisions, operations and advice to Welsh Government and others are underpinned by sound and quality-assured evidence. We recognise that it is critically important to have a good understanding of our changing environment.

We will realise this vision by:

Maintaining and developing the technical specialist skills of our staff;

Securing our data and information;

Having a well resourced proactive programme of evidence work;

Continuing to review and add to our evidence to ensure it is fit for the challenges facing us; and

Communicating our evidence in an open and transparent way.

This Evidence Report series serves as a record of work carried out or commissioned by Natural Resources Wales. It also helps us to share and promote use of our evidence by others and develop future collaborations. However, the views and recommendations presented in this report are not necessarily those of NRW and should, therefore, not be attributed to NRW.

Published by: Natural Resources Wales Maes y Ffynnon Ffordd Penrhos Bangor

© Natural Resources Wales (2017) All rights reserved. This document may be reproduced with prior permission of Natural Resources Wales.

About this report

This report was commissioned by the NRW Carbon Positive Project to better understand the greenhouse gas emissions and carbon sequestration of deep peat habitats on the NRW-managed estate.

The information within this report has been used to inform the calculation of NRW's net carbon status and the evaluation of potential measures NRW may take forward to deliver decarbonisation in the future as part of the Carbon Positive Enabling Plan and its supporting Action Plan.

Report details

| Report series: | NRW Evidence Report Series |
|---------------------|---|
| Report number: | 276 |
| Publication date: | 12 th December 2016 |
| Contractor: | Centre for Ecology and Hydrology (CEH) |
| Contract Manager: | J. Kelly |
| Contract reference: | CPPCEH001 |
| Title: | Condition based estimate of greenhouse gas emissions and carbon sequestration for NRW peatland habitats |
| Author(s): | J. Williamson, A. Burden, C. Evans |
| Technical Editor: | J. Williamson |
| Approved By: | A. Jones and J. Kelly |
| Restrictions: | None |

1 Distribution List (core)

| NRW Library, Bangor | 2 |
|---|---|
| National Library of Wales | 1 |
| British Library | 1 |
| Welsh Government Library | 1 |
| Scottish Natural Heritage Library | 1 |
| Natural England Library (Electronic Only) | 1 |

2 Recommended citation for this volume:

Williamson, J., Burden, A., Evans, C. 2016. Condition based estimate of greenhouse gas emissions and carbon sequestration for NRW peatland habitats. NRW Carbon Positive Project. NRW Evidence Report No: 276, 28pp, Natural Resources Wales, Bangor.

- **Title** Condition based Estimate of Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Carbon Sequestration for NRW Peatland Habitats.
- **Client** Natural Resources Wales

Client reference CPPCEH001

CEH reference NEC05964

CEH contact Jennifer Williamson details CEH Bangor

> t: 01248374500 e: jwl@ceh.ac.uk

Author Williamson, Jennifer L.

Approved by Chris Evans

Signed

lac

Date 12/12/2016

Contents

| 1 | Int | roduction | 5 |
|---|-----|---|----|
| 2 | Ha | abitat mapping and emissions estimates | 6 |
| | 2.1 | Land use on peat | 6 |
| | 2.2 | Categorising emissions factors | 7 |
| | 2.3 | Drainage and rewetting | 11 |
| | 2.4 | Greenhouse gas emissions | 15 |
| | 2.5 | Mitigation potential | 15 |
| 3 | Ab | oove and below ground carbon stocks | 18 |
| | 3.1 | Below ground | 18 |
| | 3.2 | Above ground | 20 |
| 4 | Сс | onclusions | 22 |
| 5 | Re | eferences | 23 |
| 6 | Ар | ppendices | 24 |
| | Ap | opendix 1: step by step procedure for the peat mapping exercise | 24 |
| | | | 27 |
| | | | |

1 Introduction

The Wales wide unified peat map (Evans et al., 2015) was developed as part of the Welsh Government funded GMEP (Glastir Monitoring and Evaluation Programme) project to quantify deep peat stocks in Wales. The unified peat map is based on BGS 1:10,000 mapping of surface deposits and the NRW Phase 1 habitat mapping of Wales. Cranfield's 1:250,000 soils mapping was not included in the Welsh peat map because of the coarse spatial scale used. The areal coverage of forested peat in Wales given in the unified peat map differs from the totals given in Vanguelova et al., (2012) because this was based on the 1:250,000 soils map, along with ground surveys. The peat map covers deep peat deposits and does not include organomineral soils.

The aim of this work is to use the data on peat coverage and condition compiled for the Welsh peat map to develop an understanding of carbon stocks, emissions and sequestration on NRW owned and managed landholdings. Additionally, NRW data on peatland restoration to date, areas of bare peat, and modelled outputs of the effects of drainage ditches on the hydrology of peat were incorporated into the updated mapping of peat on NRW land. Since the publication of the Welsh peat map a new report (Artz et al., 2016) for the Department for Energy and Climate Change (now the Department for Business, Energy and Industrial Strategy - BEIS) has been developed updating the emission factors for peatlands, specifically focussed on data available from UK, but augmented by data from other temperate oceanic peatlands (e.g. from Ireland) that were considered sufficiently representative for UK ecosystems. These emission factors have been incorporated into the emissions mapping for NRW peatlands in this report.

This document provides an outline and interpretation of the results given in the Excel tables supplied with the report in fulfilment of the contract reference CPPCEH001. The tables are as follows:

Final emission factors by Phase 1 habitat.xlsx – The areas under each habitat type and the most recent emission factors for each habitat type as derived from Artz et al., (2016). This also incorporates the potential reduction in emissions following peatland restoration for three scenarios.

Above and below ground carbon stocks by Phase 1 habitat.xlsx – The modelled above and below ground carbon stocks for each habitat type.

2 Habitat mapping and emissions estimates

2.1 Land use on peat

The NRW land holding information was used to extract the relevant data from the Welsh peat map (Evans et al., 2015) and the Phase 1 habitat mapping to calculate the total peatland area on NRW land holdings (Figure 1), creating the GIS layer NRW_Peat.shp.



Figure 1: peat on NRW land. Derived from the Welsh peat map (Evans et al 2015). GIS layer = NRW_Peat.shp

The total peat coverage on NRW land, excluding the Phase 1 habitats that sit within larger peatland areas such as rock outcrops and open water, is 11,345 ha. Of this, the largest area is covered by conifer plantation (5,743 ha), and the second largest area is blanket bog (1,037 ha).

The percentage cover of each Phase 1 habitat type is shown in Figure 2. Although some of the labels are unclear, due to the small percentage of peatland occupied by many of the Phase 1 categories, it shows that approximately 50% of NRW land on peat is conifer plantation and that blanket bog (both near-natural and modified), raised bog and 'habitat mosaic' areas make up a further 27% of the land cover types.



Figure 2: Land use categories on peat on NRW land. The values in the right hand chart show those areas each contributing less than 1% of the peatland area on the NRW estate.

2.2 Categorising emissions factors

The Phase 1 habitat categories were mapped to the broad habitat classification used in the development of new emissions factors (Artz et al., 2016) and are shown in Table 1. Examples of the varying broad habitat land uses on peat are shown in Figure 3. The broad habitat classifications were limited by the available data for emission factors, for example there is currently no emissions category corresponding to degraded or modified fen. Such habitats may be expected to have differing emissions factors but at the present time there is no available evidence to separate these into different categories. The Phase 1 data represents the most recent country-wide vegetation survey but dates from the early 1990s. More recent spatial data on the coverage of bare peat on the NRW estate were used to update the Phase 1 data where appropriate. In most cases these sites corresponded to bare peat in the Phase 1 survey, but there were a small number of locations where peatlands were reclassified from semi-natural blanket bog to eroding peat. This resulted in the file NRW_Phase1_Peat_BP.shp, with BP referring to the addition of the NRW bare peat information.



Figure 3: Examples of peatland mapped by Phase 1 habitat category inclusive of mapped drainage and rewetting effects: top left, Berwyn; top right, Borth Bog; bottom left, Afan Forest. Note the maps are different scales.

Emission factors as listed in Artz et al., (2016) were assigned to each broad habitat category for carbon dioxide (CO₂) and methane (CH₄) as well as an overall emissions estimate (t CO₂-e ha⁻¹ yr⁻¹), based on IPCC AR4 100 year global warming potentials CEH report ... version 1.0 8

and including N₂O and fluvial carbon flux estimates. CO₂ and CH₄ emission factors were also assigned upper and lower confidence intervals but these were not available for the overall emissions estimate. Artz et al., (2016) utilised evidence from UK peatlands where available, and evidence from comparable European, oceanic peatlands where UK evidence was lacking, to ensure that emissions factors were UK relevant. It should be noted that due to a lack of evidence to date, modified bog landscapes, including wet and dry heath, are represented by a single emissions estimate, despite the likelihood that emissions will vary. The emissions from fen landscapes should also be considered as having a high level of uncertainty; a recent study (Evans et al., 2016) showed that near natural fens show net carbon uptake, meaning that we may be over-estimating carbon emissions from fens. These emission factors differ slightly from those used in the Welsh peat map and can be considered an update based on the latest evidence.

| | | CO ₂ -e emission factor |
|------------------------|--------------------------------------|------------------------------------|
| Broad habitat category | Phase 1 categories included | (t/ha/yr) |
| | Blanket bog | |
| near natural bog | Raised bog | -0.2 |
| | Acid/neutral flush | |
| modified bog - bracken | Bracken | E 6 |
| dominated | Scattered bracken | 5.0 |
| | Marshy grassland Molinia dominated | |
| | Wet modified bog | |
| modified bog - grass | Dry modified bog | 5.6 |
| uominateu | Flush and spring | |
| | Marshy grassland Juncus dominated | |
| | Dry acid heath | |
| | Dry basic heath | - |
| | Scattered dry heath | - |
| | Wet heath | |
| modified has beather | Lichen/bryophyte heath | |
| dominated | Dry heath/acid grassland mosaic | 5.6 |
| dominated | Wet heath/acid grassland mosaic | |
| | Basic dry heath/calcareous grassland | |
| | mosaic | |
| | Coastal heath | |
| | mosaic | |
| bog eroding | Bare peat | 5.6 |
| | Basic flush | |
| | Bryophyte-dominated spring | |
| near natural fon | Fen | 30 |
| | Valley mire | 5.5 |
| | Modified valley mire | |
| | Basin mire | |

Table 1: Classification of Phase 1 habitats into the broad categories used in the development of new emissions factors by Artz et al, 2016.

Condition based Estimate of Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Carbon Sequestration for NRW Peatland Habitats.

| | Modified basin mire | | | |
|-----------------------|--|--------|--|--|
| | Flood-plain mire | | | |
| | Modified flood plain mire | | | |
| | Acid grassland | | | |
| | Unimproved acid grassland | | | |
| | Semi-improved acid grassland | | | |
| | Unimproved neutral grassland | - | | |
| | Unimproved calcareous grassland | | | |
| extensive grassland | Marshy grassland | - 16.5 | | |
| | Tall ruderal herb | _ | | |
| | Non-ruderal herb and fern | - | | |
| | Coastal grassland | _ | | |
| | Coastal heath/coastal grassland mosaic | _ | | |
| | Semi-improved neutral grassland | | | |
| | Semi-improved calcareous grassland | _ | | |
| extensive grassland - | Swamp | 25.2 | | |
| nutrient rich | Scattered swamp | - | | |
| | Inundation vegetation | - | | |
| | Improved grassland | | | |
| | Amenity grassland | - 31.9 | | |
| intensive grassland | Ephemeral/short perennial | | | |
| | Gardens | - | | |
| | Semi-natural broadleaved woodland | | | |
| | Planted broadleaved woodland | - | | |
| | Semi-natural coniferous woodland | _ | | |
| | Planted coniferous woodland | _ | | |
| | Semi-natural mixed woodland | _ | | |
| | Planted mixed woodland | - | | |
| | Dense scrub | _ | | |
| woodland | Scattered scrub | 11.4 | | |
| | Scattered broadleaved trees | _ | | |
| | Scattered coniferous trees | _ | | |
| | Scattered mixed trees | - | | |
| | Felled broadleaved woodland | - | | |
| | Felled coniferous woodland | - | | |
| | Felled mixed woodland | - | | |
| | Introduced scrub | | | |
| Cropland | Arable | 36.6 | | |
| | Upland species rich ledges | | | |
| | Standing water | | | |
| | Running water | | | |
| NA | Intertidal mud/sand | NA | | |
| | Intertidal cobbles/shingle | 1 | | |
| | Intertidal rocks/boulders | | | |

Condition based Estimate of Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Carbon Sequestration for NRW Peatland Habitats.

| Scattered salt marsh plants | |
|---|--|
| Salt marsh | |
| Mud/sand above mhw | |
| Shingle/gravel above mhw | |
| Rocks/boulders above mhw | |
| Dune slack | |
| Dune grassland | |
| Dune heath | |
| Dune scrub | |
| Open dune | |
| Hard cliff | |
| Soft cliff | |
| Natural rock exposure | |
| Inland cliff | |
| Acid/neutral inland cliff | |
| Basic inland cliff | |
| Scree | |
| Acid/neutral scree | |
| Basic scree | |
| Limestone pavement | |
| Other rock exposure | |
| Acid/neutral rock | |
| Basic rock | |
| Cave | |
| Quarry | |
| Spoil | |
| Mine | |
| Refuse-tip | |
| Caravan site | |
| Sea-wall | |
| Buildings | |
| Track (not comprehensively digitised) | |
| Bare ground | |
| Not accessed land | |
| Habitat code illegible on the original vegetation map | |

2.3 Drainage and rewetting

The spatial extent of drainage on NRW land was based on the mapping of peatland drains carried out by Evans et al., (2015). A bespoke software package, PCI Geomatica, was parameterised and used to extract linear features corresponding to drainage ditches from aerial photography. This assessment covered 73% of the upland peat areas in Wales and 29% of the lowland peat areas.

To distinguish between drains that have now been blocked, or those that are still open, the most recently available mapping of blocked drainage ditches from NRW was used to cut the Wales wide ditch layer from the Welsh peat map, thus providing an estimate of open and blocked drainage ditches. To estimate the effect of drainage ditches on surrounding peat, modelling outputs from Low and Baird (2014) were closely examined and, in conjunction with a previous review of hydraulic conductivity measurements on peatlands (Evans et al., 2014), it was concluded that the mid-range hydraulic conductivity model inputs used by Low and Baird provided the most realistic estimate of blanket bog hydraulic conductivity. The model outputs suggest that the presence of drainage ditches running parallel to the contour results in a water table drawdown area extending 5 m upslope of the ditch and 15 m downslope of the ditch. This gives essentially the same estimate of overall drained area as the fixed 10 m buffer either side of drainage ditches applied by Evans et al., (2014). Due to the limitations of the elevation data available to this project (50 m resolution) it was not considered realistic to use these data to make the effects of upand down-slope drainage spatially explicit, therefore the 10 m radius for upland peat was retained as the most pragmatic solution given the data and evidence available. As lowland raised bog and fen peats typically have hydraulic conductivity values orders of magnitude higher than blanket peats (Evans et al., 2014) the higher drainage radius of 50 m as used in the Wales wide mapping was also retained for this study for this habitat type. Refined drainage extents could be applied to either upland or lowland peat areas if improved empirical or modelling data become available in future, particularly in relation to changes in peat morphology in response to drainage such as cracking or the development of peat pipes, which has not been accounted for in this work because of a lack of available data.

| Initial Phase 1 category | Post drainage DECC category | Post rewetting DECC category |
|----------------------------|-------------------------------------|------------------------------|
| Blanket Bog | Modified bog – heather dominated | Rewetted bog |
| Raised Bog | Modified bog – heather dominated | Rewetted bog |
| Acid/neutral Flush | Modified bog – heather dominated | Rewetted bog |
| Grass Dominated Bog | Modified bog – heather dominated | Rewetted bog |
| Basic flush | Extensive grassland – nutrient rich | Rewetted bog |
| Bryophyte-dominated spring | Extensive grassland – nutrient rich | Rewetted bog |
| Fen | Extensive grassland – nutrient rich | Rewetted fen |
| Valley mire | Extensive grassland – nutrient rich | Rewetted fen |
| Modified valley mire | Extensive grassland – nutrient rich | Rewetted fen |
| Basin mire | Extensive grassland – nutrient rich | Rewetted fen |
| Modified basin mire | Extensive grassland – nutrient rich | Rewetted fen |
| Flood-plain mire | Extensive grassland – nutrient rich | Rewetted fen |
| Modified flood plain mire | Extensive grassland – nutrient rich | Rewetted fen |
| Improved grassland | NA - habitat considered drained | Rewetted fen |
| Marshy grassland | NA - habitat considered drained | Rewetted fen |
| Dry heath | NA - habitat considered drained | Rewetted bog |
| Amenity grassland | NA - habitat considered drained | Rewetted fen |
| Gardens | NA - habitat considered drained | Rewetted fen |

Table 2: Modification of Phase 1 categories to allow for the effects of drainage and rewetting.

Within the modelled areas of drainage around the ditches, the Phase 1 habitats were modified to a drained bog category (see Table 2) if the initial Phase 1 category was blanket bog, raised bog, acid/neutral flush or grass dominated bog. If the initial Phase 1 category was any of those categorised as near-natural fen, it was modified to a drained fen category. The drained modified bog areas were given the emission factor corresponding to modified heather dominated bog, and drained fen areas were given the emission factor corresponding to extensive grassland - nutrient rich (note that 'nutrient rich' and 'nutrient poor' refer to fen and bog peat respectively, according to the IPCC's terminology, rather than levels of artificial nutrient enrichment). The decision to modify these areas to these specific categories was led by the lack of published research on GHG emissions from drained fens supporting semi-natural vegetation. All other habitats (woodland, grassland etc.) were considered to be drainage modified in some way already. This does not take into account areas of naturally wet woodland. If more detailed surveying of such areas becomes available and studies of greenhouse gas emissions from wet woodland on peat allow specific emission factors to be developed then this should be revisited to address this limitation.

The peat area that has been rewetted to date was calculated using the same radii of influence as for the drainage affected peat. Peat on all habitats except woodlands in the area subject to rewetting was given emission factors for rewetted fen or bog depending on the starting habitat – nutrient rich grasslands were considered to revert to rewetted fen, while all modified bog habitats were considered to revert to rewetted bog.

| | Phase 1 category | Area (ha) |
|--------------|------------------|-----------|
| | E.1.6.1 | 19 |
| | E.1.6.2 | 198 |
| Drained Reg | E.1.7 | 40 |
| Drained Bog | E.1.8 | 1.8 |
| | E.2.1 | 5.2 |
| | mosaic | 9.4 |
| | E.3 | 2.2 |
| Drained Fon | E.3.1 | 20.6 |
| Drained Fen | E.3.2 | 0.1 |
| | F.1 | 37.5 |
| | B.5 | 2.9 |
| Rewetted Reg | D.1.1 | <0.01 |
| Rewelled Bog | E.1.6.1 | 0.2 |
| | E.1.8 | 0.1 |
| | B.4 | 8.4 |
| Rewetted Fen | E.3.1 | 92 |
| | E.3.2 | 0.01 |

Table 3: Drained and rewetted peat by Phase 1 category.

Using the default drainage estimates, as explained above, gives a total area of unrestored drainage-affected bog of 274 ha (based on the drainage buffer widths described above) and unrestored drainage-affected fen of 60 ha (recoded from Phase 1 habitat to DR_BOG and DR_FEN respectively in the shapefile NRWPeat_AllDrainageRewetting.shp.). This value is subject to the caveats raised in

Evans et al (2015) regarding the accuracy of ditch mapping, for example ground truthing of areas suggests that mapping from aerial photography is approximately 75% accurate (Jones pers. comm.). Using the currently available digitised data from NRW, restoration efforts to date are estimated to have rewetted 100 ha of drainage-affected fen and 3 ha of drainage-affected bog on NRW land. This does not include any ditch blocking work undertaken in woodland habitats, as there is not the information available currently to ascertain whether the ditch blocking has resulted in a change from woodland towards blanket bog or fenland vegetation. This figure is known to be an under-estimate of the true extent of rewetting on peatlands on the NRW estate, as a number of projects have not had the spatial extent of ditch blocking centrally digitised and made available to wider projects. This value can be refined in future as further information becomes available on the extent of restoration projects. The area of peatland recategorised as drained or rewetted is shown by Phase 1 habitat in Table 3.

Mapping of drainage ditches, as carried out in Evans et al., (2015), covered 73% of the Welsh upland peat and 29% of Welsh lowland peat. As a result of this, the estimate above of drainage affected area is based on the mapped areas only, meaning that the total peatland area affected by drainage will be greater. When the total area of peatland on NRW land inside and outside the area of mapped drains was compared, 70% of NRW's peatland fell within the mapped area. The split by habitat coverage was not equal between all habitat types, for example all cropland on NRW land was outside the area mapped for drainage ditches (although this does only cover 1.2 ha). 75% of non-forested NRW land on peat was within the area mapped for drainage, meaning that the majority of NRW land has drainage estimates spatially included in this study. The assumptions were made that the peatland that had not been mapped had a similar concentration of drainage ditches to the mapped areas and that all modified habitat had been affected by drainage to some extent already. Estimates of the additional areas of near natural bog and fen habitat affected by drainage beyond the current spatial extent of mapping were carried out as described below.

11% of near-natural blanket bog and 22% of near-natural fen is outside the ditchmapped area. Using the estimate that 1.6% of the near-natural bog within the tiles is drainage-affected (based on the estimated of drainage extent around ditches, as described above), this gives an additional 3.7 ha of near-natural bog subject to drainage that is not accounted for in the emissions totals. An estimated 18% of the near-natural fen within the tiles has been drainage-affected, which gives an extra 11.6 ha of near-natural fen that is actually subject to drainage. If the bog peat has higher hydraulic conductivity than the values used in the modelling work by Low and Baird, the extent of drainage effects on near natural blanket bog will also be higher. The potential under-estimation of the spatial extent of near natural fen and bog affected by drainage also means that the estimation of greenhouse gas emissions from peat on the NRW estate may be an under-estimate. If future funding becomes available to extend the mapping of drainage ditches to the full extent of peat in Wales then these under-estimates can be rectified. The final file of peat coverage on NRW land that accounts for the presence of mapped drainage ditches and mapped rewetting projects is NRWPeat_AllDrainageRewetting.shp.

2.4 Greenhouse gas emissions

When CO₂ and CH₄ are considered separately, blanket bogs on NRW land sequester 718 t CO₂-C yr⁻¹, with lowland raised bogs sequestering a further 414 t CO₂-C yr⁻¹. The largest emission of CO₂ comes from forestry plantation, which is estimated to emit 11,500 t CO₂-C yr⁻¹. Over all of the peatlands on NRW land there is a net CO₂-C emission of 13,000 t CO₂-C yr⁻¹, which is driven by the large area of land under conifer plantation. If the land area under conifer plantation is excluded NRW land holdings emit approximately 1500 t CO₂-C yr⁻¹, although this may be an overestimate based on emissions from near natural fens.

Methane emissions, in contrast, are highest from blanket bogs with almost 97 t CH₄-C emitted per year. Raised bogs contributed the second largest emissions of methane at 55 t CH₄-C yr⁻¹, and due to the large area of conifer methane emissions from conifer plantation were 24 t CH₄-C yr⁻¹. Total methane emissions from NRW peatlands were calculated at 369 t CH₄-C yr⁻¹.

Excluding potential emissions from open water environments mapped as peat, the present day estimated GHG emissions, based on IPCC AR4 100 year global warming potentials, from peat on NRW land is 100 kt CO₂-e yr⁻¹ with 65 kt CO₂-e yr⁻¹ emitted from conifer plantations, and 34 kt CO₂-e yr⁻¹ from all other habitats.

When considering the GHG emissions from peat soils on NRW landholdings it should be taken into account that CO_2 -e emission factors developed by Artz et al., (2016) include nitrous oxide (N₂O) emissions, fluvial fluxes of dissolved organic carbon (DOC) and fluxes of CH₄ from drainage ditches.

Within the results tabulation of GHG fluxes from NRW peatlands columns N:S show the upper and lower confidence intervals of the total CH₄ and CO₂ fluxes from NRW landholdings on peat. These are calculated based on the upper and lower intervals of the emissions factors and the land area in each habitat type.

2.5 Mitigation potential

Three potential scenarios were chosen as examples of the mitigation potential of NRW's peatlands. The first scenario was that all peatland areas would be restored to rewetted fen or bog (scenario 1), the second was that all peatland areas except those currently under woodland, cropland or intensive grassland would be restored to rewetted fen or bog (scenario 2) and the third, least wide-ranging scenario was that all drained fen and bog would be restored to rewetted (scenario 3).

If scenario 1 was achieved and all peatland on the NRW estate was to be rewetted and converted to fen or bog as appropriate for the site, GHG emissions are estimated to fall by 79 kt CO₂-e yr⁻¹ to 21 kt CO₂-e yr⁻¹. If all areas were to eventually revert to emissions similar to near natural bog and fen then GHG emissions would fall further, to 1.5 kt CO₂-e yr⁻¹, which can be considered the natural baseline. This baseline flux is positive due to the natural emission of methane from wetland ecosystems. The further large decrease is a result of the difference between rewetted and near-natural emission factors. This baseline should be considered a hypothetical minimum given current emission factors rather than a scenario that will occur after a certain number of years because there isn't a fixed timescale of restoration (for example it is CEH report ... version 1.0 dependent on interventions carried out and the degree of habitat degradation) and it isn't known whether rewetted peat habitats will return to baseline emissions. Table 4 shows the maximum potential emissions reductions by Phase 1 habitat under scenario 1.

If scenario 2 was achieved then GHG emissions from NRW peat would be an estimated 82 kt CO₂-e yr⁻¹, a reduction of 18 kt CO₂-e yr⁻¹. This is largely due to the emissions from conifer plantation on peat, which would remain at 65.5 kt CO₂-e yr⁻¹. If scenario 3 was achieved it would result in the smallest estimated emissions reduction, with annual emissions of 98 kt CO₂-e yr⁻¹, a reduction of approximately 2 kt CO₂-e yr⁻¹ from present day emissions. It should be noted that these estimates are reliant on the accuracy of ditch extent and restoration mapping, and as such may under- or over-estimate current emissions.

| Phase 1 name | Peat area (ha) | Potential restoration category | current emission factor CO2-e (t CO2-e ha ⁻¹ yr ⁻¹) | restored emission factor CO2-e (t CO2-e ha ⁻¹ yr ⁻¹) | Potential emissions reduction per ha CO2-e (t CO2-e ha ⁻¹ yr ⁻¹) | Total potential emissions reduction CO2-e (t CO2-e yr ⁻ ¹) |
|---|----------------------|--------------------------------------|--|--|---|---|
| Semi-natural broadleaved woodland | 71.86 | rewetted fen | 11.4 | 7.8 | 3.6 | 259 |
| Planted broadleaved woodland | 4.62 | rewetted fen | 11.4 | 7.8 | 3.6 | 17 |
| Planted coniferous woodland | 5742.6 6 | rewetted bog | 11.4 | 1.7 | 9.7 | 55700 |
| Planted mixed woodland | 6.98 | rewetted bog | 11.4 | 1.7 | 9.7 | 68 |
| Dense scrub | 88.79 | rewetted bog | 11.4 | 1.7 | 9.7 | 861 |
| Felled coniferous woodland | 47.27 | rewetted bog | 11.4 | 1.7 | 9.7 | 459 |
| Unimproved acid grassland | 178.78 | rewetted bog | 16.5 | 1.7 | 14.8 | 2650 |
| Semi-improved acid grassland | 6.99 | rewetted bog | 16.5 | 1.7 | 14.8 | 104 |
| Semi-improved neutral grassland | 8.50 | rewetted bog | 25.2 | 1.7 | 23.5 | 200 |
| Improved grassland | 129.41 | rewetted fen | 31.9 | 7.8 | 24.1 | 3120 |
| Marshy grassland | 270.20 | rewetted fen | 16.5 | 7.8 | 8.7 | 2350 |
| Marshy grassland Molinia dominated | 46.09 | rewetted fen | 5.6 | 7.8 | -2.2 | -101 |
| Bracken | 34.35 | rewetted bog | 5.6 | 1.7 | 3.9 | 134 |

| 1 apie 4. Maximum polential emissions reduction under scenario 1 – restoration to rewetted 1en of pol |
|---|
|---|

| Tall ruderal herb | 0.03 | rewetted fen | 16.5 | 7.8 | 8.7 | 0.3 |
|---------------------------|-------------|-----------------|------|------|------|------|
| Non-ruderal herb and | 0.08 | rewetted | 16.5 | 7.8 | 8.7 | 0.7 |
| fern | | fen | | | | |
| Dry acid heath | 352.20 | rewetted | 5.6 | 1.7 | 3.9 | 1370 |
| Math basth | 20.40 | god | 5.6 | 4 7 | 2.0 | 115 |
| wet neath | 29.40 | bog | 5.6 | 1.7 | 3.9 | 115 |
| Wet heath/acid | 75.85 | rewetted | 5.6 | 1.7 | 3.9 | 296 |
| grassland mosaic | | bog | | | | |
| Basic dry | 3.39 | rewetted | 5.6 | 1.7 | 3.9 | 13 |
| heath/calcareous | | bog | | | | |
| grassland mosaic | | | | | | |
| Blanket bog | 1026.9 0 | NA | -0.2 | -0.2 | NA | NA |
| Raised bog | 591.67 | NA | -0.2 | -0.2 | NA | NA |
| Wet modified bog | 656.42 | rewetted | 5.6 | 1.7 | 3.9 | 2560 |
| | | bog | | | | |
| Dry modified bog | 350.08 | rewetted | 5.6 | 1.7 | 3.9 | 1370 |
| , 0 | | bog | | | | |
| Acid/neutral flush | 108.71 | NA | -0.2 | -0.2 | NA | NA |
| Basic flush | 0.78 | NA | 3.9 | 3.9 | NA | NA |
| Fen | 40.76 | NA | 3.9 | 3.9 | NA | NA |
| Valley mire | 75.81 | NA | 3.9 | 3.9 | NA | NA |
| , Modified valley mire | 2.19 | NA | 3.9 | 3.9 | NA | NA |
| Basin mire | 22.06 | NA | 3.9 | 3.9 | NA | NA |
| Modified basin mire | 0.11 | NA | 3.9 | 3.9 | NA | NA |
| Bare peat | 16.20 | rewetted | 5.6 | 1.7 | 3.9 | 63.2 |
| | | bog | | | | |
| Swamp | 93.09 | rewetted | 25.2 | 7.8 | 17.4 | 1620 |
| | | fen | | | | |
| Arable | 1.21 | rewetted | 36.6 | 7.8 | 28.8 | 35 |
| | | fen | | | | |
| Amenity grassland | 0.18 | rewetted | 31.9 | 7.8 | 24.1 | 4.4 |
| | | fen | | | | |
| mosaic | 754.84 | rewetted | 5.6 | 1.7 | 3.9 | 2940 |
| | | bog | | | | |
| Not accessed during | 68.18 | rewetted | 5.6 | 1.7 | 3.9 | 266 |
| survey | | bog | | | | |
| Drained fen | 60.41 | rewetted | 25.2 | 7.8 | 17.4 | 1050 |
| | | fen | | | | |
| Rewetted fen | 100.51 | NA | 7.8 | 7.8 | NA | NA |
| Drained bog | 273.95 | rewetted | 5.6 | 1.7 | 3.9 | 1070 |
| | | bog | | | | |
| Rewetted bog | 3.21 | NA | 1.7 | 1.7 | NA | NA |

3 Above and below ground carbon stocks

3.1 Below ground

In contrast to the mapping of land use and emissions from peatlands in the above section, the work on below ground carbon stocks uses a 50 m grid Digital Elevation Model of the UK as its base. This raster approach results in some small differences in area because of the relatively coarse scale grid used. The modelling approach used in this report is that developed for the SNPA Peatland Strategy (Burden et al., 2016). In order to estimate peat carbon stocks within the study area, peat depth was modelled using equations taken from Holden and Connolly (2011), based on a study of peat depth in the Wicklow Mountains, Ireland (an area located at the same latitude as Snowdonia, and with a similar range of topography and altitude). Main input parameters in this model are maximum theoretical peat depth at a given elevation and angle of slope:

Equation 1: $Depth = (e^{-a*slope}) * D_{max}$

Although other peat depth models have been developed which include other explanatory factors such as elevation (e.g. Parry et al., 2012), the relationship between peat depth and elevation appears to be region-specific, and this approach was found to be ineffective for Snowdonia, where deep peats occur in both upland and lowland situations, and the same problems would arise at an all-Wales scale. For this we modified the equation of Holden and Connolly (2011) by constraining the maximum depth (D_{max}) to 300 cm across all altitudes and used a multiplier of -0.189 for slope, based on calibration of the model to Welsh peat-depth data. Measurements of peat depth in semi-natural areas using datasets from both CEH and NRW were used as the base measurements against which the goal seeking approach was applied. Goal seeking using average peat depths in 1 hectare units suggested that these values gave the lowest error estimate (calculated by using the root-mean-square deviation, or RMSE, which is an unbiased estimator of variance) across all sites with available in-situ measurements of peat depth.

To account for disturbance, separate correction factors were then applied for landuse change and drainage. These were both derived from a detailed post-drainage subsidence study by Shotbolt et al., (1998). This study suggested that, over a 30 year period following drainage of a Scottish blanket bog for forestry, subsidence rates within the forest averaged around 20 mm yr⁻¹. In areas outside the forest but still affected by drainage, subsidence rates were lower, in the region of 5 mm yr⁻¹. To model changes in peat depth we assumed that the former subsidence rate (which is similar to - albeit somewhat lower than - those observed in peatlands drained for agriculture elsewhere) would apply to all areas now under forestry or improved grassland. A similar, but lower, rate of subsidence of 10 mm yr⁻¹ was applied to areas of semi-improved grassland. For other areas of peat within 10 m of a mapped drain, we applied the lower rate of 5 mm yr⁻¹. As a first assumption, all land-use changes

CEH report ... version 1.0

were assumed to date from 1970, giving a total reduction in peat depth (to date) of 90 cm for peat under forest or improved grassland, 45 cm under semi-improved grassland and 20cm for drained semi-natural peat. Both of these correction factors were given a limit so that if the estimated peat depth fell below 5 cm, a 5 cm depth was recorded to avoid negative peat depth estimates. The resulting file is NRW_PeatDpthF.adf.

To calculate peat carbon stocks, peat depth was multiplied by an estimate of its bulk density and its carbon content, using equations in Lindsay (2010) (Equation 2).

Equation 2: Cstock = 10 * depth * bulk density * fraction OM * Proportion C

The fraction of peat that is organic matter was taken as 0.94, and the proportion of organic matter that is carbon was taken as 0.5, both from Lindsay (2010). The outputs of equations 2 and 3 are NRW_carbon.adf and NRW_BD.adf respectively.

In a previously published study based at Plynlimon in mid Wales and Glensaugh in eastern Scotland Frogbrook et al., (2009) showed that peat bulk density was negatively correlated with peat depth (Figure 4). From soil core measurements taken from both sites a relationship between total peat depth and bulk density was developed (Equation 3). The mean of up to three bulk density measurements for each core was taken as the mean bulk density, with shallower cores only using one or two measurements depending on peat depth. This approach includes the observation that degraded, shallower peats often have higher bulk density as a result of compaction.



Equation 3: bulk density = $0.7005 * \text{peat depth}^{-0.347}$

Figure 4: Average bulk density values from peat soils of varying depths at Plynlimon and Glensaugh. Samples were taken from a maximum of three depths: 0-15 cm, 15-30 cm and 50-65 cm per core (see Frogbrook et al 2009 for details). $R^2 = 0.57$

3.2 Above ground

Carbon stocks in vegetation were modelled from biomass data measured during a recent NERC Macronutrients project (Smart et al., pers comm) for all sites except fens. The NERC funded Macronutrients work was developed to progress current understanding of cycling of carbon, nitrogen and phosphorus in natural terrestrial, biological and freshwater systems. Fen biomass estimates were taken from Menichino et al., (2016), which were measured as part of the EU Life funded project on the Anglesey and Llyn fens and part-funded by NRW. Phase 1 habitats were mapped to available data as in Table 5.

| Broad | | | Above ground biomass (kg ha ⁻ | |
|--------------|---------------------------------|-------------------|---|--|
| habitat type | Phase 1 categories | Citation for data | 1) | |
| | Fen | | | |
| | Valley mire | | | |
| | Modified valley mire | | | |
| Eon | Basin mire | Menichino et al | 8 640 | |
| Ten | Modified basin mire | (2016) | 8,040 | |
| | Bare peat | | | |
| | Swamp | | | |
| | Marshy grassland | | | |
| | Semi-natural broadleaved | | | |
| Broadleaf | woodland | Smart et al (pers | 1/6 593 | |
| woodland | Planted broadleaved woodland | comm) | 140,555 | |
| | Dense scrub | | | |
| | Planted coniferous woodland | Smart et al (ners | | |
| Conifer | Planted mixed woodland | comm) | 301,680 | |
| | Felled coniferous woodland | | | |
| | Unimproved acid grassland | | | |
| Acid | Bracken | Smart et al (pers | 4 367 | |
| grassland | Non-ruderal herb and fern | comm) | 4,507 | |
| | Wet heath/acid grassland mosaic | | | |
| | Dry acid heath | | | |
| | Wet heath | | | |
| | Basic dry heath/calcareous | | | |
| | grassland mosaic | - | | |
| Blanket bog | Wet modified bog | Smart et al (ners | | |
| heather | Dry modified bog | comm) | 5,217 | |
| dominated | Mosaic | - | | |
| | Not accessed during survey | - | | |
| | Marshy grassland Molinia | | | |
| | dominated | 4 | | |
| | Blanket bog | | J | |

Table 5: Habitat types used for the carbon stocks in biomass modelling.

CEH report ... version 1.0

Condition based Estimate of Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Carbon Sequestration for NRW Peatland Habitats.

| | Raised bog | | |
|------------|---------------------------------|--------------------|-------|
| Soligenous | Acid/neutral flush | Smart at al (pars | |
| mire and | Basic flush | sinait et al (pers | 1,273 |
| flush | | commy | |
| Improved | Improved grassland | Smart et al (pers | 8 0CE |
| grassland | Arable | comm) | 8,005 |
| Semi- | Semi-improved acid grassland | Smart at al /pars | |
| improved | Semi-improved neutral grassland | sinait et al (pers | 9,447 |
| grassland | | commy | |



Figure 5: Above and below ground carbon stocks by Phase 1 category.

Total below ground carbon stocks on NRW land were modelled at 7078 kt. It should be noted that this value is based on modelled data and has not been ground truthed. Differences in the bulk density in particular will have large effects on the carbon stocks in peat. Areas of peat shown as being on land categories that were not likely to be compatible with peat, such as rock outcrops and lakes, were removed from this calculation. Modelled carbon stocks in above ground vegetation are very much smaller, at 829 kt, of which 803 kt are conifer forest biomass. Above and below ground carbon stocks split by Phase 1 habitat are shown in Figure 5. As conifer plantation covers the largest land area, the modelled below ground carbon stocks under planted conifer are the highest of any Phase 1 category. Above ground biomass carbon stocks have been estimated for woodland for completeness, but these estimates are from a single study and do not specifically cover felled plantation forestry, differing forest yield classes, or land management.

4 Conclusions

Around 50% of the peat area on NRW land is under conifer plantation. A further 30% is covered by near-natural or modified bog habitat. Current emissions estimates from peat on NRW land suggest that they are a net source of greenhouse gas emissions of 100 kt CO₂-e yr⁻¹, with approximately two thirds of emissions (CO₂-e yr⁻¹) from conifer plantation. NRW peatlands emit 11,500 t CO₂-C yr⁻¹ and 369 t CH₄-C yr⁻¹. Current carbon stocks in peat on NRW land are modelled to be in the region of 7,000 kt. Restoration of all peatland areas to rewetted fen or bog could reduce emissions from NRW peatlands by approximately 78 kt CO₂-e yr⁻¹.

Recommendations for future work include the completion of mapped drainage on peat in Wales, using the aerial photography methodology developed by BGS to give a Wales wide dataset of drainage, and completing the digitisation of restoration projects in Wales to allow the calculation of emissions from all restored sites. Further work to quantify how peat morphology changes following drainage would improve the estimates of the extent of drainage impacts on peat. Other work that would be beneficial is the monitoring of GHG emissions and fluvial carbon losses from degraded blanket bog ecosystems so that separate emissions factors for these habitats can be developed.

5 References

Artz, R., Chapman, S., Potts, J., Wilson, D., Heinemeyer, A., Evans, C., Moxley, J. (2016) WP3: Emission factors applicable to UK Peatlands. Report to the Department of Energy and Climate Change.

Evans, C., Page, S., Jones, T., Moore, S., Gauci, V., Laiho, R., Hruska, J., Allott, T., Billett, M., Tipping, E., Freeman, C., Garnett, M. (2014) Contrasting vulnerability of drained tropical and high latitude peatlands to fluvial loss of stored carbon. Global Biogeochemical Cycles. 28 1215-1234.

Evans, C., Rawlins, B., Grebby, S., Scholefield, P., Jones, P. (2015) Glastir Monitoring & Evaluation Programme. Mapping the extent and condition of Welsh peat. Welsh Government (Contract reference: C147/2010/11). NERC/Centre for Ecology & Hydrology (CEH Project: NEC04780).

Evans, C. et al (2016) Final report on project SP1210: Lowland peatland systems in England and Wales – evaluating greenhouse gas fluxes and carbon balances. Report to DEFRA.

Frogbrook, Z., Bell, J., Bradley, R., Evans, C., Lark, R., Reynolds, B., Smith, P., Tower, W. (2009) Quantifying terrestrial carbon stocks: examining the spatial variation in two upland areas in the UK and a comparison to mapped estimates of soil carbon. Soil Use and Management. 25, 320-332.

Holden, N., Connolly, J. (2011) Estimating the carbon stock of a blanket peat region using a peat depth inference model. Catena. 86, 75-85.

Lindsay R. (2010) Peatbogs and carbon: a critical synthesis to inform policy development in oceanic peat bog conservation and restoration in the context of climate change. RSPB Scotland.

Low, R., Baird, A. (2014) Assessment of hydrological impacts resulting from drainage, access trackways and related windfarm infrastructure on blanket bog and upland soligenous mires. Report to Countryside Council for Wales Contract no. R004694.

Menichino, N., Fenner, N., Pullin, A., Jones, P., Guest, J., Jones, L. (2016) Contrasting response to mowing in two abandoned rich fen plant communities. Ecological Engineering. 86, 210-222.

Parry, L., Chapman, D., Noades, J. (2012) a method for modelling peat depth in blanket peatlands. Soil Use and Management. 28, 614-624.

Shotbolt, L., Anderson, A., Townend, J. (1998) Changes to blanket bog adjoining forest plots at Bad a' Cheo, Rumster Forest, Caithness. Forestry. 71, 311-324.

Vanguelova, E., Broadmeadow S., Anderson R., Yamulki S., Randle T., Nisbet T., Morison J. (2012). A Strategic Assessment of Afforested Peat Resource in Wales. Forest Research Report to Forestry Commission Wales.

6 Appendices

Appendix 1: step by step procedure for the peat mapping exercise

Peat area and GHG emissions

- # clip the NRW land holding map to the Welsh peat outline
- # calculate new area of land
- # clip the Welsh peat Phase 1 habitat survey to the NRW peat outline
- # delete unwanted fields
- # calculate new area of land
- # add in the bare peat layer
- # clip the Phase 1 layer to the bare peat layer
- # change the reclass field to 3 (bare or eroding peat) and phase 1 code to E.4
- # Update the Phase 1 layer with the bare peat information
- # clip the BGS ditch map to the NRW peat outline
- # clip the NRW blocked ditch map to the NRW peat outline
- # recalculate the length of the ditches
- # Snap the NRW ditches to the BGS ditches
- # add fields for emission factors to original Phase 1 map
- # fill in all of the columns for each Phase 1 category
- # find out how much NRW land is covered by the BGS tiles
- # find out how much land ISN'T covered by the BGS tiles

recalculate areas

- # summarise areas by Phase 1 classification
- # erase the blocked ditches from the open ditches
- # erase the upland boundary layer from the ditch layer to get lowland ditches
- # put a 50 m boundary around the ditches
- # Use the 50 m buffer to clip the Phase 1 shapefile
- # clip new ditch layer to the upland boundary to create 10m upland drainage boundary
- # draw a 10 m buffer around the ditches
- # Use the 10 m buffer to clip the Phase 1 shapefile
- # change the classification to drained if semi natural (1,2,4,5) all other sites deemed drained already
- # Update the original land use layer with the drained EFs

recalculate areas

CEH report ... version 1.0

Recalculate the areas of each Broad habitat type inside the tiles to look at what % of the area is affected.

finding out how much NRW land is covered by the BGS tiles

recalculate areas

calculate the area.

Use the blocked ditches layer to split into upland and lowland and provide the same 10/50 m buffer.

Give rewetted EFs to all areas?

erase the ditch layer to get lowland ditches

put a 50 m boundary around the ditches

Use the 50 m buffer to clip the Phase 1 shapefile

clip new ditch layer to the upland boundary to create 10m upland drainage boundary

draw a 10 m buffer around the ditches

Use the 10 m buffer to clip the Phase 1 shapefile

change the classification to rewetted if semi natural (1,2,4,5,8,10,13)

Update the original land use layer with the rewetted EFs

calculate the area.

Carbon stocks

Using the DEM to calculate slope and as an input to calculating peat depth and carbon stocks.

create slope from DEM

#

#

#Edit the depth raster to account for the differing land use practices 90 cm reduction for forest, crop + imp grass, 45 cm for semi-imp grass and 20 for drained peat

create layers of just each of the different landuses to use as a cookie cutter.

Write the selected features to a new featureclass

#Write the selected features to a new featureclass

Cut out the raster with the shapefiles to change the peat depth

modify the peat depth in the extracted rasters

Cut the UK peat depth raster to the shape of the NRW peat layer

#merge the rasters together

DepthRaster = Raster("NRW_PeatDpthF")

CEH report ... version 1.0

NRW_BD = 0.7005 * Power(DepthRaster, -0.347)

NRW_BD.save("P:/NRW_Peatland_Accounting_NEC05964/Data/GIS/NRW_BD")

outCarbon = 10 * Raster("NRW_PeatDpthF") * Raster("NRW_BD") * 0.94 * 0.5

outCarbon.save("P:/NRW_Peatland_Accounting_NEC05964/Data/GIS/NRW_carbon ") # values in kg/m2

to calculate the sum of carbon in each habitat type I need to have a new raster that has the C stock values in each 50*50 grid cell.

sumCarbon = Raster("outCarbon") * 50 * 50

sumCarbon.save("P:/NRW_Peatland_Accounting_NEC05964/Data/GIS/NRW_sumC arbon") # values in kg/grid cell

Zonal stats to get the total carbon stocks for each habitat type

NERC SCIENCE OF THE ENVIRONMENT







BANGOR

Centre for Ecology & Hydrology Environment Centre Wales Deiniol Road Bangor Gwynedd LL57 2UW United Kingdom T: +44 (0)1248 374500 F: +44 (0)1248 362133

EDINBURGH

Centre for Ecology & Hydrology Bush Estate Penicuik Midlothian EH26 0QB United Kingdom T: +44 (0)131 4454343 F: +44 (0)131 4453943

LANCASTER

Centre for Ecology & Hydrology Lancaster Environment Centre Library Avenue Bailrigg Lancaster LA1 4AP United Kingdom T: +44 (0)1524 595800 F: +44 (0)1524 61536

WALLINGFORD - Headquarters Centre for Ecology & Hydrology Maclean Building Benson Lane Crowmarsh Gifford Wallingford Oxfordshire OX10 8BB United Kingdom T: +44 (0)1491 838800 F: +44 (0)1491 692424

