



Sveriges lantbruksuniversitet
Swedish University of Agricultural Sciences

This is an author produced version of a paper published in Acta agriculturae Scandinavica. Section A, Animal science. This paper has been peer-reviewed and is proof-corrected, but does not include the journal pagination.

Citation for the published paper:

Palmborg, Cecilia. (2012) Reed canary grass on an abandoned agricultural peat soil. Carbon dioxide emissions during two growing seasons after restoration. *Acta Agriculturae Scandinavica, Section A, Animal Science*.

Volume: 62, Number: 4, pp 238-241.

<http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/09064702.2013.770915>.

Access to the published version may require journal subscription.

Published with permission from: Taylor & Francis.

Standard set statement from the publisher:

"This is an Accepted Manuscript of an article published in ACTA AGRICULTURAE SCANDINAVICA. SECTION A: ANIMAL SCIENCE on 19 Apr 2013, available online: <http://www.tandfonline.com/10.1080/09064702.2013.770915>."

Epsilon Open Archive <http://epsilon.slu.se>

1 SHORT COMMUNICATION

2 **Reed canary grass on an abandoned agricultural peat soil. Carbon dioxide emissions**
3 **during two growing seasons after restoration.**

4 C. PALMBORG

5 *Department of Agricultural research for northern Sweden, Swedish University of Agricultural*
6 *Sciences, SE-90183, Umeå, Sweden, e-mail: Cecilia.Palmborg@slu.se. Tel. +46(0)90786871,*
7 *Fax: +46(0)907868162*

8 **Abstract**

9 Reed canary grass (RCG) can be a suitable energy crop on abandoned agricultural peatland
10 areas. It can be harvested for more than ten years without reestablishment, and nutrient
11 recycling to rhizomes makes the fertilizer demand low. A field near Malå in Sweden was
12 restored by improving drainage and sowing RCG in 2010. The first growing season there
13 were higher CO₂ emission from soil and lower groundwater level and water content on the
14 nearby field that was not restored, than on the reed canary grass field. The reason could be
15 compaction of peat on the restored field by agricultural machinery and higher transpiration
16 and respiration from vegetation on the abandoned field. The second growing season, the
17 groundwater level was raised on some plots. Neither carbon dioxide emissions nor the growth
18 of the RCG were affected by the higher groundwater level.

19 **Keywords:** *Groundwater level, pipe drainage, soil respiration*

20

21 **Introduction**

22 Reed canary grass, *Phalaris arundinacea* L. (RCG) is a tall wetland grass that grows wild
23 along sea and river shores and also in ditches and abandoned fields where it has been grown

24 for forage in the past. It is considered to be a suitable bioenergy crop for agricultural peatland
25 soil in Sweden and Finland. Reed canary grass has lower ash concentrations when grown on
26 peat soil than on mineral soils, and the high ash content is one of the major restrictions in use
27 of RCG as a fuel.

28 In the inland of Sweden vast areas of peatlands were ditched for agricultural purposes in the
29 19th century and the first half of the 20th century. These areas were largely abandoned during
30 the second half of the 20th century, mainly since many soils could not carry heavy machinery.
31 Lately, research has shown that these abandoned ditched areas are still emitting a lot of CO₂,
32 even though they are not used for agriculture today (Maljanen et al. 2007). Some of these
33 peatlands could be restored by deepening ditches and used for RCG cropping. Life cycle
34 analysis of RCG cropping on a former peat extraction site in Finland showed that this RCG
35 fuel had 40% less climate impact than coal (Shurpali et al. 2010). One obstacle for the
36 development of RCG on agricultural peatland is the European Union restrictions for
37 bioenergy crops on peatlands that are supposed to prevent CO₂ emissions from degradation of
38 peat. However, in northern Scandinavia, the effect of restoration of agricultural peatland to
39 RCG cropland on the emission of greenhouse gases is unknown and needs to be assessed.

40 The first aim of this study was to compare the CO₂-emissions of a newly restored agricultural
41 field cropped with RCG with an adjacent abandoned area. The second aim was to investigate
42 if it was possible to mitigate CO₂-emissions by elevation of the groundwater level during the
43 growing season.

44 **Materials and methods**

45 An abandoned agricultural field of 6 ha close to the lake Fårträsk, in Malå, Sweden, [65°11'N](#)
46 [18°45'E](#), was cleared from bush vegetation and partly pipe drained with 20 m between pipes,
47 partly drained by deepening the old open ditches. The peat was 0.5 – 1 m deep. The pipe

48 drained area was dominated by Carex peat with remains of deciduous trees while the area
49 with open ditches mainly had Sphagnum peat in the surface. On the pipe drained part, sedge
50 tussocks were removed before the soil preparation. All fields were graded by moving top soil
51 towards the middle of the narrow fields in order to facilitate surface runoff. This was most
52 successful on the part with the open ditches, where the narrow fields between the ditches were
53 20-25 m wide. On the pipe drained parts where the distance between the open ditches was 40-
54 50 m, surface water was often standing on some parts of the field after heavy rain. Two of the
55 pipe drained fields also had the possibility to regulate the groundwater level by turning up a
56 90° bend at the ends of the pipes to create a 50 cm deep water lock that prevented the outflow
57 of water from the pipes. On one of these latter fields an old road was following the open ditch
58 and the peat adjacent to the road was mixed with gravel. RCG was sown on the field in the
59 beginning of July 2010.

60 Carbon dioxide emissions from soil was measured using the EGM 4 portable equipment from
61 PP systems on PVC pipes with 10 cm diameter that were pressed 10 cm into the peat. Carbon
62 dioxide accumulating in the chamber was measured every 4.7 seconds during 80 seconds and
63 only readings with a linear accumulation of CO₂ during the last 10 measurements were used.
64 The pipes were installed once every season; 148 pipes were used 2010 and 128 pipes 2011.
65 Any vegetation within the pipe was removed before each measurement. At every other
66 measuring point, vegetation was cut also 40 cm around the pipe to prevent root ingrowth
67 under the pipe and connected vegetation-derived CO₂.

68 In the first season, measurements were made in a cross pattern on two places in one field with
69 open ditches and two places on the adjacent abandoned field. In each cross, 19 points were
70 measured with distances of 2-4 m between points. These measurements were used to create
71 semivariograms to determine spatial co-variation and to compare the RCG field with the
72 abandoned field. The difference between the factors 1) RCG or not 2) cut grass or not and 3)

73 low or high (more than 50 cm) surrounding grass, was tested using means for each
74 “treatment” for each cross with the two-level designs analysis of NCSS 8.

75 In the pipe drained fields an attempt to regulate the groundwater level by turning the pipes up
76 was made. On two fields eight plots were marked, each having two drainage pipes. On each
77 field, the two plots closest to the lake were considered to be one block and the two plots
78 further away from the lake one block. Using a randomized block design, the pipes of a plot
79 were either free draining or blocked by a water lock. CO₂ emission measurements were made
80 in the area between the two drainage pipes in 3 points close to the ditch and 6 points in the
81 middle of the field the first year and in 16 points at least 2 m apart in a zigzag-pattern
82 covering the plot area the second year. The first year, vegetation was cut 40 cm around 4
83 (every other) of the pipes. The second year, 3 of these cut areas on each plot were reused, but
84 without installing the pipe at exactly the same point. New non-vegetated areas were created
85 by glyphosate treatment in June and cutting of the killed vegetation one week later. Also the
86 old non-vegetated plots were glyphosate treated.

87 Ground water level was determined in 48 ground water pipes installed down to the bottom of
88 the peat layer. In each plot, Groundwater pipes were installed both close to and between the
89 drainage pipes and also close to the open ditch and in the middle of the field. Surface water
90 content was determined in 28 points using a profile probe PR2 calibrated with different
91 calibration functions determined from fixed volume sampling for a) the abandoned field, b)
92 gravel mixed peat and c) the remaining RCG field. Significant effects of groundwater
93 regulation and the cutting treatments were tested by General Linear Model in NCSS 8. The
94 significance level used was $p < 0.05$ for all statistical testing.

95 Vegetation biomass was sampled (three 0.25 m² samples, cut with a 2 cm stubble, evenly
96 distributed over the plots) from each plot in the pipe drained fields. The samples were dried
97 at 60°C to determine the dry weight (DW).

98 **Results and discussion**

99 The semivariograms made from the measurements in the field with open ditches and the
100 abandoned field in the first year showed no spatial co-variation on the scale 4-24 m. The CO₂
101 emissions were higher in the abandoned field than in the RCG field both on Sep 03 and Sep
102 22 (Figure 1). The distribution pattern was normal but there were some hot spots that were
103 outliers in both fields. Logarithmic transformation gave different results in the different fields
104 so it was not used. In Sep 22, the measuring points where vegetation had been cut, had a
105 lower CO₂ emissions. This shows that at least 28% of the CO₂ emission on the abandoned
106 field, and 14 % on the RCG field, derived from root or root associated respiration. Measuring
107 points close to the ditches on the RCG field also had lower CO₂ emissions. There the top soil
108 was thinner and vegetation was lower than on the middle of the field. The groundwater level
109 was lower in the abandoned field (57-78 cm from soil surface) than the RCG field (49-63 cm
110 from soil surface) and soil water content also was lower: 0.54-0.55 g H₂O/ml soil on the
111 abandoned field and 0.73-0.74 g H₂O/ml soil on the RCG field. The reason for the impeded
112 drainage on the RCG field could be differences in peat hydraulic conductance and also
113 compaction by the heavy machinery used for drainage and soil preparation of the RCG field.
114 When equipment was installed we noticed that the soil was softer in the abandoned field.
115 Since no reference measurements were done before the restoration, the lower CO₂ emission
116 on the RCG field could be an inherent difference in soil properties, an effect of soil
117 compaction, or an effect of lower primary production allocated below ground during the
118 establishment year. Soil compaction in wheel ruts led has been shown to give lower CO₂
119 emissions on stump harvested podzolic soils (Strömngren et al. 2012).

120 In the experiment with regulation of the groundwater level, the groundwater level was
121 significantly higher in regulated plots in June 2011 only. In 2010 and later in the season 2011
122 many groundwater pipes were empty most of the time. Groundwater means for freely draining

123 plots were 80-93 cm and regulated plots 66-86 cm from ground level. CO₂ emission rate was
124 never significantly affected by groundwater regulation. Amount of RCG biomass at the end of
125 the season (mean value was 790 g DW*m⁻²) was also not affected by the regulation. The
126 precipitation in the summer of 2011 was higher than normal both in June, July and August.
127 The measured soil moisture in the surface soil was high at all (measurements means of 0.71-
128 0.72 g H₂O/ml soil). Plant production and soil microbial activity probably never was water
129 limited. Generally a lowering of the water table of peatlands should increase CO₂ emissions,
130 but the effects are in reality very complex. In a review, Laiho (2006) suggests that peats that
131 are already well decomposed due to a long term exposure to air, are more resistant to further
132 decomposition, and thus less affected by drainage. This would be true for our site in Malå,
133 which has long been used for agriculture.

134 The presence of vegetation around the measurement pipes enhanced CO₂ emissions
135 significantly in 2011 but not in 2010. Also, in 2011 the difference between vegetated and non-
136 vegetated measurement points increased during the season to a maximum of 33% in August
137 (Figure 2). The difference between points cut already in 2010 and points cut only in 2011
138 prevailed two and a half months after the killing of the vegetation. This shows that in a boreal
139 climate microbial respiration from dead roots can still constitute a substantial part of the CO₂
140 emission after one growing season. Similarly, Norberg et al. (2012) found a reduction of CO₂
141 emissions by 30- 40% on non-vegetated plots compared to the surrounding grassland on
142 agricultural peat soil in southern Sweden.

143 In conclusion, there was no indication that restoration of abandoned agricultural field to reed
144 canary grass production gave higher carbon dioxide emissions from decomposition of the peat
145 substrate than the abandoned field. More research is needed to be able to quantify carbon
146 dioxide emissions on a yearly basis from the field.

147

148 **References**

- 149 Laiho, R. (2006). Decomposition in peatlands: Reconciling seemingly contrasting results on
150 the impacts of lowered water levels. *Soil Biology & Biochemistry* 38, 2011-2024.
- 151 Maljanen, M., Hytonen, J., Makiranta, P., Alm, J., Minkkinen, K., Laine, J. & Martikainen,
152 P.J. (2007). Greenhouse gas emissions from cultivated and abandoned organic
153 croplands in Finland. *Boreal Environment Research* 12, 133-140.
- 154 Norberg, L., Berglund, Ö. & Berglund, K. (2012). Mitigating greenhouse gas emissions from
155 cultivated organic soils Carrots, pastures, barley or potatoes? Which crop to chose? In
156 T. Magnusson et al. (ed.) *Peatlands in Balance. The 14th International Peat*
157 *Congress*. (Stockholm, Sweden), Extended abstract no. 148
- 158 Shurpali, N.J., Strandman, H., Kilpelainen, A., Huttunen, J., Hyvonen, N., Biasi, C.,
159 Kellomaki, S. & Martikainen, P.J. (2010). Atmospheric impact of bioenergy based on
160 perennial crop (reed canary grass, *Phalaris arundinaceae*, L.) cultivation on a drained
161 boreal organic soil. *Global Change Biology Bioenergy* 2, 130-138.
- 162 Strömngren, M., Mjöfors, K., Holmström, B. & Grelle, A. (2012). Soil CO₂ Flux During the
163 First Years After Stump Harvesting in Two Swedish Forests. *Silva Fennica* 46, 67-79.

164

165

166

167

168


169

170

171

172

173 Figure 1



174

175

176

177 Figure 1: Soil respiration measured in September 2010 in a newly established reed canary

178 grass (RCG) field and an adjacent field where agriculture ceased in the 1960's (abandoned).

179 The middle line shows the median, the box the 25% and 75% percentiles, the whiskers the

180 10% and the 90% percentiles and the dots the outliers. n=33-38 measurement points.

181

182

183

184

185


186

187

188 Figure 2

189

190



191

192

193 Figure 2. Soil respiration from plots with free draining pipes (low groundwater, gw) or water

194 lock regulated drainage pipes (high gw). Points cut 2010 were also kept free of vegetation

195 2011. Means and SE of four plots per treatment. Soil temperature is means from 7 cm depth

196 from all measurement points.

197