#### Carbon Sequestration in Coastal Freshwater Peatlands: A Market Credit Tool for Restoration

Funded by

#### U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Region 4 & The Nature Conservancy, NC Chapter

Curtis Richardson<sup>1</sup>, Neal Flanagan<sup>1</sup>, Hongjun Wang<sup>1</sup>, & Mengchi Ho<sup>1</sup>

&

Sara Ward<sup>2</sup>, and Tom Augspurger<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Duke University Wetland Center, Nicholas School of the Environment <sup>2</sup>U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Region 4

### Outline

- Importance of restoring agricultural peatlands and drained wetlands
- Conceptual C credit accounting plan USFWS
- Experimental site description
- Questions
  - Does hydrologic restoration increase GHG flux?
  - Does restoration increase C and N Sequestration?
  - What controls C sequestration ?
  - Conclusions





(325 Tg C)

Drained and converted organic soils in agriculture that have potential for increased greenhouse gas losses (unpublished map from NC RAMSAR working group)







## Wetland Restoration

Recommended expansion of restoration at Pocosin Lakes NWR



### Why?

- Peatland restoration allows substantive C and N sequestration benefits
- Refuge habitat improvement
- Reduces nutrient runoff to estuaries

## 1) Amount retained that would be lost without restoration (stop loss)



where CF = conversion factors for ft<sup>2</sup>/ac and lb/kg

- Rate of peat loss when drained 0.03 ft/yr
- Bulk density 0.2 g/cm<sup>3</sup>
- Peat nitrogen content 1.35%
- Peat carbon content 43%

#### = 190 lb N/ac/yr and 6100 lb C/ac/yr

## Off-Set Accounting

Components of estimate:		Sequestration Nitrogen	Nitrogen (ID/ac/yr)	
1)	amount retained that would otherwise be lost without hydrology restoration	190	6100	
2)	amount retained in peat as soil genesis is re- established	7	230	
3)	amount retained in the above ground biomass	0.6	140	
	τοται ·	200	6500	

200

0 J 0 0



#### (Peat Fire June –September 2008)

#### (How much C was lost?)



#### 16,814 ha Burned

## 9.9 Tg C lost

#### Mickler and Welch 2012

Large Scale Hydrology-Carbon Sequestration Experiment

## Pocosins Lake National Wildlife Refuge in Coastal NC



#### Pocosin Lakes National Wildlife Refuge

#### **Experimental Design**





#### Reference • REF Restored • B-7, C-2, D-11 Drained • C-14

Outflow Sampler

OW Ier



#### 500 x 500 ft



#### Tree Shrub Herb



Reference

Restored D11

Restored C2

Restored B7



Drained C14

#### Above-ground Biomass in Three Hydrologic Regimes in Pocosin Lakes National Wildlife Refuge





Litter Accumulation Rates in Pocosins by Species & Hydrology Treatments





#### **Decomposition rates in drained, restored and reference pocosins** (**Preliminary data from Tim Moore, McGill**)



DIC



TOC





## Does Hydrologic Restoration Alone Control GHG Flux? &

# Which GHG is the **Dominant Contributor?**



## Average By Treatment













## Average By Treatment



## Questions

- How does this peat exist under such low summer water tables?
- What controls CO<sub>2</sub> production in unsaturated peatlands? Phenolic cpds possible microbial block (Bridgham and Richardson, 2003)
- What are the responses of these peatlands to drought and can they resist drought effects? (Wang Ho and Richardson 2012)

## Drought

- Low precipitation, drainage for agriculture and forest
- Aerobic decay

#### More CO2



**Figure 2** The biogeochemical 'cascade', whereby constraints on decomposition are removed by severe drought in oligotrophic peatlands. Oxygen stimulates bacterial growth rates (A), modest CO<sub>2</sub> release and *de novo* synthesis of phenol oxidase (B), leading to a decline in inhibitory phenolics (C). Lower inhibitor abundances enable further stimulation of microbial metabolism and edaphic hydrolases (D). Increased cleavage of carbon and nutrients through stimulated hydrolases (E) provides resources and more favourable pH (when waterlogging returns) for enhanced microbial activity and abundance (F), and hence *de novo* production of hydrolases, phenol oxidases and maximum CO<sub>2</sub> emissions (G), but also a direct nutrient-driven stimulation of enzyme activities (H). Positive feedbacks accelerating carbon losses are shown (red) including physicochemical phenolic removal (dotted line).

#### Fenner and Freeman, 2011

#### Drought unlocks carbon historically restored in boreal peatland

Generally, such phenomenon occurs in saturated peatlands,

## However, Unsaturated peatlands?



**Figure 3** | Effects of the 2006 severe natural drought (water table 30 cm below surface) on oligotrophic peatland net CO<sub>2</sub> flux. CO<sub>2</sub> losses increase during the drought but are further accelerated during the re-wet phase. Light and dark shading denote replicate wetlands A and B respectively. The mean of five sampling stations averaged over distinct four-month periods (before, during and 1 year after the event, at 10 cm depth) is shown. Error bars denote s.e.m.

Fenner and Freeman, 2011

#### (Wang, Ho and Richardson in Prep, Poster 336)



site

Figure 3. Temporal variation of CO<sub>2</sub> emission during drought incubation of peat monoliths from drained, natural and restored Pocosin peatland sites.

(Wang, Ho and Richardson in Prep, poster 336)



Figure 1. Temporal variations of soil moisture (A), soluble and polyphenol (B), labile polysaccharide (C) and phenol oxidase activity(D) during the drought incubation of peat monolith from natural, drained & restored Pocosin sites.

#### (Wang, Ho and Richardson in Prep, poster 336)

#### Phenolics-latch for CO<sub>2</sub> production



Log (Soluble polyphenol ( $\mu$ g g<sup>-1</sup> dry soil)) Inorganic nitrogen ( $\mu$ g N g<sup>-1</sup> dry soil) Figure 4. Soluble polyphenol (A) and inorganic nitrogen (B, NH<sub>4</sub><sup>+</sup>+ NO<sub>x</sub><sup>-</sup>) vs. CO<sub>2</sub> emission during the initial 60-day drought incubation of all peat monoliths

#### **Properties of Soil and Plants in the Pocosin Study Sites in Coastal NC**

	Natural site	Drained site	Restored site
pH <sup>p</sup>	3.7±0.0 <sup>b</sup>	4.3±0.1ª	3.9±.01 <sup>b</sup>
LOI (%) <sup>s</sup>	95.7±0.6ª	<b>92.0</b> ±1.2 <sup>b</sup>	96.3±0.7ª
Total N (%) <sup>s</sup>	1.5±0.1ª	1.2±0.1 <sup>b</sup>	1.3±0.1 <sup>ab</sup>
Total C (%) <sup>s</sup>	53.4±1.0ª	53.1±0.8ª	56.0±1.1ª
Total P (µg g <sup>-1</sup> ) <sup>s</sup>	327.2±25.3ª	378.1±45.2ª	395.6±54.9ª
NOx <sup>-</sup> -N (µg g <sup>-1</sup> ) <sup>k,s</sup>	7.6±1.0 <sup>b</sup>	16.3±3.1ª	13.0±0.9 <sup>ab</sup>
NH <sub>4</sub> <sup>+</sup> -N (µg g <sup>-1</sup> ) <sup>k,s</sup>	87.1±21.5ª	45.8±8.1 <sup>ab</sup>	4.1±1.7 <sup>b</sup>
C/N in leaves	48.7±4.2ª	<b>29.3±3.2</b> <sup>b</sup>	51.1±3.3ª
C/N in stems	135.6±10.7ª	75.9±14.4 <sup>b</sup>	144.4±10.4ª
Phenolics (mg C g <sup>-1</sup> ) <sup>I</sup>	56.1±6.1ª	14.9±1.0 <sup>b</sup>	63.3±6.1ª

(Wang, Ho and Richardson in Prep, Poster 336)

## **Conclusion and application**

- Build-up polyphenol inhibit CO2 production under drought (weakens drought effects)
- Moderate drought might increase C accumulation (similar with restored site results)
- Altered species composition caused by drainage or by severe drought results in decreased polyphenol in soil & increased CO<sub>2</sub> flux
- Nitrogen deposition stimulates CO2 flux



#### Potential Peatland Restoration sites



