

1 Forests on drained agricultural peatland are potentially 2 large sources of greenhouse gases – insights from a full 3 rotation period simulation

4
5 H. He¹, P.- E. Jansson², M. Svensson², J. Björklund^{1, 3}, L. Tarvainen^{4, 5}, L.
6 Klemedtsson¹ and Å. Kasimir¹

7 [1]{Department of Earth Sciences, University of Gothenburg, Gothenburg, Sweden }

8 [2]{Department of Land and Water Resources Engineering, Royal Institute of Technology
9 (KTH), Stockholm, Sweden }

10 [3]{Swiss Federal Institute for Forest, Snow and Landscape Research (WSL), Birmensdorf,
11 Switzerland }

12 [4]{Department of Forest Ecology and Management, Swedish University of Agricultural
13 Sciences, Umeå, Sweden }

14 [5]{Department of Biological and Environmental Sciences, University of Gothenburg,
15 Gothenburg, Sweden }

16
17 Correspondence to: H. He (hongxing.he@gvc.gu.se)

18 19 **Abstract**

20 The CoupModel was used to simulate a Norway Spruce forest on fertile drained peat over 60-
21 years, from planting in 1951 until 2011, describing abiotic, biotic and greenhouse gas (GHG)
22 emissions (CO₂ and N₂O). By calibrating the model against tree ring data we obtained a
23 ‘vegetation fitted’ model by which we were able to describe the fluxes and controlling factors
24 over the 60 years. We discuss some conceptual issues relevant to improving the model in
25 order to better understand peat soil simulations. However, the present model was able to
26 describe the most important ecosystem dynamics such as the plant biomass development and
27 GHG emissions. The GHG fluxes are composed of two important quantities, the Spruce forest
28 carbon (C) uptake, 413 g C m⁻² yr⁻¹ and the decomposition of peat soil, 399 g C m⁻² yr⁻¹. N₂O
29 emissions contribute to the GHG emissions by 0.7 g N m⁻² yr⁻¹, corresponding to 76 g C m⁻²

1 yr⁻¹. The 60-year-old Spruce forest has an accumulated biomass of 16.0 kg C m⁻². However,
2 over this period, 26.4 kg C m⁻² GHG has been added to the atmosphere, which means a net
3 addition of GHG emissions. The main losses are from the peat soil and, indirectly, from forest
4 thinning products, which we assume have a short lifetime. We conclude that after harvest at
5 an age of 80 years, most of the stored biomass carbon is liable to be released, the system
6 having captured C only temporarily and with a cost of disappeared peat, adding CO₂ to the
7 atmosphere.

8

9 **1 Introduction**

10 Peatlands contain around one third of the carbon (C) stored in global soils, which is
11 equivalent to almost half that present in the atmosphere (FAO, 2012; IPCC, 2013).
12 Undisturbed peatlands accumulate C as partially decayed vegetation, and the decay processes
13 emit C in the form of carbon dioxide (CO₂) and methane (CH₄). Overall, the net greenhouse
14 gas (GHG) balance of the ecosystem photosynthesis and respiration is generally positive, thus
15 peatlands are considered to be C sinks contributing to an attenuation of climate change
16 (Gorham, 1991). However, when peatlands are drained for intensified land use, i.e. agriculture
17 or forestry, the stored peat starts to decompose aerobically. The accelerated soil
18 decomposition emits large amounts of CO₂, in contrast CH₄ emissions are greatly reduced,
19 possibly even accounting for a net uptake of atmospheric CH₄ (Limpens et al., 2008). The
20 decomposition also releases nitrogen, and another powerful GHG, nitrous oxide (N₂O), could
21 also be produced, primarily through microbial nitrification and denitrification processes
22 (Firestone and Davidson, 1989). Globally, peatlands cover only 3% of the Earth surface
23 among which 10% - 20% of the total peatlands have been drained for agriculture or forestry,
24 mainly in the boreal and tropical regions (FAO, 2012). However, these small areas emit
25 around 6% of the global annual anthropogenic GHG emissions (IPCC, 2013).

26 To date, a number of studies have investigated the size of GHG fluxes from managed
27 peatlands with different land uses, together with their interactions with environmental factors
28 e.g. (Kasimir Klemedtsson et al., 1997; Von Arnold et al., 2005a; Von Arnold et al., 2005b;
29 Alm et al., 2007; Beek et al., 2010; Lund et al., 2010; Lohila et al., 2011; Ojanen et al., 2013).
30 Several factors have been found to influence the size of the emissions, including the
31 groundwater level (GWL), land use intensity, climate zones, and soil fertility (Klemedtsson et
32 al., 2005; Drösler et al., 2008; Leppelt et al., 2014). In general, nutrient rich fens with deep
33 GWL are larger GHG sources than ombrotrophic bogs with shallow GWL, while intensive

1 land use in tropical/temperate regions have much higher emissions than extensive land use in
2 boreal regions (Byrne et al., 2004). Peatlands in Europe used as grassland, agricultural land,
3 peat cuts, and abandoned peat are generally found to be net GHG sources (Byrne et al., 2004;
4 Drösler et al., 2008). However, forested drained peatland can be everything from a source to a
5 small GHG sink due to the growing forest, where the net primary production (NPP) of trees
6 and understorey vegetation balances the soil emissions (Drösler et al., 2008; Klemedtsson et
7 al., 2008; Hommeltenberg et al., 2014). Previous flux measurement studies have also shown
8 contradictory results. Measurements from Scandinavia and Great Britain have shown the NPP
9 to compensate for the soil CO₂ release, and thus the forests to act as net sinks (Hargreaves et
10 al., 2003; Von Arnold et al., 2005a; Von Arnold et al., 2005b; Ojanen et al., 2013).
11 Hommeltenberg et al., (2014) also reported an afforested drained bog in southern Germany to
12 be a net GHG sink; however, if the 44-year history of the forest were included in the analysis,
13 then the so-called ‘long-term carbon balance’, showed the forest to be an overall GHG source.
14 Von Arnold et al., (2005a) showed that accounting for N₂O in the greenhouse budget
15 calculation could shift drained birch peatlands from being minor GHG sinks into sources.
16 This was also shown by Meyer et al., (2013) for a drained former agricultural peat soil with
17 spruce forest, where soil N₂O emissions, in terms of global warming potential (265 times of
18 CO₂ in a 100-year perspective, IPCC, 2013), offset half the net ecosystem exchange (NEE).
19 Large N₂O emissions are most pronounced for fertile soils like former agricultural peatlands
20 (Klemedtsson et al., 2005). So far most studies have only covered a few years at most.
21 Consequently we still lack an understanding of the full GHG balance when viewed over the
22 full forest rotation (Maljanen et al., 2010).

23 In the present study we aim to address this knowledge gap by exploring the GHG balance for
24 a Norway Spruce (*Picea abies*) forest on drained agricultural peatland (Skogaryd Research
25 Site: <http://www.fieldsites.se/en/field-research-stations>) over a full rotational time period.
26 Since measurements are mostly short-term, and because it is not possible to directly upscale
27 the measured fluxes to the entire forest rotation period (Drösler et al., 2008; Hommeltenberg
28 et al., 2014), we chose a modeling approach based on emission data over five years and data
29 on forest growth rate over 45 years for a Spruce forest on former agricultural peatland. This
30 study forms a continuation of that by He et al., (2016), in which the process-based model
31 ‘CoupModel’ (Jansson, 2012) was calibrated to simulate the water, heat, and major C and N
32 processes for the Skogaryd Research Site.

33 **1.1 Conceptual model of drained peatland for forestry**

1 When peatlands are drained for forestry or agriculture, resulting in a lower GWL, the aerobic
2 soil volume increases (Fig. 1a). The previously water-logged peat soil then decomposes
3 aerobically, losing soil C stock and also causing a lowering of the soil surface (surface
4 subsidence) (Eggelsmann, 1976; Hooijer et al., 2012). During the first few decades after
5 planting, the development of plant roots and leaf area cover increases the transpiration rate, so
6 deepening the GWL (Fig. 1b). In other words, a growing forest will, in part, help to keep the
7 soil drained. However, drainage becomes less efficient with time due to subsidence and
8 ditches becoming filled with litter and moss, all of which can lead to an increased GWL (Fig.
9 1c), which is why ditch maintenance is performed regularly. After ditch maintenance the
10 forest ecosystem restarts at the well-drained state (Fig. 1d), until the final clear-cutting when
11 re-drainage has to be conducted. The entire cycle then starts again and can continue until all
12 the peat is gone.

13

14 **2 Material and methods**

15 **2.1 Site description**

16 Data used for the present study were obtained from the Skogaryd research site, located in
17 southwest Sweden (58°23'N, 12°09'E), which is part of the Swedish Infrastructure for
18 Ecosystem Science (SITES, www.fieldsites.se). The drained peat area at Skogaryd was
19 previously a fen, classified as mesotrophic peat with a peat depth of more than 1 m, according
20 to the soil classification scheme suggested by Karlsson (1989). It was initially drained by
21 ditches in the 1870s and then used for agriculture until 1951. Norway Spruce (*P. abies*) was
22 then planted and the stand is now a mature mixed coniferous forest dominated by Norway
23 Spruce (95% by stem volume), with a sparse presence of Scots pine (*Pinus sylvestris*) and
24 Silver birch (*Betula pubescens*) (Klemedtsson et al., 2010). The site has been intensively
25 measured and monitored since 2006, providing abiotic and biotic data including CO₂ and N₂O
26 fluxes that could be used to validate the long-term model predictions. More detailed site
27 description can be found in He et al., (2016), Klemedtsson et al., (2010), Meyer et al. (2013)
28 and Ernfors et al. (2010).

29 **2.2 Brief introduction to the CoupModel**

30 The CoupModel (coupled heat and mass transfer model for soil-plant-atmosphere systems) is
31 an updated version of the previous SOIL and SOILN model (Jansson and Moon, 2001). The

1 main model structure is a one-dimensional, layered soil depth profile, in which the water,
2 heat, and C and N dynamics are simulated based on detailed descriptions of soil physical and
3 biogeochemical processes. C and N dynamics are simulated both in the soil and in the plant,
4 driven by the canopy-intercepted radiation, regulated by multiplicative response functions of
5 air temperature, and plant availability of water and N. Two vegetation layers are simulated in
6 the model, the Spruce tree and the understorey layer (e.g. grasses and shrubs) (He et al.,
7 2016). The model is available at <http://www.coupmodel.com/>. A detailed description of the
8 model, its parameterization and setup is given in He et al., (2016); here only the variables and
9 parameters with different values are reported.

10 **2.3 Model approach and design**

11 The CoupModel conceptually divides the soil organic matter (SOM) into two pools called soil
12 litter (fresh plant detritus) and humus, constituting a fast and a slow decomposing pool,
13 respectively (Johnsson et al., 1987). When soil litter decays carbon is either released as CO₂,
14 or adds into a resistant fraction, the humus pool (Johnsson et al., 1987). In this study, the soil
15 humus pool was used to represent the old stored soil peat. Thus soil decomposition is
16 composed of both peat decomposition (called humus decomposition in the model) and soil
17 litter decomposition. Besides, CoupModel conceptualizes the soil profile into a number of soil
18 layers, where the soil's physical structure (defined by the measured water retention
19 characteristics) and the drainage depth (a parameter used for estimation of horizontal flow of
20 water out of the site due to drainage) is assumed to be fixed over time (Figs 1e and 1f), with
21 the drainage depth set to 0.5 m as in He et al., (2016). Though the drainage depth is a very
22 important parameter for the simulated GWL, a fixed drainage level is not to be confused with
23 a fixed GWL as the latter is simulated (see Fig 5f). The subsidence of the soil surface and any
24 variation in drainage (Figs 1a, 1b, 1c and 1d) during the plant development years (1951 to
25 2011) cannot explicitly be simulated. We thus make the following assumptions to simplify the
26 system:

27 First, the soil layers are assumed the same over the 60 years simulated. And the soil physical
28 characteristics in 1951 are assumed the same as measured in 2006; possibly not fully true but
29 better than introducing uncertain numbers, and could be argued reasonable since 1) this site
30 has been drained for many years (starting in 19th century), why physical soil compaction
31 should not be important during the last 60 years, and 2) soil properties were not found to be
32 the major GHG emission influencing factor (He et al., 2016). A range of drainage depth was

1 used to quantify the model's sensitivity. The lower end of the range was chosen to be a
2 drainage depth of 0.3 m, since this has been suggested to be the minimum requirement to
3 sustain forest productivity on drained peatlands (Sarkkola et al., 2010; Ojanen et al., 2013).
4 The higher drainage level, 0.8 m, was set according to general forest management practices
5 and also took into consideration the fact that our simulated soil depth only reaches a
6 maximum of 1 m.

7 Second, in order to define the initial soil C content in 1951, we use the soil C measurements
8 made at Skogaryd in 2007, back-calculated to 1951 by assuming an annual peat loss of 260 g
9 C m⁻² yr⁻¹ from 1951 to 2007, Table 2. This annual loss was taken from the recent IPCC
10 wetland supplement (IPCC, 2014), where it represents the emission factor for forest on
11 drained nutrient-rich peatlands in the temperate region. The model's sensitivity to this initial
12 condition was assessed by varying IPCC emission factors (EF's) between 200 and 330 g C m⁻²
13 yr⁻¹ when calculating total soil C in 1951, Table 2. In addition, an extremely large initial soil
14 C is also used in the sensitivity analysis which was back-calculated using the highest peat
15 decomposition rate of 630 g C m⁻² yr⁻¹ (Meyer et al., 2013) measured at Skogaryd during
16 2008 (Table 2). The back calculated total soil C is assumed uniformly distributed in the soil
17 profile of 1 meter depth, based on the measured data in 2007 (He et al., 2016).

18 Third, the soil C / N ratio in 1951 is assumed to be the same as measured in 2006, and the N
19 deposition rate was also assumed to be constant as in He et al., (2016) during the entire
20 simulated period. The model's sensitivity to this was tested by varying the initial soil C / N
21 ratio between 20 and 45, the latter being a value measured at a nearby un-drained peatland
22 near Skogaryd.

23 Fourth, similar to the previous calibration study, the model only simulates the C and N
24 dynamics in the uppermost 1 m depth of soil.

25 The model was initially run with the calibrated single parameter representation using the same
26 mean parameter values as used by He et al., (2016). However, each calibrated parameter has a
27 range of possible values, its so-called posterior distribution, which we varied in order to fit the
28 model results to the 45 year (1966 to 2011) tree-ring-derived biomass data and extended
29 abiotic data (2006 to 2011). We call the model parameterized to fit those data the 'vegetation
30 fitted' model, used for sensitivity analysis by varying the drainage depth, initial soil C, as well
31 as the initial soil C / N ratio.

32 **2.4 Tree ring sampling and data processing**

1 The previous calibration of the CoupModel mainly focused on the soil processes while plant
2 development was less emphasized (He et al., 2016). In order to calibrate the model results of
3 the plant biomass development, we acquired incremental core samples from the Spruce trees
4 in Skogaryd during spring 2013, to estimate forest biomass. In total, 25 samples were
5 obtained from randomly chosen trees. The cores were taken at breast height (1.3 m above
6 ground). The annual growth rings in the tree cores were cross-dated according to standard
7 dendrochronological methods (Stokes and Smiley, 1968) to assign an exact calendar year of
8 formation to each ring. Tree ring width data were obtained by analysis of scanned images of
9 carefully surfaced cores using the software CooRecorder (cybis.se). The annual variation in
10 height growth was modeled with the Korf's function using cumulative radial growth during
11 the previous years, calibrated by extensive inventory data, collected in 2010 (Meyer et al.,
12 2013). Since the inventory data lacked information concerning trees with a diameter smaller
13 than 10 cm, and because the sample depth of trees decreases back in time, the forest biomass
14 calculations were only considered to be valid from 1966 (a date when all trees had a diameter
15 above 10 cm and the sample replication was complete). The forest biomass was calculated for
16 stem, living branches, dead branches, stumps and roots including fine roots, following the
17 allometric equations (Marklund, 1988) for Spruce in Minkkinen et al., (2001) and Meyer et
18 al., (2013), using the inputs of measured annually resolved radial growth and modeled annual
19 longitudinal growth. The total biomass of the tree stands was calculated as a sum of the
20 average biomass of the individual trees, where the planting density was assumed to be 3000
21 trees ha⁻¹, which was a typical planting density during the 1950s in Sweden (Drossler et al.,
22 2013). A thinning was conducted by the land owner in 1979 when the number of trees was
23 reduced to a ca. 1000 trees ha⁻¹, according to the survey data presented in Meyer et al. (2013).
24 Using these tree ring biomass data, the thinning management was estimated to have removed
25 72% of the Spruce biomass. The forest thinning practices was assumed and made according to
26 general Swedish forest management guidelines (Svensson et al., 2008). In addition, a heavy
27 storm hit Skogaryd forest in 2010 and blew down 10% of the tree biomass. The fallen trees
28 were removed from the experimental site after the storm event. Therefore an additional
29 harvest was included in the CoupModel to simulate this removal of storm-fallen biomass.

30 **2.5 Data for model forcing**

31 To drive the model, we used daily mean meteorological data (1961 to 2011) from the Swedish
32 Meteorological and Hydrological Institute (SMHI) Sätenäs station (58°44'N, 12°71'E),
33 (www.smhi.se) situated approximately 60 km east of Skogaryd. Precipitation, air temperature,

1 wind speed and relative humidity data from Såtenäs were strongly correlated ($R^2 > 0.8$) with
2 those from Skogaryd from 2006 to 2011, and were of similar magnitude. Another driving
3 variable needed in CoupModel is the global short wave radiation. As these data are not
4 available from Såtenäs station, they were deduced by the model from the potential global
5 radiation and atmospheric turbidity, using the measured total cloud-cover fraction (for more
6 details see <http://www.coupmodel.com>). Since meteorological data were only available from
7 1961, the meteorological data from 1961 to 1971 were duplicated to represent the climate
8 between 1951 and 1961.

9 **2.6 GHG budget compilation**

10 For a total GHG budget of the system we include harvest removal and products. We assume
11 that the biomass removed by thinning management in 1979 and the storm harvest in 2010 was
12 mainly used for paper production, as is common practice in Sweden (Swedish Forest Agency,
13 2005). We therefore use the emission factors suggested in the IPCC guidelines (IPCC, 2006),
14 in which paper is assumed to decay exponentially with a half-life of 2 years.

15

16 **3 Results**

17 **3.1 Model performance**

18 **3.1.1 Plant and soil development from 1951 to 2011**

19 The simulated tree biomass dynamics during the 60 years agrees well with the estimated tree
20 biomass from radial growth observations beginning in 1966. After an initial phase of slow
21 growth during the establishment of the Spruce trees' leaf area, growth increased almost
22 linearly (Fig. 2d). The slow establishment of the Spruce in the first decade was probably due
23 to competition from grasses and other field vegetation. The Spruce's gradually increased their
24 leaf (needles) cover until a closed canopy formed in the 1980s with a maximum leaf area
25 index (LAI) of around 6, which was similar to field measurements (Fig. 2b). The simulated
26 annual average Spruce tree growth over the whole period is $413 \text{ g C m}^{-2} \text{ yr}^{-1}$ with the
27 maximum growth rate of $848 \text{ g C m}^{-2} \text{ yr}^{-1}$ in 1974 (Fig. 2c). However, the 'vegetation fitted'
28 model generally shows underestimation of the plant growth before 1970s, which is probably
29 due to the model's difficulty to distribute the importance of the Spruce tree and the
30 understorey layer. The underestimation of Spruce tree growth for the first 20 years suggests

1 an overestimation of the modeled understory layer. The LAI and the NPP of Spruce
2 generally follow the dynamics of the plant's ability to intercept radiation (Fig. 2a); however,
3 the model slightly overestimates annual Spruce tree growth from the 1970s to the 1990s, and
4 underestimates it from 1996 until 2011 (Fig. 2c). Furthermore, the large increase of simulated
5 plant growth observed in 2006 was not observed in the tree ring data. The total tree biomass
6 in 2011 is modeled to be 16.0 kg C m^{-2} , which is very similar to the biomass estimated from
7 the tree ring data, 16.2 kg C m^{-2} (Fig. 2d). The thinning conducted in 1979 removed 6.8 kg C
8 m^{-2} plant biomass, and the storm in 2010 caused an additional removal of 1.8 kg C m^{-2} ; these
9 quantities were used for indirect emission calculations (Fig. 2d). The modeled amounts of leaf
10 and root biomass in 2007 also match estimations using allometric equations reported by
11 Meyer et al., (2013). The modeled and estimated values for leaf biomass were 0.95 and 1.06
12 kg C m^{-2} , respectively, and the values for total roots (both coarse roots ($> 2 \text{ mm}$) and fine
13 roots ($< 2 \text{ mm}$)) were 2.9 and 3.0 kg C m^{-2} , respectively. The modeled value for Spruce stem
14 biomass was 12.8 kg C m^{-2} , which was higher than the estimated 11.2 kg C m^{-2} . This
15 discrepancy may be explained by the estimated total Spruce tree biomass by Meyer et al.
16 (2013) being smaller than that estimated from tree ring data. The maximum biomass of
17 understory vegetation was simulated to be around 2 kg C m^{-2} 10 years after planting, but it
18 decreased gradually thereafter (Fig. 2e).

19 Table 1 shows the soil C budget of each modeled soil layer (down to 1 m) in 1951 and 2011.
20 The soil C content at the uppermost 5 cm layer increases due to the addition of plant litterfall
21 (Fig. 3), where the modeled C content in the first meter of soil is shown to match the observed
22 data. Except the deepest layer, the other soil layers all lose soil C where losses decrease by
23 depth. This is due to a soil water content increase, where decomposition is zero in the
24 saturated soil (like the 90-100 cm layer) (Table 1). Over the whole of the simulated 60 years,
25 the accumulated soil litter decomposition almost equaled that of the soil peat (treated as
26 humus in the model), where *ca.* 80% of the litter is respired and the rest adds into the resistant
27 soil C fraction, the soil peat (called humus formation in the figure). Over the 60 years, the soil
28 litter was close to balance as the accumulated plant litterfall almost equal to the accumulated
29 soil litter decomposition and humus formation (Fig. 3). Thus the total losses of soil C are
30 mostly from decomposition of historical soil peat.

31 **3.1.2 Comparing vegetation fitted model output with observational data** 32 **from 2006 to 2011**

1 The simulation beginning in 1951 using the ‘vegetation fitted’ model showed a good fit with
2 data collected during 2006 until 2011 of GWL, total net radiation and soil temperature data.
3 The linear correlations between the simulated and measured data were all above 0.8 with the
4 mean errors close to zero (Fig. 4). Discrepancies were found in May 2010, when the measured
5 GWL peaked (high GWL) which by the model was underestimated (Fig. 4c), and during
6 summers and autumns when the model overestimated both radiation and soil temperature
7 (Figs 4a, 4b). Besides showing reasonable description of abiotic factors, the model results
8 were also similar to observed data between 2007 and 2008 on NEE flux, both in terms of
9 seasonal pattern and magnitude (Fig. 4d). However, the simulations seem to slightly
10 underestimate the CO₂ uptake during summertime and overestimate the respiration flux in the
11 autumn (Fig. 4). The model performance for N₂O emissions was generally similar as in the
12 previous calibration study (He et al., 2016), where the annual emission size was reasonably
13 simulated but the model had some difficulties in capturing every measured emission peak.

14 **3.2 GHG balance**

15 **3.2.1 Annual NEE and N₂O from 1951 to 2011**

16 The annual 60-year NPP for the Spruce forest, including biomass and litter, was on average
17 673 g C m⁻² with less than 100 g C m⁻² during the first 10 years after planting, and with a
18 value that fluctuates around 1000 g C m⁻² yr⁻¹ over the last 40 years (Fig. 5b). Peat respiration
19 (decomposition) shows a slight decreasing trend during the simulated period, with an annual
20 average of 399 g C m⁻² (Fig. 5c). The decreasing trend may be explained by a lower amount
21 of soil peat left in the surface (Table 1 and Fig. 3) and an increasing GWL (Fig. 5f) where
22 inter-annual variations are mainly regulated by the weather (Fig. 5a). NPP and peat
23 decomposition are the two major components of NEE, in which the system showed itself to be
24 both a sink and a source during the first 19 years (1951 to 1970), but thereafter to be a
25 continuous CO₂ sink, except for 1980 and 2002 (Fig. 5d). The thinning management in 1979
26 had a large impact on the NEE which changed the system to that of a source of 820 g C m⁻² yr⁻¹
27 for the following year. After 1981, the forest ecosystem was a continuous sink of CO₂ with
28 an average NEE of 217 g C m⁻² yr⁻¹ except for being a minor source of 82 g C m⁻² yr⁻¹ for 2002
29 (Fig. 5d).

30 Surprisingly, the model does not predict the largest N₂O emissions to occur in the early period
31 when the peat decomposition was high. Instead it predicts most of the N₂O to be emitted from
32 1966 to 1988, a period concomitant with the rapid increase of Spruce NPP, and at thinning.

1 Over the 60 years, the simulated annual N₂O emission varied from less than 0.01 to 7 g N m⁻²
2 yr⁻¹, with an average of 0.7 g N m⁻² yr⁻¹ (Fig. 5e).

3 **3.2.2 Overall GHG balance from 1951 to 2011**

4 Over the full 60-year time period the forest trees acted as a C sink and the soil as a source, of
5 fairly similar size (Fig. 6). This could be viewed as a relocation of C from the soil to the trees,
6 since our model predicts the total soil C loss to be 75 kg CO₂ m⁻² over the 60 years, while
7 total plant biomass (including spruce forest and understorey vegetation) sequesters 58 kg CO₂
8 m⁻². The accumulated NEE shows the young forest ecosystem to be a net CO₂ source, and it is
9 not until 1990, 39 years after the forestation, that the ecosystem uptake balances hitherto
10 emissions and it reaches zero CO₂ emission before becoming an overall carbon sink. If
11 including the N₂O emissions during the 60-year rotation period, taking the most commonly
12 used 100-year time horizon global warming potential from the IPCC (1 g N₂O = 265 g CO₂eq,
13 IPCC, (2013)), the source strength of the forest ecosystem increases and the system switch to
14 an overall small GHG source.

15 However, if including the fate of the biomass removed as thinnings, usually used for paper
16 production, resulting in indirect CO₂ emissions from consumed paper makes this extended
17 system (from the production site to the fate of the products) a large GHG source of 38 kg CO₂
18 m⁻² by the end of the simulation (Fig. 6). Soon, the whole forest will be harvested releasing
19 most of the captured carbon into the atmosphere again, 16 kg C m⁻² (Fig. 2d), and if
20 everything were released from these soils there would be 96.9 kg CO₂ m⁻² released over a
21 period of 60 years.

22 **3.3 Model sensitivity**

23 Accumulated plant biomass is most sensitive to a higher soil C / N ratio or a shallower
24 drainage depth (Table 2). The peat decomposition is instead more sensitive than the
25 accumulated plant biomass to larger initial soil C or increasing drainage depth (Table 2). Also
26 the NEE and N₂O sizes are very sensitive to these variations, the NEE becoming a CO₂ source
27 at larger initial soil C, since peat decomposition rate becomes larger than the accumulated
28 plant biomass. The model sensitivity also shows higher N₂O emissions under shallower rather
29 than deeper drainage (Table 2). When these various factors were combined, the peat
30 decomposition varied by -38% to +33%, being largest when the combination was deep
31 drainage with the largest initial soil C, and a low initial soil C / N ratio. The accumulated

1 biomass varied between -69% and +6%, being smallest when the combination was shallow
2 drainage with a low initial soil C and a large soil C / N ratio. However, the overall total GHG
3 emissions, including the thinning and storm harvested biomass and its associated CO₂ losses,
4 the emissions increased by 11% to 57% (Table 2), suggesting that the total GHG balance was
5 still a source to the atmosphere.

6

7 **4 Discussion**

8 **4.1 Comparison of our simulated results with observational and published data**

9 The GHG balance over a rotational period for forestry on drained peatland is mainly
10 determined by two large values *viz.* those important quantities relating to plant growth and
11 peat decomposition. We therefore first discuss the validity of these two variables by
12 comparing our simulated results with values published in the literature.

13 **4.1.1 Plant growth**

14 Our simulated Spruce growth at 413 g C m⁻² yr⁻¹ was higher than the normal growth rate of
15 162 to 270 g C m⁻² yr⁻¹ in southwest Sweden, but lower than the potential growth rate of 472
16 to 607 g C m⁻² yr⁻¹ under experimentally optimal nutrient conditions (Bergh et al., 2005). This
17 high growth rate can be explained by the fertile soil at the Skogaryd site, which was a drained
18 fen before it was used for agriculture, and then forestry. The high rate of nitrate leaching,
19 estimated at 4.3 g N m⁻² yr⁻¹ also suggests that nutrients are not likely to be limiting. That the
20 forest growth at this site is close to maximum has also been demonstrated in a modeling study
21 by Tarvainen et al., (2013) who showed that if canopy N content was increased by 30%,
22 canopy C uptake would only increase by only 2% - 4% and none of the 37 nutrients tested
23 would directly limit photosynthesis. The very small increase of plant growth (+6%) in our
24 model sensitivity analysis (Table 2), obtained when more deeply drained soil plus a larger
25 initial soil C and a lower C / N ratio assumed, can also be explained by the already high
26 fertility at the site, so any extra nutrient availability would have a negligible impact. Our
27 simulated understorey vegetation was small during most of the simulated years; however, it
28 dominated the organic matter dynamics and GHG fluxes in the first two decades after
29 plantation, a finding similar to that of Laiho et al., (2003).

30 **4.1.2 Soil CO₂ and N₂O fluxes**

1 Our simulated average peat decomposition rate of $399 \text{ g C m}^{-2} \text{ yr}^{-1}$ during the period 1951 to
2 2011 is lower than the value measured in 2008, which was $630 \text{ g C m}^{-2} \text{ yr}^{-1}$ (Meyer et al.,
3 2013). However, this high peat decomposition rate could be attributed to an inter-annual
4 weather variation, which is corroborated by the high plant growth measured in 2008, $830 (\pm$
5 $390) \text{ g C m}^{-2} \text{ yr}^{-1}$. Our simulated N_2O emission, $0.52 (\pm 0.1) \text{ g N m}^{-2} \text{ yr}^{-1}$ during 2007 to 2009
6 is similar to the observed data, $0.71 (\pm 0.59) \text{ g N m}^{-2} \text{ yr}^{-1}$ and measurements 2006 to 2011,
7 $0.38 (\pm 0.12) \text{ g N m}^{-2} \text{ yr}^{-1}$ (Holz et al., 2015). Only during these years, our predicted level of
8 emissions was $0.50 (\pm 0.12) \text{ g N m}^{-2} \text{ yr}^{-1}$. Our simulated CO_2 and N_2O fluxes are therefore
9 generally comparable with the measured data.

10 Our simulated peat decomposition and N_2O emissions are generally comparable in size with
11 measured flux data from afforested drained peatland published in the literature (Table 3).
12 However, when compared with the IPCC EF's for temperate drained nutrient-rich forest soil,
13 which are given as 260 (200 to 330) $\text{g C m}^{-2} \text{ yr}^{-1}$ for CO_2 and 0.28 (-0.06 to 0.61) $\text{g N m}^{-2} \text{ yr}^{-1}$
14 for N_2O (IPCC, 2014), our simulated values were found to be larger. This could be explained
15 by the higher soil fertility at the Skogaryd site and also a deeper GWL (mean of 0.52 m during
16 the simulated 60 years), compared to what pertained at those sites used for constructing the
17 IPCC EF's. That the GWL is of crucial importance for emission levels for drained peat soils
18 has also been shown by Couwenberg et al., (2011) and Leppelt et al., (2014). This could
19 justify our assumption that our somewhat high estimates were due to deep and long-lasting
20 drainage. The high N_2O emission during the period 1966 to 1988 could be explained by the
21 deep GWL (Fig.5). However, the unexpectedly low simulated N_2O emission in the first years
22 after planting could be explained by a high N uptake by the understorey vegetation, probably
23 dominated by grasses, making less N available for nitrification and denitrification.

24 **4.2 Challenges of modeling long-term dynamics of an organic soil**

25 Overall our modeling application indicates, given a few assumptions, that the CoupModel is
26 generally able to simulate the decadal-scale dynamics of the drained organic soils used for
27 forestry. However, our modeling exercise also reveals that there are some issues which still
28 need to be more explicitly accounted for when simulating organic soils and which require
29 further model development. These are the nature of the soil organic matter and physical
30 changes of a peat soil.

31 **4.2.1 A need for explicitly specifying the nature of soil organic matter**

1 A multi-pool approach was developed for modeling SOM dynamics from mineral soils and
2 has been shown to work well for forest mineral soils e.g. (Svensson et al., 2008; Wu, 2013).
3 However, for organic soils, because there is no explicit peat pool in the model, we have had to
4 assume the peat to comprise an unknown mixture of the fast and the slow pool. In the present
5 study we have assumed the initial values of SOM as only representative of the slow pool. The
6 decomposition coefficients for the fast and slow pool were obtained by calibrating the model
7 coefficient against the measured fluxes as we did in our previous study (He et al., 2016).
8 However in this long term simulation there is a continuous addition of Spruce litter leading to
9 resistant soil organic matter and a change in substrate quality over the simulation period for
10 the slow pool. Although most existing models do not explicitly specify the nature of the
11 organic matter (Smith et al., 1997), they can still simulate the total organic matter dynamics
12 fairly well over a relatively short period. Metzger et al., (2015) found that the CoupModel
13 could capture major C fluxes and the ecosystem dynamics when applied to five European
14 treeless peatlands, where they pointed out that the total C flux was mainly determined by the
15 decomposition coefficients of the total SOM. Continuous addition of organic matter into the
16 slow pool from litter decomposition must also change the decomposition coefficient for the
17 slow pool over time. However, this is seldom accounted for. In order to understand the long-
18 term dynamics of organic matter, which might differ in origin and components, a more
19 precise consideration of the changes of soil organic matter characteristics would be helpful.

20 **4.2.2 Modeling physical changes of peat soil**

21 For mineral soils in which the physical structure of the soil does not normally change over
22 time, the CoupModel works well by assuming the soil layer profile to be fixed over time
23 (Jansson and Karlberg, 2011; Jansson, 2012). However, this is not the case for organic soils
24 where the soil structure is mainly built by soil organic matter, which gradually disappears
25 through decomposition. Thus the soil's physical characteristics change over time, e.g. the pore
26 structure, which could change the soil hydraulic conductivity and preferential flows
27 (Kechavarzi et al., 2010). Moreover, decomposition makes the top soil to disappear during a
28 forest rotation, resulting in surface subsidence (Minkinen and Laine, 1998; Leifeld et al.,
29 2011; Hooijer et al., 2012). This causes the GWL to come closer to the soil surface, which in
30 the normal case requires further drainage or ditch management. This process has not so far
31 been implemented in the CoupModel, which currently is not able to account for surface
32 subsidence, mainly due to lack of feedback coupling between the soil's biological and
33 physical properties in the model. The model physical subroutine simulates the water and heat

1 flow and then links this to the biochemical processes by response functions of water moisture
2 and soil temperature. While there is no feedback to the soil physical processes arising from
3 organic matter decomposition or other changes of the soil.

4 All these processes remain a major challenge when applying the CoupModel to the long-term
5 dynamics of a forest ecosystem on drained peatland. To quantify the uncertainty from surface
6 subsidence, in the present study, the system was simplified by assuming a fixed drainage
7 depth, whereas a range of values was used to quantify the model's sensitivity. The variation of
8 the drainage depth had a considerable impact on the soil peat decomposition, as shown by the
9 model sensitivity analysis (Table 2), which in turn highlights the need, when developing
10 future models, to explicitly account for these processes when performing long-term
11 simulations.

12 **4.2.3 Initial soil C, N and soil C / N ratio**

13 A major difficulty in the simulation was the unknown initial soil conditions. We chose to use
14 the EF's 260 (200 to 330) $\text{g C m}^{-2} \text{yr}^{-1}$ for CO_2 from the IPCC wetland supplement (IPCC,
15 2014), which compiles up-to-date observational data from similar sites under temperate
16 climate conditions. Another alternative could be to use the subsidence rate to calculate the soil
17 C losses, which has been applied in other published studies e.g. (Leifeld et al., 2011;
18 Hommeltenberg et al., 2014). By taking the measured subsidence, 0.22 m (ranging from -0.15
19 m to 1.03 m) during ca. 60 year post-drainage period for Finnish drained afforested fens
20 (Minkinen and Laine, 1998), analogizing the measured total soil C in the upper 0.5 m in
21 2007, which was 55.3 kg C m^{-2} (Meyer et al., 2013), the estimated soil losses during the 60
22 year period would be 24.3 kg C m^{-2} , which is equivalent to a loss of 405 $\text{g C m}^{-2} \text{yr}^{-1}$, close to
23 current modeling estimates, 399 $\text{g C m}^{-2} \text{yr}^{-1}$. Increased initial soil C in our sensitivity analysis
24 show both peat decomposition and plant growth to increase (Table 2). Compared to the
25 'vegetation fitted' model, the combination of a small initial soil C, a large soil C / N ratio, and
26 a shallow drainage, gives a larger reduction in plant growth than in peat decomposition, which
27 is why the overall emissions of GHG increase.

28 **4.3 GHG balance for the forest ecosystem**

29 Our modeling indicates forest on drained agricultural peatland to be a strong net CO_2 source
30 for the first 39 years of the forest rotation which changes into a CO_2 sink thereafter due to a
31 large tree growth (Fig. 6). This means that, despite soil decomposition being high, the high

1 growth rate of forest over 60 years compensates for most C losses. Meyer et al., (2013) also
2 showed the forest ecosystem in Skogaryd to be an overall GHG sink ($410 \text{ g CO}_2\text{eq ha}^{-1} \text{ m}^{-2}$) in
3 2008, a year when the plant growth rate was at its maximum, thus offsetting the high rate of
4 peat decomposition. Our findings are also generally in line with the few previous field
5 investigations conducted on afforested drained agricultural peatlands where Mäkiranta et al.,
6 (2007) and Lohila et al., (2007) found a 30-year-old Scots pine forest on drained agricultural
7 bog to be, overall, a small source of CO_2 ($50 \text{ g C m}^{-2} \text{ yr}^{-1}$), which was explained by a small
8 leaf area index (varying between 0.7 and 2 during the observational period). Another study by
9 Hommeltenberg et al., (2014), reported an afforested drained bog in Germany, previously
10 used for agriculture, to emit $500 \text{ g C m}^{-2} \text{ yr}^{-1}$. By combining eddy covariance measurements
11 and biometric estimation, they concluded it to be a major CO_2 source, emitting a total of 13.4
12 kg C m^{-2} over the last 44 years. However, their short-term measurements (2010 to 2012) also
13 indicated that forest growth offsets peat decomposition, a result similar to our study.

14 Growing forests on drained peat is done at the cost of the soil peat, which has generally
15 accumulated slowly during the last millennia (the last four thousand years in Skogaryd).
16 When the forest growth has been larger than the soil loss, the system has been interpreted as
17 being an overall sink (Meyer et al., 2013; Hommeltenberg et al., 2014). However the soil loss
18 and the forest gain can be viewed as a 'relocation' of the peat carbon into timber carbon.
19 Where can we expect this carbon to be found in the future? The simulated NEE (figure 6) tells
20 that the system remains a sink for two decades but growth rate probably declines over time, as
21 shown in the simulated period from 2011 to 2031. To keep the forest will eventually turn the
22 system into a source again since the peat soil will continue to decompose as long as it is kept
23 aerated by a living transpiring forest. Sudden fires would also be a risk releasing the forest
24 biomass C. However the forest in Skogaryd is not a nature reserve but a managed forest
25 already mature for harvesting, commonly done at 80 years of age in southern Sweden. The
26 harvested wood products over a forest rotation is used for both timber and paper, about 40 and
27 60% (Sweden CRF table 4.Gs2 for year 2013, submitted to the UNFCCC 2015) having a half-
28 life of 30 and 2 years respectively (IPCC 2006). Thus the carbon will soon be released as
29 CO_2 . However a better alternative would be the use of timber for wooden buildings which
30 otherwise should have been built by using concrete (Gustavsson et al., 2006). The
31 displacement of concrete by wood could according to a meta-analysis by (Sathre and
32 O'Connor, 2010) avoid emissions by 2.1 times the C content of the timber. However, even
33 then, most buildings do not last more than a century and only a few buildings are functional

1 for longer periods. Thus most harvested biomass will soon be burnt releasing the stored C.
2 These indirect emissions following the consumption of wood would shift the system from an
3 overall small sink into a large GHG source (Fig. 6). Another alternative use of the biomass
4 could be as biochar in agricultural soils (Ojanen et al., 2013), which potentially could shift the
5 system into an overall GHG sink. However, we think this alternative to be somewhat peculiar,
6 since it is just moving C around, releasing it from peat and storing it in agricultural soils, and
7 it is not clear for how long time the char-carbon persists. Additionally, there are some other
8 direct and indirect GHG sources that become apparent during the full forest rotation period
9 which we have not accounted for, such as methane emissions in drainage ditches and loss of
10 dissolved organic C or particulate organic C. However, these contributions to the overall
11 GHG balance are in general of minor importance and thus not likely to alter the overall
12 picture (Meyer et al., 2013; Hommeltenberg et al., 2014). In summary, the overall message is
13 that a forest rotation on fertile drained peat soil has a long-term GHG cost, never reaching a
14 balance, and thus the wood products produced on peat soil cannot be regarded as renewable
15 products.

16 In Sweden, forests on drained peatland cover 1.7 Mha (Maljanen et al., 2010; Von Arnold et
17 al., 2005a) of which 0.4 Mha has high fertility, comparable to the soil in the present study.
18 According to our simulations, these forests emit around $1.74 \text{ kg CO}_2\text{eq m}^{-2} \text{ yr}^{-1}$ (peat
19 decomposition and N_2O emissions). Thus these fertile drained peat soils in Sweden emit 7
20 Mtonnes CO_2eq annually, which is equivalent to 12% of the emissions coming from all other
21 sectors in Sweden when excluding LULUCF. From a climate change perspective, forested
22 drained peatlands should be highlighted for actions, especially following forest clear-cut.
23 Instead of digging the ditches deeper for replanting a new forest, making the soil wetter would
24 reduce the soil decomposition, as shown by our sensitivity analysis and other studies (e.g.
25 Karki et al., 2014). However, these measures need support from policy makers since
26 landowners often only recognize revenues from forest production, not the cost of GHG
27 emissions.

28

29 **5 Conclusion**

30 Our simulation study shows that the GHG fluxes in a forested drained peatland are composed
31 of two important quantities: C uptake by forest growth, and C losses from the soil. By fitting
32 the CoupModel to the Spruce growth, up-scaled from radial tree-growth observations, we
33 obtained a 'vegetation fitted' model by which we were able to describe the C and N fluxes

1 over 60 years. We show that the forest C growth is tightly coupled to soil C losses, and if the
2 forest is harvested and used, there will only be losses over time. The model sensitivity
3 analysis conducted provides evidence that a wide range of drainage depths, site fertilities and
4 initial soil C contents lead to similar overall results. Further model developments are however
5 needed to better simulate the drained peat soil over forest rotation period.

6

7 Author contributions: HH, ÅK, PEJ and LK planned and initialized the study. HH conducted
8 the data analysis and modeling under supervision from ÅK, MS and PEJ. JB and LT helped
9 HH with the tree ring data collection and analysis. HH and ÅK wrote the paper with all
10 authors commenting and participating in the interpretation of the results and contributing to
11 the discussions.

12 **Acknowledgements**

13 This work is part of the program “practicable tool for estimation of nitrous oxide when
14 cropping biomass in agriculture and forestry”, funded by the Swedish Energy Agency (project
15 number 32652-1). We also gratefully acknowledge part-funding by LAGGE (Landscape and
16 Greenhouse Gas Exchange) and BECC (Biodiversity and Ecosystem services in a Changing
17 Climate) projects. We also gratefully acknowledge the Skogaryd research station, which is a
18 part of SITES (Swedish Infrastructure for Ecosystem Science), for providing data.

1 **References**

- 2 Alm, J., Shurpali, N., Minkkinen, K., Aro, L., Hytönen, J., Laurila, T., Lohila, A., Maljanen,
3 M., Martikainen, P. J., Mäkiranta, P., Penttilä, T., Saarnio, S., Silvan, N., Tuittila, E.-S., and
4 Laine, J.: Emission factors and their uncertainty for the exchange of CO₂, CH₄ and N₂O in
5 Finish managed peatlands, *Boreal environment research*, 12, 191-209, 2007.
- 6 Beek, C. L., Pleijter, M., and Kuikman, P. J.: Nitrous oxide emissions from fertilized and
7 unfertilized grasslands on peat soil, *Nutrient Cycling in Agroecosystems*, 89, 453-461,
8 10.1007/s10705-010-9408-y, 2010.
- 9 Bergh, J., Linder, S., and Bergström, J.: Potential production of Norway spruce in Sweden,
10 *Forest Ecology and Management*, 204, 1-10, 10.1016/j.foreco.2004.07.075, 2005.
- 11 Berglund, Ö., and Berglund, K.: Distribution and cultivation intensity of agricultural peat and
12 gyttja soils in Sweden and estimation of greenhouse gas emissions from cultivated peat soils,
13 *Geoderma*, 154, 173-180, 10.1016/j.geoderma.2008.11.035, 2010.
- 14 Byrne, A. K., Chojnicki, B., Christensen, R. T., Drösler, M., Freibauer, A., Friborg, T.,
15 Frolking, S., Lindroth, A., Mailhammer, J., Malmer, N., Selin, P., Turunen, J., Valentini, R.,
16 and Zetterberg, L.: EU peatland, current carbon stocks and trace gas fluxes, *CarbonEurope-*
17 *GHG Concerted Action-Synthesis of the European Greenhouse Gas Budget, Report*, 58, 2004.
- 18 Couwenberg, J., Thiele, A., Tanneberger, F., Augustin, J., Bärish, S., Dubovik, D.,
19 Liashchynskaya, N., Michaelis, D., Minke, M., Skuratovich, A., and Joosten, H.: Assessing
20 greenhouse gas emissions from peatlands using vegetation as a proxy, *Hydrobiologia*, 674,
21 67-89, 10.1007/s10750-011-0729-x, 2011.
- 22 Drossler, L., Nilsson, U., and Lundqvist, L.: Simulated transformation of even-aged Norway
23 spruce stands to multi-layered forests: an experiment to explore the potential of tree size
24 differentiation, *Forestry*, 87, 239-248, 10.1093/forestry/cpt037, 2013.
- 25 Drösler, M.: Trace gas exchange and climatic relevance of bog ecosystems, southern
26 Germany, Ph.D., Department of Ecology, Technical University of Munich, 2005.
- 27 Drösler, M., Freibauer, A., Christensen, T. R., and Friborg, T.: Observations and status of
28 peatland greenhouse gas emissions in Europe, *Ecological Studies*, 203, 243-261, 2008.
- 29 Eggelsmann, R.: Peat consumption under influence of climate, soil condition, and utilization,
30 *Proc 5 th Int Peat Congr, Poznan, Poland*, 233-247, 1976.

1 Ernfors, M., Arnold, K., Stendahl, J., Olsson, M., and Klemedtsson, L.: Nitrous oxide
2 emissions from drained organic forest soils—an up-scaling based on C: N ratios,
3 *Biogeochemistry*, 84, 219-231, 10.1007/s10533-007-9123-1, 2007.

4 Ernfors, M., Rütting, T., and Klemedtsson, L.: Increased nitrous oxide emissions from a
5 drained organic forest soil after exclusion of ectomycorrhizal mycelia, *Plant and Soil*, 343,
6 161-170, 10.1007/s11104-010-0667-9, 2010.

7 FAO: Peatlands - Guidance for climate change mitigation by conservation, rehabilitation and
8 sustainable use, Rome, Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations, edited by:
9 Joosten H., Tapio-Biström M.-L. and, Tol S., available at:
10 <http://www.fao.org/docrep/015/an762e/an762e.pdf> (last access: 12 June 2015), 2012

11 Firestone, M. K., and Davidson, E. A.: Microbiological basis of NO and N₂O production and
12 consumption in soil, Wiley, New York, 1989.

13 Gorham, E.: Northern peatland: role in the carbon cycle and probable responses to climatic
14 warming, *Ecological Applications*, 182-195, 1991.

15 Gustavsson, L., Madlener, R., Hoen, H. F., Jungmeier, G., Karjalainen, T., Klöhn, S.,
16 Mahapatra, K., Pohjola, J., Solberg, B., and Spelter, H.: The Role of Wood Material for
17 Greenhouse Gas Mitigation, *Mitigation and Adaptation Strategies for Global Change*, 11,
18 1097-1127, 10.1007/s11027-006-9035-8, 2006.

19 Hargreaves, K. J., Milne, R., and Cannell, M. G. R.: Carbon balance of afforested peatland in
20 Scotland, *Forestry*, 76, 299-317, 2003.

21 He H., Kasimir Å., Jansson P.-E., Svensson M., Meyer A. and Klemedtsson L., Factors
22 controlling Nitrous Oxide emission from a spruce forest ecosystem on drained organic soil,
23 derived using the CoupModel, *Ecological Modelling*, 321, 46-63,
24 10.1016/j.ecolmodel.2015.10.030, 2016.

25 Hommeltenberg, J., Schmid, H. P., Drösler, M., and Werle, P.: Can a bog drained for forestry
26 be a stronger carbon sink than a natural bog forest?, *Biogeosciences*, 11, 3477-3493,
27 10.5194/bg-11-3477-2014, 2014.

28 Holz, M., Aurangojeb, M., Kasimir, Å., Boeckx, P., Kuzyakov, Y., Klemedtsson, L., Rütting,
29 T., 2015, Gross nitrogen dynamics in the mycorrhizosphere of an organic forest soil,
30 *Ecosystems*, 1-12, doi:10.1007/s10021-015-9931-4, 2015.

1 Hooijer, A., Page, S., Jauhiainen, J., Lee, W. A., Lu, X. X., Idris, A., and Anshari, G.:
2 Subsidence and carbon loss in drained tropical peatlands, *Biogeosciences*, 9, 1053-1071,
3 10.5194/bg-9-1053-2012, 2012.

4 IPCC: 2006 IPCC Guidelines for National Greenhouse Gas Inventories, Prepared by the
5 National Greenhouse Gas Inventories Programme, edited by: Eggleston H.S., Buendia L.,
6 Miwa K., Ngara T. and Tanabe K., Published: IGES, Japan, 2006.

7 IPCC: Climate Change 2013: The physical science basis, contribution of working group 1 to
8 the fifth assessment report of the intergovernmental panel on Climate Change United
9 Kingdom and New York, 1535, 2013.

10 IPCC: 2013 Supplement to the 2006 IPCC Guidelines for National Greenhouse Inventories:
11 Wetlands, Switzerland, 2014.

12 Jansson, P.-E. and Karlberg, L.: Coupled heat and mass transfer model for soil-plant-
13 atmosphere systems, Royal Institute of Technology, Stockholm, 484 pp., available at:
14 <http://www.coupmodel.com/default.htm> (last access: 15 October 2015), 2011.

15 Jansson, P.-E., and Moon, D. S.: A coupled model of water, heat and mass transfer using
16 object orientation to improve flexibility and functionality, *Environmental Modelling and*
17 *Software*, 16, 37-46, 2001.

18 Jansson, P. E.: CoupModel: model use, calibration, and validation, *Transactions of the*
19 *ASABE*, 55, 1335-1344, 2012.

20 Johnsson, H., Bergström, L., Jansson, P.-E., and Paustian, K.: simulated nitrogen dynamics
21 and losses in a layered agriculture soil, *Agriculture, Ecosys. Environ.*, 18, 333-356, 1987.

22 Jungkunst, H. F., Flessa, H., Scherber, C., and Fiedler, S.: Groundwater level controls CO₂,
23 N₂O and CH₄ fluxes of three different hydromorphic soil types of a temperate forest
24 ecosystem, *Soil Biology and Biochemistry*, 40, 2047-2054, 10.1016/j.soilbio.2008.04.015,
25 2008.

26 Karki, S., Elsgaard, L., Audet, J. and Lærke, P. E., Mitigation of greenhouse gas emissions
27 from reed canary grass in paludiculture: effect of groundwater level, *Plant Soil*, 383, 217-230,
28 DOI 10.1007/s11104-014-2164-z, 2014.

29 Karlsson, H. S.: Soil classification and identification, Swedish council for building research
30 Stockholm, Sweden, 1989.

1 Kasimir Klemedtsson, Å., Klemedtsson, L., Berglund, K., Martikainen, P. J., Silvola, J., and
2 Oenema, O.: Greenhouse gas emissions from farmed organic soils: a review, *Soil Use and*
3 *Management*, 13, 245-250, 1997.

4 Kechavarzi, C., Dawson, Q., and Leeds-Harrison, P. B.: Physical properties of low-lying
5 agricultural peat soils in England, *Geoderma*, 154, 196-202, 10.1016/j.geoderma.2009.08.018,
6 2010.

7 Klemedtsson, L., Von Arnold, K., Weslien, P., and Gundersen, P.: Soil C /N ratio as a scalar
8 parameter to predict nitrous oxide emissions, *Global Change Biology*, 11, 1142-1147,
9 10.1111/j.1365-2486.2005.00973.x, 2005.

10 Klemedtsson, L., Jansson, P.-E., Gustafsson, D., Karlberg, L., Weslien, P., Arnold, K.,
11 Ernfors, M., Langvall, O., and Lindroth, A.: Bayesian calibration method used to elucidate
12 carbon turnover in forest on drained organic soil, *Biogeochemistry*, 89, 61-79,
13 10.1007/s10533-007-9169-0, 2008.

14 Klemedtsson, L., Ernfors, M., Björk, R. G., Weslien, P., Rütting, T., Crill, P., and Sikström,
15 U.: Reduction of greenhouse gas emissions by wood ash application to a *Picea abies* (L.)
16 Karst. forest on a drained organic soil, *European Journal of Soil Science*, 61, 734-744,
17 10.1111/j.1365-2389.2010.01279.x, 2010.

18 Kluge, B., Wessolek, G., Facklam, M., Lorenz, M., and Schwärzel, K.: Long-term carbon loss
19 and CO₂-C release of drained peatland soils in northeast Germany, *European Journal of Soil*
20 *Science*, 59, 1076-1086, 10.1111/j.1365-2389.2008.01079.x, 2008.

21 Laiho, R., Vasander, H., Penttilä, T., and Laine, J.: Dynamics of plant-mediated organic
22 matter and nutrient cycling following water-level drawdown in boreal peatlands, *Global*
23 *Biogeochemical Cycles*, 17, 1053, 10.1029/2002GB002015, 2003.

24 Leifeld, J., Müller, M., and Fuhrer, J.: Peatland subsidence and carbon loss from drained
25 temperate fens, *Soil Use and Management*, 27, 170-176, 10.1111/j.1475-2743.2011.00327.x,
26 2011.

27 Leppelt, T., Dechow, R., Gebbert, S., Freibauer, A., Lohila, A., Augustin, J., Drösler, M.,
28 Fiedler, S., Glatzel, S., Höper, H., Järveoja, J., Lærke, P. E., Maljanen, M., Mander, Ü.,
29 Mäkiranta, P., Minkkinen, K., Ojanen, P., Regina, K., and Strömngren, M.: Nitrous oxide
30 emission budgets and land-use-driven hotspots for organic soils in Europe, *Biogeosciences*,
31 11, 6595-6612, 10.5194/bg-11-6595-2014, 2014.

1 Limpens, J., Berendse, F., Blodau, C., Canadell, J. G., Freeman, C., Holden, J., Roulet, N. T.,
2 Rydin, H., and Schaepman Strub, G.: peatlands and the carbon cycle: from local processes to
3 global implications - a synthesis, *Biogeosciences*, 5, 1475-1491, 2008.

4 Lohila, A., Laurila, T., Aro, L., Aurela, M., Tuovinen, J. P., Laine, J., Kolari, P., and
5 Minkkinen, K.: Carbon dioxide exchange above a 30 year old Scots pine plantation
6 established on organic soil cropland, *Boreal environment research*, 12, 141-157, 2007.

7 Lohila, A., Minkkinen, K., Aurela, M., Tuovinen, J. P., Penttilä, T., Ojanen, P., and Laurila,
8 T.: Greenhouse gas flux measurements in a forestry-drained peatland indicate a large carbon
9 sink, *Biogeosciences*, 8, 3203-3218, 10.5194/bg-8-3203-2011, 2011.

10 Lund, M., Lafleur, P. M., Roulet, N. T., Lindroth, A., Christensen, T. R., Aurela, M.,
11 Chojnicki, B. H., Flanagan, L. B., Humphreys, E. R., Laurila, T., Oechel, W. C., Olejnik, J.,
12 Rinne, J., Schubert, P. E. R., and Nilsson, M. B.: Variability in exchange of CO₂ across 12
13 northern peatland and tundra sites, *Global Change Biology*, 16, 2436-2448, 10.1111/j.1365-
14 2486.2009.02104.x, 2010.

15 Maljanen, M., Sigurdsson, B. D., Guðmundsson, J., Óskarsson, H., Huttunen, J. T., and
16 Martikainen, P. J.: Greenhouse gas balances of managed peatlands in the Nordic countries –
17 present knowledge and gaps, *Biogeosciences*, 7, 2711-2738, 10.5194/bg-7-2711-2010, 2010.

18 Marklund, L.: Biomassfunktioner för tall, gran och björk i Sverige, *Rapporter Skog*, 45,
19 Sveriges Lantbruksuniversitet, Sweden, 1– 73, 1988.Metzger, C., Jansson, P. E., Lohila, A.,
20 Aurela, M., Eickenscheidt, T., Belelli-Marchesini, L., Dinsmore, K. J., Drewer, J., van
21 Huissteden, J., and Drösler, M.: CO₂ fluxes and ecosystem dynamics at five European treeless
22 peatlands – merging data and process oriented modeling, *Biogeosciences*, 12, 125-146,
23 10.5194/bg-12-125-2015, 2015.

24 Meyer, A., Tarvainen, L., Noursratpour, A., Björk, R. G., Ernfors, M., Kasimir Klemedtsson,
25 Å., Lindroth, A., Rantfors, M., Rütting, T., Wallin, G., Weslien, P., and Klemedtsson, L.: A
26 fertile peatland forest does not constitute a major greenhouse gas sink, *Biogeosciences* 10,
27 7739-7758, 10.5194/bgd-10-5107-2013, 2013.Minkkinen, K., Laine, J., and Hökkä, H.: tree
28 stand development and carbon sequestration in drained peatland stands in Finland- a
29 simulation study, *Silva Fennica*, 35, 55-69, 2001.

30 Minkkinen, K., and Laine, J.: Long-term effect of forest drainage on the peat carbon stores of
31 pine mires in Finland, *Canadian Journal of Forest Research*, 28, 1267-1275, 1998.

1 Minkkinen, K., Korhonen, R., Savolainen, I., and Laine, J.: Carbon balance and radiative
2 forcing of Finnish peatlands 1900-2100- the impact of forestry drainage, *Global Change*
3 *Biology*, 785-799, 2002.

4 Minkkinen, K., Laine, J., Shurpali, N. J., Mäkiranta, P., Alm, J., and Penttilä, T.:
5 Heterotrophic soil respiration in forestry drained peatlands, *Boreal environment research*, 12,
6 115-126, 2007.

7 Morison, J., I. L., Matthews, R., Miller, G., Perks, M., Randle, T., Vanguelova, E., White, M.,
8 and Yamulki, S.: Understanding the Carbon and Greenhouse gas balance of forests in Britain,
9 Forestry Commission Research Report, Forestry commission, Edinburgh, 149, available at:
10 [http://www.forestry.gov.uk/pdf/FCRP018.pdf/\\$FILE/FCRP018.pdf](http://www.forestry.gov.uk/pdf/FCRP018.pdf/$FILE/FCRP018.pdf) (last access: 1 July 2015).
11 2012.

12 Muukkonen, P., Mäkipää, R., Laiho, R., Minkkinen, K., Vasander, H., and Finer, L.:
13 Relationship between biomass and percentage cover in understorey vegetation of boreal
14 coniferous forests, *Silva Fennica*, 40, 231-245, 2006.

15 Mäkiranta, P., Hytönen, J., Aro, L., Maljanen, M., Pihlatie, M., Potila, H., Shurpali, N., Laine,
16 J., Lohila, A., Martikainen, P. J., and Minkkinen, K.: Soil greenhouse gas emissions from
17 afforested organic soil croplands and cutaway peatlands, *Boreal environment research*, 12,
18 159-175, 2007.

19 Mäkiranta, P., Laiho, R., Fritze, H., Hytönen, J., Laine, J., and Minkkinen, K.: Indirect
20 regulation of heterotrophic peat soil respiration by water level via microbial community
21 structure and temperature sensitivity, *Soil Biology and Biochemistry*, 41, 695-703,
22 10.1016/j.soilbio.2009.01.004, 2009.

23 Ojanen, P., Minkkinen, K., and Penttilä, T.: The current greenhouse gas impact of forestry-
24 drained boreal peatlands, *Forest Ecology and Management*, 289, 201-208,
25 10.1016/j.foreco.2012.10.008, 2013.

26 Sarkkola, S., Hökkä, H., Koivusalo, H., Nieminen, M., Ahti, E., Päivänen, J., and Laine, J.:
27 Role of tree stand evapotranspiration in maintaining satisfactory drainage conditions in
28 drained peatlands, *Canadian Journal of Forest Research*, 40, 1485-1496, 10.1139/x10-084,
29 2010.

- 1 Schindler, U., Müller, L., and Behrendt, A.: Field investigations of soil hydrological
2 properties of fen soils in North-East Germany, *Journal of Plant Nutrition and Soil Science*,
3 166, 364-369, 2003.
- 4 Smith, P., Smith, J. U., Powlson, D. S., McGill, W. B., Arab, J. R. M., Chertov, O. G.,
5 Coleman, K., Franko, U., Frolking, S., Jenkinson, D. S., Jensen, L. S., Kelly, R. H., Klein
6 Gunnewiek, H., Komarov, A. S., Li, C., Molina, J. A. E., Mueller, T., Parton, W. J., Thornley,
7 J. H. M., and Whitmore, A. P.: A comparison of the performance of nine soil organic matter
8 models using datasets from seven long term experiments, *Geoderma*, 81, 153-225, 1997.
- 9 Stokes, M. A., and Smiley, T. L.: *An Introduction to Tree ring Dating*, University of Arizona
10 Press, Tucson, AZ, 1968.
- 11 Swedish Forest Agency: *Grundbok for skogsbrukare*. Skogsstyrelsens förlag, Jönköping,
12 Sweden, 190, 2005.
- 13 Svensson, M., Jansson, P.-E., and Berggren Kleja, D.: Modelling soil C sequestration in
14 spruce forest ecosystems along a Swedish transect based on current conditions,
15 *Biogeochemistry*, 89, 95-119, 10.1007/s10533-007-9134-y, 2008.
- 16 Tarvainen, L., Wallin, G., Rantfors, M., and Uddling, J.: Weak vertical canopy gradients of
17 photosynthetic capacities and stomatal responses in a fertile Norway spruce stand, *Oecologia*,
18 173, 1179-1189, 10.1007/s00442-013-2703-y, 2013.
- 19 Weslien, P., Kasimir Klemedtsson, Å., Börjesson, G., and Klemedtsson, L.: Strong pH
20 influence on N₂O and CH₄ fluxes from forested organic soils, *European Journal of Soil
21 Science*, 60, 311-320, 10.1111/j.1365-2389.2009.01123.x, 2009.
- 22 Wu, J., Jansson, P. E., van der Linden, L., Pilegaard, K., Beier, C., and Ibrom, A.: Modelling
23 the decadal trend of ecosystem carbon fluxes demonstrates the important role of functional
24 changes in a temperate deciduous forest, *Ecol. Modell.*, 260, 50-61,
25 10.1016/j.ecolmodel.2013.03.015, 2013.
- 26 Von Arnold, K., Nilssonb, M., Hanelc, B., Wesliend, P., and Klemedtssond, L.: Fluxes of
27 CO₂, CH₄ and N₂O from drained organic soils in deciduous forests, *Soil Biology and
28 Biochemistry*, 37, 1059–1071, 2005a.
- 29 Von Arnold, K., Weslien, P., Nilsson, M., Svensson, B. H., and Klemedtsson, L.: Fluxes of
30 CO₂, CH₄ and N₂O from drained coniferous forests on organic soils, *Forest Ecology and
31 Management*, 210, 239-254, 10.1016/j.foreco.2005.02.031, 2005b.

1 Yamulki, S., Anderson, R., Peace, A., and Morison, J. I. L.: Soil CO₂, CH₄ and N₂O fluxes
2 from an afforested lowland raised peat bog in Scotland: implications for drainage and
3 restoration, *Biogeosciences*, 10, 1051-1065, 10.5194/bg-10-1051-2013, 2013.

4

- 1 Table 1. Soil C content in the soil profile during 1951 to 2011 estimated by the vegetation
 2 fitted model, kg C m⁻².

Soil layers (cm)	Layer thickness (cm)	Soil C 1951	Soil C 2011	Losses in soil C
0-5	5	6.3	7.8	- 1.5 ¹
5-15	10	12.5	7.5	5.0
15-25	10	12.5	7.7	4.8
25-35	10	12.5	7.9	4.6
35-50	15	18.8	14.7	4.1
50-70	20	25.0	22.1	2.9
70-90	20	25.0	24.3	0.7
90-100	10	12.5	12.5	0

- 3 Note: ¹ negative change means an increase of soil C

1 Table 2. Model sensitivity: change compared with 'vegetation fitted' model during 1951 to
2 2011.

Variables	Vegetation fitted model	Drainage depth (m)		Initial soil C (kg C m ⁻²)			Initial C/N ratio (-)		Combination 1	Combination 2
		(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)		
		-0.3	-0.8	121.7 ¹	129.0 ²	145.8 ³	20	45		
Alternative No		(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(1)+(3)+(7)	(2)+(5)+(6)
Accumulated plant biomass (kg C m ⁻²)	16.0	-35%	3%	-0.4%	1%	4%	4%	-48%	-69%	6%
Peat decomposition (g C m ⁻² day ⁻¹)	1.09	-25%	13%	-3%	3%	17%	2%	-14%	-38%	33%
NEE (g C m ⁻² day ⁻¹) ⁴	-0.12	-52%	-130%	22%	-23%	-125%	42%	-441%	-388%	-257%
N ₂ O emission (g N m ⁻² day ⁻¹)	0.0018	33%	-68%	-6%	3%	22%	58%	-84%	-63%	-25%
Indirect CO ₂ emission (kg CO ₂ equ m ⁻²)	34.5	-21%	1%	-1%	0.5%	0.3%	2%	-47%	-70%	3%
NEE+N ₂ O+indirect CO ₂ emissions (kg CO ₂ equ m ⁻²)	44.1	18%	6%	-3%	14%	46%	25%	31%	11%	57%

3 ^{1;2;3}: Back-calculated initial soil C using the reported range of IPCC EF's 200; 330 and 630 g C m⁻² yr⁻¹
4 respectively.

5 ⁴: positive change of NEE means the forest ecosystem sequesters more atmospheric CO₂ than the
6 'vegetation fitted' model; negative change means sequestering less atmospheric CO₂ or a possible
7 source to the atmosphere.


1 Table 3. A comparison of soil peat CO₂ and N₂O emissions in the present study with values
 2 published in the literature.

Soil CO ₂ flux (g C m ⁻² yr ⁻¹)	Soil N ₂ O emissions (g N m ⁻² yr ⁻¹)	Ecosystem type	Country	References
190 to 1000		Forestry-drained boreal peatland	Finland	Ojanen et al., (2013)
109 to 1200	0 to 1.9	Forest soils and other vegetated sites on deep peat	UK and other European Countries	Morison et al., (2012)
125 to 260 ¹		Forestry-drained peatland	Finland	Minkkinen et al., (2007)
700		Grassland on agricultural fen peat	Germany	Kluge et al., (2008)
1405	1.94 (0.67)	Highly fertile drained peatland for forestry with low soil pH	Sweden	Weslien et al., (2009)
452	0.05	Afforested drained lowland raised peat bog	UK	Yamulki et al., (2013)
123 to 259 ¹	0.02 to 0.57	Drained organic soils for deciduous and coniferous forests	Sweden	Von Arnold et al., (2005a; 2005b)
399	0.7	Drained forested agricultural peatland	Sweden	This study

3 ¹: Calculated by assuming 50% of measured soil respiration to have originated from root-based
 4 activity.

5

6




1

2 Figure 1. Conceptual representation of the dynamics of plants and peat soil development over
 3 a forest rotation period. The upper figures (1a, 1b, 1c, 1d) represent the conceived reality and
 4 1e and 1f represent the CoupModel conceptualization. For all the figures, Spruce tree and
 5 understorey vegetation, e.g. grasses are considered but for clarity, understorey vegetation is
 6 only shown in Fig. 1a. ‘C 2007’ in Figure 1f represents the measured total soil C in the upper
 7 0.5 m of the soil profile in 2007, and ‘C 1951’ is the total soil C in the upper 1 m of the soil
 8 profile, as back-calculated from the equation: $2 \times \text{‘C 2007’} + (2007-1951) \times \text{IPCC EF’s}$. Any
 9 variation of climate during the forest development in this conceptual figure is not considered.

10

11




1
2

1 Figure 2. a) Simulated (black line) Spruce adsorbed radiation; b) simulated and measured (red
2 hollow circle) leaf area index; c) annual Spruce tree growth rate; d) total Spruce tree biomass;
3 e) Spruce tree biomass for different components. In Fig. 2e, the solid red symbols show the
4 calculated plant biomass of leaf biomass, root and stem biomass using the allometric function
5 given by Meyer et al., (2013).

6

7




1

2 Figure 3. Simulated development of major soil C pools in the first meter of soil, from 1951 to
 3 2011. The red circle shows the measured total soil C in 2007 (+/- 95% confidence intervals)
 4 by Meyer et al., (2013).

5


6



1 Figure 4. a) Simulated (black line) and measured (red hollow circle) total net radiation; b) soil
2 surface temperature (0-5 cm depth; c) GWL; d) NEE. Measured data used to create these plots
3 are 5-day averages, except for NEE where daily averages have been used.


4

5



1
2

1 Figure 5. For the period 1951 to 2011: a) Annual precipitation (mm yr^{-1}) and air temperature
2 ($^{\circ}\text{C}$); b) the simulated annual NPP of Spruce trees ($\text{g C m}^{-2} \text{ yr}^{-1}$); c) simulated annual peat
3 decomposition rate ($\text{g C m}^{-2} \text{ yr}^{-1}$); d) simulated annual NEE ($\text{g C m}^{-2} \text{ yr}^{-1}$); e) simulated annual
4 N_2O emissions ($\text{g N m}^{-2} \text{ yr}^{-1}$); f) simulated annual GWL (m). The dashed reference line
5 separates the duplicated 1951 to 1961 and real climate 1961 to 2011. The source or sink is
6 based on the atmospheric perspective, e.g. the soil emissions are sources, and plant uptakes
7 are sinks.
8



1

2 Figure 6. Simulated total GHG balance for the forest ecosystem from 1951 to 2011 and
 3 extended to 2031. The simulated results of 2011 to 2031 are obtained by running the
 4 'vegetation fitted model' with meteorological data from 1991 to 2011 extended to represent
 5 the climate of 2011 to 2031. It should be noted that the GHG balance presented in this figure
 6 assumes no final harvest.

7

8