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SUMMARY

The siting of wind farms on natural and afforested upland peatlands presents an interesting public policy dilemma. Such locations may offer developers attractive wind characteristics amidst sparse human settlement, but the associated disturbance of carbon from soils and vegetation may reduce the carbon benefits that can be derived from wind farm operation. To examine the relative impacts, an estimate was made of the CO₂ payback time for a wind farm hypothetically sited on an afforested peatland in north-east England known as Harwood Forest. The location is representative of many potential wind farm sites, and was chosen for this study because its carbon fluxes and stores have been extensively characterised. We adjusted a published LCA for a wind farm in another location to take account of CO₂ that would be emitted or not sequestered as a result of site disturbance if it were constructed and operated in Harwood Forest. The results show that the wind farm would compensate for its life cycle CO₂ emissions in less than three years of operation in Harwood Forest, whereas the CO₂ payback time would be reduced to less than five months if it were placed at an alternative site where CO₂ emissions from disturbed soil and vegetation were not an issue.
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INTRODUCTION

Under the European Union Renewables Directive, the United Kingdom (UK) has a commitment to derive 15% of its final energy consumption from renewable sources by 2020 (DECC 2009). Meeting this objective will necessitate an increase in renewable electricity from about 5.5% of total usage today (DECC 2009) to more than 30% (HM Government 2009). Much of this will be from onshore wind turbines, whose visual and environmental impacts have raised particular public concern. The “dash for wind” has met with opposition from local communities concerned about the industrialisation of open land in the rural landscape, and the resulting delay in implementation has hindered the pursuit of national targets. One option is to build wind farms on upland (often peatland) which has already been afforested. Here, public concern may be less significant, largely because “naturalness” has already been altered by afforestation of wilderness areas with exotic conifer species, of which Sitka spruce (Picea sitchensis) is by far the most common.

The construction of wind farms in forestry plantations has a number of potential drawbacks. One of these relates to the performance of the wind turbines themselves; the plantation acts as a complex obstacle to air flow, tending to reduce wind speeds, increase wind shear and create additional turbulence (Boddington 2004). Of primary interest here, however, is the associated disturbance to ecosystems and processes within the forest. Establishing the wind farm requires clearance of a considerable area of plantation to accommodate roads and turbine platforms, and the resulting disturbance of soil has been associated with a significant flux of CO₂ to the atmosphere and to drainage waters (Waldron et al. 2009). Moreover, because such plantations are currently significant carbon sinks (Magnani et al. 2007), large-scale deforestation accompanying their conversion to wind farms would negatively impact on the national greenhouse gas inventory. Some commentators (e.g. Nayak et al. 2010) have taken the view that the CO₂ emissions caused by disturbance of poorly selected and managed sites approach or even exceed the emissions from fossil fuel combustion averted by the wind farm over its lifetime.

This conceptual study presents a first-order estimate, using life cycle assessment (LCA), of the effect of disturbance due to wind farm development on the carbon balance of a site in north-east England where carbon stores and fluxes in soils, vegetation and trees under active silvicultural management have been extensively characterised. We use a published LCA that estimates the embedded energy, CO₂ emissions and electrical power generation of a
wind farm in another location, which is hypothetically placed within the UK electrical grid, allowing us to adjust for CO₂ that would be emitted or not sequestered by the afforested peatland as a result of site disturbance during construction and operation of the wind farm. Life cycle energy and CO₂ assessments for the wind turbines and associated civil engineering works are combined with characterisations of forest and peatland carbon stores and fluxes to assess how clearfelling a parcel of forest and disturbing its soil would change the CO₂ payback calculation.

METHODS

Study site
Harwood Forest is a ca. 4,000 ha Sitka spruce (Picea sitchensis) plantation in Northumberland National Park, England. It is located at 55° 12' N, 02° 02' W, about 30 km inland from the North Sea coast (Figure 1), at an altitude of 200–400 m a.s.l. Annual rainfall is around 950 mm and mean annual temperature about 7 °C (Zerva & Mencuccini 2005b). The soil is mostly shallow peaty gley, and the land was ericaceous moorland before it was converted to forest plantation in the 1930s. The water table fluctuates seasonally and its level varies spatially, with greater depths to water table beneath mature forest stands (average 20 cm in winter, 90 cm in summer) and shallower depths in clearfelled stands (10 cm in winter, 25 cm in summer) (Zerva & Mencuccini 2005a). The forest plantation is segmented into stands of different ages with a forest rotation of approximately 40 years. At the end of each rotation the stands are clearfelled and replanted, although silvicultural practices are now changing in order to reduce adverse impacts on carbon balance arising from the disturbance of forest.

Figure 1. Location of Harwood Forest.
In this part of the country, organic soils over a large area of upland landscape are dominated by ericaceous dwarf shrubs such as Calluna vulgaris and Vaccinium spp., with notable peat deposits. The population density is low and the prevailing use of the land is for low-intensity sheep grazing, military training, amenity and forestry. The region’s forests extend to about 100,000 hectares, of which the UK Forestry Commission owns and manages half. Forest resources are conceived as being for mixed training, amenity and forestry. The region’s forests extend to about 100,000 hectares, of which the UK Forestry Commission owns and manages half. Forest resources are conceived as being for mixed use, and the region’s spatial strategy (NEA 2008) lists a dozen or so forest-derived benefits including recreation, tourism, timber, ecosystem protection, CO₂ sequestration and renewable energy resources. The theoretical wind energy potential of Harwood Forest and Knowesgate has been assessed at 400–500 MW (installed capacity), but a report to the North East Assembly which balanced wind energy development in the region against preservation of the landscape recommended that this should be reduced to 100 MW (NEA 2006).

**Wind farm life cycle assessment**

Ardente *et al.* (2008) present a detailed evaluation of the energy and environmental performance of a non-peatland wind farm in Italy, which indicates that the lifetime CO₂ costs incurred by the development can be recovered within six months of commissioning. On this basis, wind power generation is clearly an effective strategy for reducing emissions as the remainder of the wind farm’s operating life is essentially carbon free. The question remains, however, whether the CO₂ emissions and the payback time are altered significantly when the effects of disturbing ecosystem processes within a forested and/or peatland site are taken into account. To arrive at an estimate, we explore the CO₂ emissions and lost C sequestration that would result from placing the Ardente *et al.* (2008) wind farm on the afforested peatland at Harwood Forest. In order to simulate the translocation as accurately as possible, site-specific information on all facets of the wind farm’s likely carbon budget was derived from literature, as described below.

**Life cycle assessment of wind turbines**

Life cycle assessment (LCA) is based on the principle that it is possible to estimate the total amount of energy and materials required for, and the emissions associated with, manufacturing, operating, and decommissioning an energy generating technology. While full LCA considers a wide range of impacts including global warming potential, acidification, human toxicity, *etc.*, it is common to see more restricted analyses that concentrate purely on energy and CO₂ emissions. Life cycle assessments have been performed on a wide range of renewable energy sources including wind (Takahara *et al.* 1997, Lenzen & Munksgaard 2002, Ardente *et al.* 2008, Martinez *et al.* 2009, Tremeac & Meunier 2009), solar (e.g. Alsema 2000), wave (Parker *et al.* 2007) and tidal stream (Douglas *et al.* 2008) converters.

Within LCA, energy analysis concentrates on determining an energy intensity (often expressed as kWhₘ₉ kWhₑ⁻¹), which relates the energy embodied within materials, manufacturing processes and the operation of a device over its lifetime (kWhₘ₉) to the electricity generated (kWhₑ) over the same period. Typical wind farms have energy intensities significantly lower than unity; that is, they generate more energy during their lifetimes than is required to manufacture, operate and decommission them. The vast majority of the energy input occurs during manufacture and installation. Lenzen & Munksgaard (2002) suggest energy intensities of around 0.03 to 0.09 kWhₘ₉ kWhₑ⁻¹. Associated with this is the energy payback time, which is the time it takes a turbine to generate the primary-energy equivalent of the energy input required for its construction, operation and decommissioning. Typical energy payback times are around six months (Lenzen & Munksgaard 2002, Martinez *et al.* 2009, Tremeac & Meunier 2009), suggesting that over a 20-year lifetime a turbine would generate 40 or more times the quantity of energy consumed (Ardente *et al.* 2008).

Of more direct interest here is the CO₂ intensity, which expresses the carbon emissions associated with manufacture, operation and decommissioning of the generator per unit of electricity production over its lifetime. Typical units are g CO₂ kWhₑ⁻¹, and it can be calculated as:

\[
\text{CO}_2\text{-eq intensity} = \frac{E_{\text{CO}_2}}{8760 \cdot \lambda \cdot P \cdot T}
\]  

(1)

As there are no CO₂ emissions from fossil fuel burn, \(E_{\text{CO}_2}\) represents the indirect CO₂ emissions (kg CO₂) arising from manufacture, construction, operation and decommissioning over the life cycle of the device. The denominator is the lifetime energy production (kWhₑ), calculated as the product of the turbine’s rated power \(P\) (kW), the annual load factor \(\lambda\) (%) (see below), the operating lifetime \(T\) (years) and the number of hours in a year (8760).

The variability of wind means that the turbine will not always operate at its rated power. The load factor reflects this and is the ratio of the net electricity generated by the wind turbine to the net generation that would have occurred if it were to operate continuously at its rated capacity. Typical
load factors in the UK are around 30% (DECC 2009), although there is considerable variation and load factors for some sites in the Shetland Isles are as high as 53.5% (Boehme & Wallace 2007). The load factor cited in Ardente et al. (2008) is atypically low at around 20%; this was attributed to operational problems and anomalous weather during the first year of operation. For the calculations here, we assume a load factor of 27%, which was the average for onshore wind in the UK in 2008 (DECC 2009).

In order to determine CO₂ equivalent emissions, other greenhouse gases are converted to CO₂ equivalence by their global warming potentials (Bolin et al. 1995), using a 100-year time horizon. Life cycle CO₂ emissions for the eleven-turbine wind farm assessed by Ardente et al. (2008) were in the range 2,700–3,700 t CO₂; the corresponding CO₂ intensity was calculated at 10–15 g CO₂ kWh⁻¹.

The CO₂ payback time is the time required for the CO₂-equivalent emissions avoided by displacing wind power generation to equal the emissions released during the life cycle of the turbine, i.e. \( E_{CO2} \). A typical value for payback would be around six months (Ardente et al. 2008) but there is substantial variability between studies. The payback time depends on the life cycle emissions and the amount of electricity generated by the turbine, but also on the assumed carbon intensity of the grid electricity displaced by the wind turbine. There is a great deal of debate over grid intensity because emissions vary significantly between electricity systems and over time, and it is not a straightforward matter to identify precisely what generation has been displaced at any one moment. A common practice in LCA is to apply an average national electricity generation mix. For the UK in 2007 this was 39% coal, 36% natural gas, 17% nuclear and 8% other (DECC 2008), giving an average intensity of around 0.52 kg CO₂ kWh⁻¹.

However, UK Government guidelines recommend a CO₂ intensity figure of 0.430 kg CO₂ kWh⁻¹ when calculating avoided CO₂ emissions from renewable generation; this is stated to reflect long run emissions from combined cycle gas turbines, which are assumed to be the first plants to reduce output in response to reduced electricity demand (DEFRA 2008). Alternatively, some studies assume that wind displaces marginal coal plants; a displacement value of around 0.860 kg CO₂ kWh⁻¹ (IEA 1998) has been used in the UK. Nayak et al. (2008, 2010) offer a compromise by assuming that all thermal power plants (oil, gas, and coal) are used for grid balancing and it is their combined output that is displaced when nuclear and renewable power is generated. Their recommendation, applied in this study, is to use the emission factor of the UK’s fossil fuel sourced grid mix, which was 0.605 kg CO₂ kWh⁻¹ in 2008 (DECC 2009, page 125, Table 5C).

Wind farms and disturbance of forest ecosystems

The wind farm development at Harwood Forest is assumed to be identical in structure to that described by Ardente et al. (2008), with eleven 660 kW turbines, each with a rotor diameter of 50 m, a steel tower 55 m high and a lifetime of 20 years. The use of relatively modest turbines is justified here as, although larger turbines (~2 MW) are now common, their deployment may be blocked in this location due to visual impacts. In addition to the turbine specifications, and critically for this study, Ardente et al. (2008) offer a detailed breakdown and assessment of the civil engineering works that are primarily responsible for site disturbance; these include roadways, cable trenches and the turbine foundations. Despite the modest capacity of this wind farm it still requires substantial volumes of materials to build the turbines and the associated civil infrastructure (Table 1).

Table 1. Quantities (in tonnes) of major materials used in manufacture of turbines and civil works for an eleven-turbine wind farm (Ardente et al. 2008).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Material</th>
<th>Wind Turbines</th>
<th>Civil Works</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Steel</td>
<td>731</td>
<td>123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cast iron</td>
<td>66</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glass-reinforced plastic</td>
<td>54</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Copper</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plastics</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aggregate</td>
<td>21,708</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local soil/stones</td>
<td>10,333</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sand</td>
<td>2,802</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concrete</td>
<td>4,097</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Each tower is supported by a square, steel-reinforced concrete foundation ‘pad’ about 10–15 m per side (Lindsay 2005, Nayak et al. 2010). The pit required to accommodate the foundation is about 20 m square (Nayak et al. 2008, LWP 2006), although in practice the area disturbed may be greater (Lindsay 2005); here we assume the excavated area to be a 30 m square. A perimeter buffer around the excavation pit might be clearfelled to allow access to the turbine pad. This buffer area is assumed to be a 50 m square enclosing the excavated area. A hard standing area is commonly constructed for each pad

site to provide a stable foundation for the cranes that are used in construction, maintenance and decommissioning of the turbine. In the case study cited by Hall (2006), the area of excavation required for each hard standing was about equal to the area needed for the turbine base itself, and this 1:1 ratio is used here. The turbine pads are connected by a network of access roads built after clearfelling trees. The roads are made of crushed stone emplaced in a roadbed approximately 5 m wide (LWP 2006). It is assumed that road construction requires excavation or destruction of the peat down to mineral soil. We estimate that 500 m of new road construction is required per turbine (Nayak et al. 2008, Lindsay 2005, LWP 2006) and that a 10 m buffer will be cleared of trees on each side of the access road. Crushed stone for road beds is assumed to be quarried off-site (Hall 2006, Nayak et al. 2008) without any need for deforestation or peat excavation. As transmission cables can be buried alongside the access roads, no additional disturbance is attributed to their emplacement. Two utility buildings, a substation and a control station are each assumed to require 2 ha of clearfelling and peat excavation (estimated visually from LWP 2006). In summary, each turbine pad can be characterised by land subject to excavation for construction of roads, hard standings, utility buildings and the foundation itself; and land subject to degradation in a buffer zone around the foundation and alongside roads. Per turbine, excavated land totals 0.79 ha and degraded land approximately 1.16 ha.

Carbon losses resulting from ecosystem disturbance
Harwood Forest provides an excellent case study location due to the existence of a series of established studies of soil and biomass carbon for forest of a range of ages on the same soil and geological substrata. Zerva & Mencuccini (2005a) report the soil and biomass carbon stocks whilst Magnani et al. (2007) compare the CO₂ fluxes of the entire ecosystem with other cases in Europe. Kowalski et al. (2004) show the magnitude of carbon losses when soils are disturbed at harvesting, with clearfelling converting a managed UK forest from a carbon sink of around 6 t C ha⁻¹ year⁻¹ to a source of around 1 t C ha⁻¹ year⁻¹ for several years because respiratory fluxes from the soil exceed photosynthesis.

Although it is likely that real turbines would be positioned in forest stands of different ages, it is assumed here that all site development occurs in 20-year-old second rotation stands, in order to simplify the estimation of carbon fluxes. This is a reasonable “typical” stand age for a forest plantation established in the 1930s with 40-year rotations. Moreover, the timing of future harvest for the 20-year-old stand is conveniently synchronous with the end of the 20-year lifetime of a wind farm; and this assumption about stand age permits the use of data collected at Harwood Forest by Phillips (2000), Zerva et al. (2005), Zerva & Mencuccini (2005a, b) and Magnani et al. (2007).

On excavated land, harvesting of trees will be followed by complete removal of the peat soil. It is assumed that the (organic) peat will be left exposed to the elements and so will decompose aerobically, with all of its carbon content being released to the atmosphere. This assumption is inaccurate because, for example, an unknown fraction of the carbon will be transported to rivers, probably over a long period. Also, the developer may temporarily stack excavated peat and later restore a portion of it to the landscape.

It is assumed that the buffer areas will be managed to encourage the development of grassland vegetation and discourage tree growth during the lifetime of the wind farm. The initial clearfelling will prolong exposure of the soil to solar irradiation and deprive it of carbon inputs from litterfall and tree roots, leading to significant loss of carbon (Zerva & Mencuccini 2005a, b). Soils alone released about 15 t C ha⁻¹ in the first ten months after tree harvesting at Harwood Forest (Zerva & Mencuccini 2005a); but this loss will be partially offset by sequestration, litterfall and below-ground carbon transport as invasive grassland vegetation matures (Huotari et al. 2009). A value of 81 t C ha⁻¹ is adopted for soil carbon loss on degraded land, calculated as the difference between the carbon stock of the second rotation 20-year-old stand (181 t C ha⁻¹) and the clearfell site (100 t C ha⁻¹) of Zerva et al. (2005).

Branches and roots are assumed to remain onsite after clearfelling. Roots die and decompose below ground, contributing to the soil carbon efflux. Branches decompose on the land surface, releasing all carbon to the atmosphere. Tree stems are transported from the site to sawmills and are ultimately used in construction and furniture. Following Harmon et al. (1990), 43% of the carbon from the stems is assumed to remain sequestered from the atmosphere for at least the lifetime of the wind farm, while the remaining 57% is released to the atmosphere in less than five years.

Phillips (2000) estimated that the carbon stored in an 18-year-old stand of trees at Harwood Forest was around 70 t C ha⁻¹, about half of which was allocated to tree stems, mirroring the allocation for stems and bark found in a plantation of Sitka spruce in Ireland (Green et al. 2007). Adding two years of
carbon storage within trees to Phillips’ (2000) estimate at a rate of 4.79 t C ha\(^{-1}\) yr\(^{-1}\) (Green et al. 2007) gives 79.58 t C ha\(^{-1}\) for a 20-year-old stand. This could not be reconciled with an alternative estimate (154 t C ha\(^{-1}\)) for Harwood derived by applying \(R\) (the ratio of below-ground to above-ground biomass) equal to 0.23 (Green et al. 2007) to the figure for carbon storage in fine and coarse roots of a 20-year-old stand (28.8 t C ha\(^{-1}\), generated by allometric equations) given by Zerva et al. (2005). Accordingly, this study adopts an intermediate value based on careful field measurements in Ireland by Green et al. (2007), who estimated the total carbon stock in a 19-yr-old stand at 91 t C ha\(^{-1}\). Adding one year’s carbon accumulation to simulate a 20-year-old stand yields 95.8 t C ha\(^{-1}\) for carbon stored in trees; one-half of this for stems is 47.9 t C ha\(^{-1}\) and an equal amount is allocated for roots and branches.

Phillips (2000) noted ecosystem accumulation of carbon (in soils and forest biomass) of around 5 t C ha\(^{-1}\) year\(^{-1}\) over a 40-year chronosequence. Sequestration rates in the second half of this period, when the trees had matured, are likely to exceed this figure because the ecosystem showed net carbon loss during an unknown portion of the first half. Magnani et al. (2007) measured maximum net ecosystem production in stands of age 3–30 years at around 5.5 t C ha\(^{-1}\) yr\(^{-1}\); this figure is adopted for the 20-year-old forest.

**Calculations**

The effects of site disturbance on ecosystem CO\(_2\) loss over the wind farm’s lifetime and CO\(_2\) payback time were calculated in the Microsoft® Office Excel spreadsheet which is published with this article at http://www.mires-and-peat.net/map04/map_04_10_calc.zip. Table 2 summarises the values of all variables used in the calculations. First, the wind farm’s baseline CO\(_2\) intensity and payback time were assessed without taking into account any impacts of site disturbance. The effects of (a) the CO\(_2\) lost from the 8.69 ha of excavated land and (b) the CO\(_2\) lost from the 12.76 ha of degraded land were then examined separately, and comparisons made. Finally, a sensitivity study was conducted by systematically varying key values and assumptions in turn.

Table 2. Values of variables used to calculate the effects of site disturbance on ecosystem CO\(_2\) losses and CO\(_2\) payback time, with literature sources.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Wind farm and grid variables</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Turbine capacity (kW)</td>
<td>660</td>
<td>Ardente et al. (2008)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of turbines / pad sites</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Ardente et al. (2008)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wind farm lifetime (yrs)</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Ardente et al. (2008)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Load factor (%)</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>DECC (2009)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wind farm life cycle CO(_2) emissions (kg CO(_2))</td>
<td>3,700,000</td>
<td>Ardente et al. (2008)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CO(_2) intensity of grid electricity (kgCO(_2) kWh(^{-1}))</td>
<td>0.605</td>
<td>DECC (2009)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site disturbance and ecosystem variables</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Excavated area per turbine (ha)</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>Nayak et al. (2008, 2010); Lindsay (2005); LWP (2006)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degraded area per turbine (ha)</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>Nayak et al. (2008); Lindsay (2005); LWP (2006)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C stock, peat soil (kg C ha(^{-1}))</td>
<td>181,000</td>
<td>Zerva et al. 2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soil C lost, clearfell (kg C ha(^{-1}))</td>
<td>81,000</td>
<td>Zerva et al. 2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C stock, roots &amp; branches (kg C ha(^{-1}))</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>Green et al. (2007)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C stock, tree stems (kg C ha(^{-1}))</td>
<td>35,000</td>
<td>Green et al. (2007)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C lost, tree stems (%)</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>Harmon et al. 1990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecosystem C sequestration (kg C ha(^{-1}) yr(^{-1}))</td>
<td>5,500</td>
<td>Magnani et al. 2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soil pH</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>Zerva &amp; Mencuccini (2005a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average annual temperature (°C)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Kowalski et al. (2004)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Conversion factors</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Conversion C to CO(_2)</td>
<td>3.667</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
RESULTS

Wind farm without site disturbance

Ardente et al. (2008) estimate that all aspects of manufacture, installation, operation and decommissioning of the eleven-turbine wind farm would incur an inherent (embedded) emissions ‘cost’ of 2,700–3,700 t CO₂ over its life cycle; the range indicates the uncertainty in the CO₂ burden of the materials used. Assuming a 27% load factor for Harwood Forest, annual power generation here would be 17,171 MWh, giving a CO₂ intensity of 10.8 g CO₂ kWh⁻¹ based on the more conservative estimate of life cycle carbon cost (3,700 t CO₂). With a grid electricity carbon intensity of 0.605 kg CO₂ kWh⁻¹, the annual CO₂ emissions avoided will be 10,389 t CO₂ yr⁻¹ and the CO₂ payback time 130 days or less than five months.

Effect of site disturbance

Table 3 shows the estimated CO₂ losses from five forest ecosystem categories affected by the wind farm over its life cycle. Overall, about 24,176 t CO₂ is released, and this is split more or less evenly between excavated and degraded land. This estimate of CO₂ emitted as a consequence of site disturbance must be added to the wind farm’s embedded lifecycle CO₂ emissions of 3,700 t CO₂ to arrive at a global emissions estimate for the wind farm.

Table 4 shows the effect of combining disturbance-related CO₂ emissions with the inherent CO₂ cost of the wind farm. The overall emissions total 27,876 t CO₂ and the CO₂ intensity increases to 81.2 g CO₂ kWh⁻¹. The net impact is that the payback time increases to 979 days, or less than three years. Thus, the analysis indicates that, even when CO₂ emissions due to site disturbance are taken into account, a wind farm development on the afforested peatland at Harwood Forest could pay back embedded CO₂ emissions in a reasonable period and thus represents an effective strategy for reducing CO₂ emissions from electricity generation.

Sensitivity

Figure 2 shows the effect on CO₂ payback time of increasing some of the wind farm variables and ecosystem CO₂ loss factors by 10%. CO₂ payback time is sensitive to wind farm load factor (important in determining energy output) and assumed grid CO₂ intensity, with an increase in these variables reducing the payback time. This study adopts the historically reported UK load factor value of 27%.

Table 3. Estimated carbon losses from the forest and peat soil system at Harwood Forest due to construction and 20-year operation of the wind farm.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Disturbance Process</th>
<th>excavated area</th>
<th>degraded area</th>
<th>total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lost CO₂ sequestration</td>
<td>3,521</td>
<td>5,147</td>
<td>8,668</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excavation of peat to accommodate infrastructure</td>
<td>5,794</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5,794</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degradation of peatland in buffer zones</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3,790</td>
<td>3,790</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decomposition of tree branches and roots</td>
<td>1,533</td>
<td>2,241</td>
<td>3,774</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disposal of unpreserved stem material</td>
<td>874</td>
<td>1,277</td>
<td>2,151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>total</td>
<td>11,722</td>
<td>12,454</td>
<td>24,176</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4. Comparison of estimates of CO₂ emissions, intensity and payback for the wind farm at Harwood Forest, with and without the effect of site disturbance.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>CO₂ emissions (t CO₂)</th>
<th>CO₂ intensity (g CO₂ kWh⁻¹)</th>
<th>CO₂ payback (days)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Without site disturbance</td>
<td>3,700</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With site disturbance</td>
<td>27,876</td>
<td>81.2</td>
<td>979</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 2. Sensitivity of wind farm CO₂ payback time to a 10% increase in key factors for the emissions case that includes ecosystem CO₂ release due to site disturbance. CO₂ payback time is 979 days before varying key factors.

Increasing this to 29.4%, which was the UK average for onshore wind on an unchanged configuration basis in 2008 (see DECC 2009, section 7.76 and Table 7.4) would reduce the CO₂ payback time by 80 days (-8%). Likewise, increasing the assumed electrical grid CO₂ intensity to that of coal power generation, i.e. 0.860 kg CO₂ kWh⁻¹ (IEA 1998), reduces payback time by 290 days (-30%). Alternatively, using a grid intensity of 0.43 kg CO₂ kWh⁻¹ to represent displacement of gas turbine electricity generation lengthens the CO₂ payback time by 399 days (+40%). CO₂ payback time is also sensitive to LCA assumptions about the wind farm’s life cycle CO₂ emissions; using Ardente et al.’s (2008) lower estimate of 2,700 t CO₂ would decrease payback time by 35 days (-4%).

Sensitivity to increases in the assumed CO₂ losses from ecosystem processes is smaller, with ecosystem carbon sequestration and disturbed area assumptions showing the largest changes. This study uses the maximum carbon sequestration value of around 5.5 t C ha⁻¹ yr⁻¹ for stand ages spanning 3–30 years which was measured using eddy covariance apparatus at Harwood Forest by Magnani et al. (2007). Taking the maximum value of 9.0 t C ha⁻¹ yr⁻¹ reported for a Sitka spruce plantation in Ireland by Black et al. (2009) would increase the CO₂ payback time by 194 days (+20%). The area excavated and degraded during wind farm development is site specific, is dependent upon developer practices, and shows significant variation in published reports (Nayak et al. 2008, 2010; Hall 2006). Because the water table at Harwood Forest is lower than in natural bog, a smaller allocation of hard standing per pad site may provide sufficient stable ground for turbine construction on afforested peatland. We used a ratio of 1:1 for turbine base to hard standing area, following the Environmental Statement for a Lake District proposal quoted by Hall (2006), while Nayak et al. (2008) use a ratio closer to 1:3.5 in their case study. Using the latter allocation for hard standings lengthens payback time.
Our sensitivity study indicates that change in the excavated for turbine bases is generous; replacement of some of the excavated peat soil immediately after construction should yield a smaller disturbed footprint and lower emissions (Nayak et al. 2008). Our sensitivity study indicates that change in the area degraded is relatively significant for the CO₂ calculations, but would need to increase by more than fifteen times to push the CO₂ payback time beyond the lifetime of the wind farm.

DISCUSSION

Hall (2006) performs a calculation similar to that presented here, based on information provided in an Environmental Impact Assessment for a proposed 27-turbine wind farm on a Cumbrian peatland, which returns a CO₂ payback time of 3.5 years. In a second study, the same author calculates CO₂ payback times of 8–16 years for wind farms on peatland soils in Scotland (cited by Douglas 2006). One salient difference between these estimates and the one presented here is in the assumed CO₂ intensity of grid electricity replaced by the turbines; Hall (2006) uses the gas turbine (only) figure of 0.43 kgCO₂ kWh⁻¹.

Another difference is in the assumed carbon losses in natural (Hall 2006) versus second-rotation afforested (this study) peatland soils and ecosystems. A natural bog’s hydrology is often poorly understood by planners (Lindsay 2005) and natural peatland needs to be considered as much a mounded or flowing body of water as a parcel of land. Excavations, linear cuts for roads, cable trenches and drainage ditches disrupt water flow and result in lowered water table and aeration of peat soils for a significant distance from the edge of disturbance (Boelter 1972). Calculations of CO₂ payback times for wind farms on natural peatlands assume that excavation and ditch drainage results in aeration of peat soils extending 50 m (Nayak et al. 2008; Hall 2006), 100 m (Hall 2006, high case) and 200 m (Lindsay 2005) from the edge of excavation. At Harwood Forest, decades of silviculture have introduced a complex of roads and drainage ditches which fundamentally modify surface water flow patterns, while the patchwork of forest stands of different ages results in differential water table drawdown. Over a 10-month period in 2002, depth to water table averaged 60 cm beneath 40-year-old forest compared to 16 cm in a nearby clearfelled parcel as a consequence of water use and evapotranspiration in the forest stand (Zerva & Mencuccini 2005a). As the water table at Harwood Forest is already discontinuous and drawn down, we did not assume a halo of peat oxidation beyond the boundary of excavated or clearfelled land. Furthermore, silvicultural practices including excavation of drainage ditches and overturning of topsoil are incorporated in the carbon loss figures for a clearfelled forest in Zerva et al (2005).

Hargreaves et al. (2003) documented conversion of peatland from a carbon sink (~0.25 t C ha⁻¹ year⁻¹) to a source (2–4 t C ha⁻¹ year⁻¹) after it was drained and ploughed, but observed that the peatland became a carbon sink again when ground vegetation recolonised. Sedges, rushes and grasses that invade a clearfelled site at Harwood Forest within the first year after harvest (Zerva & Mencuccini 2005a) represent a significant store of below- and above-ground carbon (Huotari et al. 2009). We did not assume complete oxidation of soil carbon in our degraded (clearfelled but unexcavated) zone as others have done (Hall 2006, Douglas 2006). At Harwood Forest, the original conversion from natural to afforested peatland, accompanied by soil carbon loss from drainage, occurred more than 50 years ago. Soil carbon has accumulated beneath first- and second-rotation forest cover since then, but has never attained previous levels; today, an undisturbed grassland adjacent to Harwood Forest contains 274 t C ha⁻¹ of soil carbon compared to 140 t C ha⁻¹ in a first rotation 40-year-old stand and 249 t C ha⁻¹ for second rotation 30-year-old stand (Zerva et al. 2005). The initial drainage during the transition from undisturbed peatland to plantation forest results in a pulse of the most labile fraction of peatland soil carbon, leaving a relatively higher fraction of recalcitrant soil carbon in the disturbed ecosystem (Laiho 2006). The response of soil carbon to site disturbance (i.e. clearfelling and soil degradation) at Harwood Forest should follow the patterns documented for disturbance to an afforested plantation by Zerva et al. (2005), Zerva & Mencuccini (2005a) and Phillips (2000), and would not be expected to mimic that of a drained natural peatland. For one thing, clearfelling at Harwood Forest precipitates raising rather than lowering of the water table, and soil carbon loss may be driven more by loss of litterfall and increase in solar irradiance (Zerva et al. 2005, Zerva & Mencuccini 2005a, Zerva & Mencuccini 2005b) than by oxidation of peat due to aeration.

Nayak et al. (2008, 2010) have provided the most comprehensive approach to estimating CO₂ payback times for wind farms located on peatlands, utilising published sources for estimating carbon stores and fluxes, and providing analytical tools for planners to prospectively estimate life cycle CO₂ emissions for peatland wind farms. Their studies underline the importance of management decisions in reducing
CO₂ payback time, and suggest that with wise site selection, management practices and peatland restoration, additional greenhouse gas emissions attributable to site disturbance can be limited to less than 10% of the total C emissions saved. Nayak et al. (2008, 2010) do not assume complete oxidation of drained peat soils, but rather apply equations derived empirically during development of the ECOSSE soil carbon model for CO₂ and CH₄ emissions (Smith et al. 2007). These equations are not directly applicable at Harwood Forest, firstly because litterfall and below-ground carbon transport from trees (and their loss after clearfelling) exceeds that of a natural peatland, making the comparison inconsistent; and secondly, because export of dissolved and suspended organic carbon in streams is greatly accelerated in the first years after clearfelling due to harvesting practices and may represent losses in the order of 5–10 t C ha⁻¹ yr⁻¹ (Reynolds 2007). The approach adopted here differs from that of Nayak et al. (2008, 2010) in that it is retrospective, using field measurements of carbon stores and fluxes to estimate CO₂ payback time. We support the contention of Nayak et al. (2008, 2010) that characterising peatland hydrology is critical in estimating the CO₂ emissions from degraded land, and that action taken to minimise the drainage of water from soils around roads, turbine foundations and building works is essential for minimising carbon loss.

CONCLUSION

Useful conclusions can be drawn from the work of Nayak et al. (2008, 2010), Hall (2006) and this study. First, CO₂ emissions caused by site disturbance may equal or exceed those resulting from the manufacture, operation and decommissioning of a wind farm. Secondly, although the calculations are site specific, wind farms on natural and afforested peatlands can deliver acceptable CO₂ payback times of less than four years. This relatively short payback time underlines the productivity and low carbon footprint of wind turbines over their operating lifetimes. However, there is a distinct difference between natural and afforested peatlands in terms of their responses to site disturbance. Natural peatland ecosystems are fragile hydrological complexes in which introduced features that interrupt water flow can lower the water table far from the edge of excavation, exposing the most labile carbon fraction to decomposition. In an afforested peatland, the landscape is a quilt of forest stands with drawdown, segmented and discontinuous water table, lessening the influence of drainage on soil carbon efflux. Clearfelling at Harwood Forest results in a rise in water table, not a drop, and in any case the most labile fraction of soil carbon will have been lost during the initial conversion to plantation decades earlier. A more significant factor in the disturbance of afforested peatlands is the loss of sequestration, litterfall and below-ground carbon transport from trees, as well as the accelerated loss of dissolved and suspended organic carbon in streamflow as a result of clearfelling.

Despite the technical case that the CO₂ emissions avoided by installing a wind farm on an afforested peatland probably exceed the emissions caused by disturbance of the site, it should be remembered that CO₂ payback time is a relative measure. The case for excavating and degrading peatland soil is supportable only as a lesser of evils. A higher portion of low-carbon power in the national electricity mix would reduce its CO₂ intensity and extend the CO₂ payback time if calculated on the basis of the full grid mix, thus weakening the case for building wind farms on natural and semi-natural sites. Wind power developers should be aware of greenhouse gas emissions associated with site development and make efforts to reduce the footprints of pad sites, buffer zones, roads and building works that disturb hydrology, forests and soils.
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