

Copyright is owned by the Author of the thesis. Permission is given for a copy to be downloaded by an individual for the purpose of research and private study only. The thesis may not be reproduced elsewhere without the permission of the Author.

# **Quantifying and Valuing the Ecosystem Services of Pastoral Soils under a Dairy Use**

A thesis presented in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree

of

Doctor of Philosophy

in

Ecological Economics

at

Massey University, Palmerston North, New Zealand

**Estelle Jeanne DOMINATI**

**2011**



## Abstract

The full range of ecosystem services provided by soils are rarely recognised or understood, nor is the link between soil natural capital and these services. Understanding these concepts is more important than ever to meet the food and fibre demands of a growing global population, while ensuring the sustainability of the finite resource that is soil. The objective of the thesis was to develop a framework to describe the natural capital and ecosystem services of pastoral soils, and to apply it to quantify and value soil ecosystem services under a dairy use in New Zealand.

A new conceptual framework was developed from current scientific understanding of land classification, soil formation, soil processes and ecosystem services concepts. The framework links soil formation, maintenance and degradation processes to soil natural capital stocks, and provides a basis for exploring the influence of drivers like climate and land use on soil natural capital stocks and the flow of ecosystem services. The soil services identified included provision of food, support to human infrastructure and animals, flood mitigation, filtering of nutrients and contaminants, detoxification and recycling of wastes, carbon storage and greenhouse gases regulation, and pest and disease populations regulation. Based on the conceptual framework, new methodology was developed to quantify and model each provisioning and regulating service from soils. Proxies based on soil properties and a process-based model were used to explore the impacts of soil type (Horotiu silt loam and Te Kowhai silt loam) and dairy management practices on soil properties and processes behind each service at the farm scale. Neoclassical economic valuation techniques were then used to value soil ecosystem services for the case study examples.

Under a dairy operation, the total value of soil ecosystem services was \$15,777/ha/yr for a Horotiu silt loam. Regulating services (\$11,445/ha/yr) had a greater value than provisioning services (\$4,322/ha/yr). The ecosystem services from a Te Kowhai silt loam were less valuable, \$11,687/ha/yr. The difference in value between soils reflects differences in their physical structure and associated hydraulic properties, the natural capital stocks behind many services. Valuing some services (e.g. filtering of P) was challenging since some services cannot be substituted by artificial inputs or manufactured capital.

This new approach provides for the first time land managers and policy makers with the ability to compare the total utility of soils, not just their productivity and versatility for different land uses. It also provides a powerful practical tool for evaluating the environmental impact of farm management practices, resource management options and policy alternatives at the regional and national levels, by enabling direct linkages between the economy and the environment. This study allows the value of soil to be benchmarked against commonly used indicators of economic performance such as GDP at the national level and net profits at the farm scale. The case study examples showed that the value of 'un-priced' soil ecosystem services to be significantly higher than net profit of dairy farms.

## Acknowledgements

Firstly, I would like to dedicate this work to my dad, Jacques Raymond Dominati (1947-2005), the first and real doctor of the family. He passed away before I even started my Ph.D., but I know he would have enjoyed this work very much, passionate by gardening and the outdoors as he was. I miss him every day.

A great thank you to each and every one of all the many people who have supported me throughout my Ph.D. First, I would like to thank my partner, Mike Cook, for his tremendous patience, kindness, love, and endless support. He has kept me sane through the whole process, and was always available to listen to my “PhD ranting”. I owe him more than I can tell.

I am particularly grateful to my supervisor, Dr. Alec Mackay, for the countless hours spent with me, his constant encouragements, and his much appreciated and contagious enthusiasm and energy. Twice, he gave me the opportunity to come to New Zealand and work on captivating projects, and for that I will be forever indebted to him.

A very special thank you to Dr. Steve Green, for his patience with “frog girl”, the endless hours of modelling, and his great contribution to this work. It wouldn’t have been possible without him. I also want to thank Professor Murray Patterson for his supervision, advice and great insight.

To my dear family, thank you for always being there for me, even from the other side of the world. Thank you to my mum, Sylviane, for her love, and always wanting the best for us. To my little brother, Emmanuel, who managed to become a doctor before me. He’s always been the crafty one. To my aunt Maryse and my uncle Max for their support. And to all the rest of you, dearest to my heart.

I am indebted to a number of people who have been a great help, passing on knowledge, especially Dr. Brent Clothier, Dr. Kevin Tate, Dr. Surinder Saggat, and many unnamed others at Landcare Research, Plant and Food Research and AgResearch. It’s been great to work with you all these past four years.

I would also like to thank my wonderful friends, in New Zealand and in France, especially Julie Piazza and Elsje Van der Merwe: thank you for all the girly chats and the much needed laughter. But also Aurelie, Liat, Amelie, Anne-Gaelle, Elodie, Emilie, Cyriele, Natalie, “the girls” back home, and all the others, you know who you are!

Last but not least, I would like to thank AgResearch for their financial support, as a member of the sustainable land use research initiative (SLURI), a formal collaboration between three Crown Research Institutes.



<b>Chapter Three</b>	<b>Detailed Framework for Cultural and Provisioning Services provided by Soils</b>	<b>41</b>
3.1	Cultural services	41
3.2	The provision of food, wood and fibre	42
3.2.1	Soil properties and supporting processes involved in the provision of food	44
3.2.1.1	Role of soil structure: the provision of support to plants	44
3.2.1.2	Role of available water capacity: the provision of water to plants	47
3.2.1.3	Role of soil fertility: the provision of nutrients to plants	50
3.2.2	Degradation processes and drivers impacting on the provision of food	60
3.2.2.1	Degradation processes affecting the provision of food	60
3.2.2.2	External drivers affecting plant growth	62
3.2.3	Quantifying plant growth and the provision of food from soil natural capital stocks	64
3.2.3.1	Previous attempts to quantify the provision of food from soils	64
3.2.3.2	Parameters chosen to quantify plant growth and the provision of food	65
3.3	Provision of support for human infrastructure and animals	69
3.3.1	Soil properties and supporting processes involved in the provision of support to human infrastructure and animals	73
3.3.2	Degradation processes and drivers impacting on the provision of support	76
3.3.3	Quantifying the provision of support for human infrastructure and animals	77
3.4	Provision of raw materials	78
3.5	Summary of the quantification of soil provisioning services	80
<b>Chapter Four</b>	<b>Detailed Framework for Regulating Services provided by Soils</b>	<b>83</b>
4.1	Flood mitigation	83
4.1.1	Soil properties and supporting processes contributing to the provision of flood mitigation	84
4.1.2	Degradation processes and drivers influencing flood mitigation	88
4.1.3	Quantification of flood mitigation	89
4.1.3.1	Previous attempts to quantify flood mitigation	89
4.1.3.2	Parameters chosen to quantify flood mitigation	89
4.2	Filtering of nutrients and contaminants	90
4.2.1	Soil properties and supporting processes contributing to the filtering of nutrients and contaminants	90
4.2.2	Degradation processes and drivers influencing the filtering of nutrients and contaminants	96
4.2.3	Quantifying the filtering of nutrients and contaminants	98
4.2.3.1	Previous attempts to quantify the filtering of nutrients and contaminants	98

4.2.3.2	Parameters chosen to quantify the filtering of nutrients and contaminants	98
4.3	Detoxification and decomposition of wastes	101
4.3.1	Soil properties and supporting processes contributing to detoxification and the decomposition of wastes	104
4.3.2	Degradation processes and drivers influencing the detoxification and decomposition of wastes	108
4.3.3	Quantifying detoxification and the recycling of wastes	112
4.3.3.1	Previous attempts to quantify detoxification and the recycling of wastes	112
4.3.3.2	Parameters chosen to quantify detoxification and the recycling of wastes	112
4.4	Carbon storage and greenhouse gases regulation	113
4.4.1	Soil properties and supporting processes contributing to carbon storage and greenhouse gases regulation	114
4.4.1.1	Carbon stocks and carbon flows	116
4.4.1.2	Greenhouse gases regulation from soil	126
4.4.2	Degradation processes and drivers influencing carbon storage and greenhouse gases regulation	130
4.4.2.1	Degradation processes	130
4.4.2.2	External drivers	131
4.4.3	Quantifying carbon storage and greenhouse gases regulation	132
4.4.3.1	Previous attempts to quantify carbon storage and greenhouse gases regulation	132
4.4.3.2	Parameters chosen to quantify carbon storage and greenhouse gases regulation	133
4.5	Biological regulation of pest and disease populations	136
4.5.1	Soil properties and supporting processes contributing to the regulation of pest and disease populations	143
4.5.1.1	Regulation of population dynamics of soil biota	143
4.5.1.2	Regulation of animal pests and diseases	145
4.5.1.3	Regulation of plant pests	147
4.5.2	Degradation processes and drivers influencing the regulation of pests and diseases	150
4.5.3	Quantifying the regulation of pest and disease populations	151
4.5.3.1	Previous attempts to quantify the regulation of pest and disease populations	151
4.5.3.2	Parameters chosen to quantify the regulation of pest and disease populations	152
4.6	Summary of the quantification of soil regulating services	153
<b>PART TWO</b>	<b>CAPACITY BUILDING</b>	<b>157</b>
<b>Chapter Five</b>	<b>Methodology for the Dynamic Modelling of Soil Ecosystem Services</b>	<b>159</b>
5.1	Context of the study	159
5.1.1	A dairy farm in the Waikato	163

5.1.2	Soils chosen for the study	163
5.1.2.1	Typic Orthic Allophanic Soil	164
5.1.2.2	Typic Orthic Gley Soil	165
5.2	Modelling soil ecosystem services	165
5.2.1	The SPASMO model	166
5.2.2	History and functioning of the SPASMO model	168
5.2.3	Model inputs	169
5.3	Additions made to the model	171
5.3.1	Pasture utilisation	174
5.3.2	Impacts of cattle treading on soil structure	176
5.3.2.1	Macropore loss function	177
5.3.2.2	Macroporosity recovery after treading	183
5.3.2.3	Effects of cattle treading on runoff	185
5.3.3	Impacts of treading on pasture growth	187
5.3.3.1	Loss of pasture growth potential	188
5.3.3.2	Relative treading damage on pasture	189
5.3.3.3	Recovery of pasture growth potential after a grazing event	190
5.3.4	Rotation and stocking rate	192
5.3.5	Use of a standoff-pad	193
5.3.6	Calculation of P runoff	193
5.3.7	Simulation of extreme N and P losses	195
5.4	Summary of modelling	195
 <b>Chapter Six</b>		
	<b>Methods for the Economic Valuation of the Environment and Soil Ecosystem Services</b>	<b>197</b>
6.1	Different theories for valuing soil ecosystem services	197
6.1.1	Value and Neoclassical Economics	197
6.1.1.1	Neoclassical Economics, theory of value and price	198
6.1.1.2	Rationale for neoclassical economic valuation	204
6.1.1.3	Problems with neoclassical economic valuation	205
6.1.2	Value and Ecological Economics	207
6.1.2.1	EMERGY analysis and ecological pricing	207
6.1.2.2	Ecological and contributory values	208
6.1.2.3	Multicriteria methods and value pluralism	210
6.1.3	Intrinsic value	211
6.2	Neoclassical economic valuation methods	212
6.2.1	Criteria for evaluating neoclassical valuation methods	213
6.2.2	Techniques using revealed preferences	214
6.2.2.1	Market prices	214
6.2.2.2	Productivity change approach	215
6.2.2.3	Averting behaviour and defensive expenditure	217
6.2.2.4	Replacement cost approach	219
6.2.2.5	Provision cost approach	221
6.2.2.6	Hedonic pricing method	223
6.2.2.7	Travel Cost method	226
6.2.3	Techniques using stated preferences	228
6.2.3.1	Contingent valuation method	228

6.2.3.2	Random utility theory and choice modelling	230
6.2.3.3	Group valuation	235
6.2.4	Benefit transfer	237
6.2.5	Final evaluation of neoclassical economic valuation methods	239
6.3	Conclusion on valuation	243
<b>PART THREE</b>	<b>EMPIRICAL RESULTS FOR DAIRY FARM SOILS</b>	<b>245</b>
<b>Chapter Seven</b>	<b>Quantification and Economic Valuation of Soil Ecosystem Services</b>	<b>247</b>
7.1	Description of the typical dairy farm and base case scenario	247
7.2	General methodology	248
7.3	Provision of food, wood and fibre (S1)	251
7.3.1	Quantification of the provision of food	251
7.3.2	Economic valuation of the provision of food	254
7.3.2.1	Value of the food quantity (S1a)	254
7.3.2.2	Value of the food quality (S1b)	256
7.4	Provision of support for human infrastructure and animals (S2)	257
7.4.1	Provision of support for human infrastructure (S2a)	257
7.4.1.1	Quantification of the provision of support for Infrastructure	257
7.4.1.2	Economic valuation of the provision of support for infrastructure	258
7.4.2	Provision of support for animals (S2b)	261
7.4.2.1	Quantification of the provision of support for animals	261
7.4.2.2	Economic valuation of the provision of support for animals	262
7.5	Provision of raw materials	265
7.6	Flood mitigation (S3)	266
7.6.1	Quantification of flood mitigation	266
7.6.2	Economic valuation of flood mitigation	267
7.7	Filtering of nutrients and contaminants (S4)	269
7.7.1	Quantification of the filtering of nutrients	269
7.7.1.1	Quantification of the filtering of N	270
7.7.1.2	Quantification of the filtering of P	271
7.7.2	Economic valuation of the filtering of nutrients	273
7.7.2.1	Valuation of the filtering of N (S4a)	273
7.7.2.2	Valuation of the filtering of P (S4b)	276
7.7.3	Quantification of the filtering of contaminants	278
7.7.4	Valuation of the filtering of contaminants (S4c)	280
7.8	Detoxification and recycling of wastes (S5)	282
7.8.1	Quantification of the recycling of wastes	282
7.8.2	Valuation of the recycling of wastes	283
7.9	Carbon storage and greenhouse gases regulation (S6)	285
7.9.1	Quantification of carbon storage and GHGs regulation	285
7.9.2	Valuation of carbon storage and GHGs regulation	294

7.10	Regulation of pest and disease populations (S7)	294
	7.10.1 Quantification of the regulation of pest populations	295
	7.10.2 Valuation of the regulation of pest populations	297
7.11	Summary of quantification and valuation	299

<b>Chapter Eight</b>	<b>Impact of Soil Type on the Provision of Soil Ecosystem Services</b>	<b>305</b>
----------------------	--	------------

8.1	Effect of soil type on the provision of soil services	305
8.2	Soil services quantification and valuation	306
	8.2.1 Provision of food quantity	306
	8.2.2 Provision of food quality	307
	8.2.3 Provision of support for human infrastructure	308
	8.2.4 Provision of support to animals	308
	8.2.5 Provision of raw materials	309
	8.2.6 Flood mitigation	309
	8.2.7 Filtering of N	310
	8.2.8 Filtering of P	312
	8.2.9 Filtering of contaminants	314
	8.2.10 Recycling of wastes	315
	8.2.11 Carbon flows	316
	8.2.12 Nitrous oxide regulation	317
	8.2.13 Methane oxidation	318
	8.2.14 Regulation of pest and disease populations	319
8.3	Overview of the influence of soil type on the provision of soil services	320

<b>Chapter Nine</b>	<b>Impact of Dairy Cow stocking rates and the Use of a Standoff Pad on the Provision of Soil Ecosystem Services</b>	<b>323</b>
---------------------	---	------------

9.1	Twelve scenarios to investigate farm management	323
9.2	Soil services quantification and valuation	324
	9.2.1 Provision of food quantity	324
	9.2.2 Provision of food quality	326
	9.2.3 Provision of support for human infrastructure	326
	9.2.4 Provision of support to animals	326
	9.2.5 Provision of raw materials	328
	9.2.6 Flood mitigation	328
	9.2.7 Filtering of N	329
	9.2.8 Filtering of P	331
	9.2.9 Filtering of contaminants	333
	9.2.10 Recycling of wastes	335
	9.2.11 Carbon flows	337
	9.2.12 Nitrous oxide regulation	338
	9.2.13 Methane oxidation	340
	9.2.14 Regulation of pest and disease populations	341
9.3	Overview of the influence of farm management on the provision of soil services	343

<b>Chapter Ten</b>	<b>Thesis Summary and Conclusions</b>	<b>349</b>
10.1	Thesis contributions	349
	10.1.1 Theoretical contributions	349
	10.1.2 Methodological contributions	351
	10.1.3 Knowledge contributions	352
10.2	Limitations of the study	354
	10.2.1 Of the quantification	354
	10.2.2 Of the economic valuation	357
	10.2.3 Of the framework and the whole exercise	359
10.3	Future research	359
	10.3.1 Immediate future of this work	359
	10.3.2 Applications of a soil services framework for land management around the world	360
	10.3.3 Applications of a soil services framework for land management in New Zealand	361
	10.3.3.1 Natural capital based land management	361
	10.3.3.2 Improving soil quality indicators	362
	10.3.3.3 Informing the debate on land use and land use change	362
	10.3.3.4 Investing in ecological infrastructure	363
	<b>List of PhD Outputs</b>	<b>365</b>
	<b>References</b>	<b>367</b>
	<b>APPENDICES</b>	<b>389</b>
<b>Appendix A</b>	<b>Examples of SPASMO Input Files</b>	<b>391</b>
<b>Appendix B</b>	<b>P sorption Function for P Leaching</b>	<b>395</b>
<b>Appendix C</b>	<b>Examples of SPASMO Outputs</b>	<b>398</b>
<b>Appendix D</b>	<b>Determination of Sustainable Yield</b>	<b>401</b>
<b>Appendix E</b>	<b>Multiplier Effect for the Waikato economy</b>	<b>403</b>
<b>Appendix F</b>	<b>Data and Methods for the Economic Valuation of Soil Services</b>	<b>404</b>
F.1	Annualisation of capital costs	404
F.2	Standoff pad costs	405
F.3	Effluent system costs	408
F.4	Mitigation functions	411
	F.4.1 N mitigation function	411
	F.4.2 P mitigation function	414
F.5	Constructed wetlands costs	415

## List of Figures

Figure 1-1	North Island land uses	1
Figure 1-2	Relationships between thesis chapters	9
Figure 2-1	Illustration of the use of the key terms employed in this thesis	14
Figure 2-2	Framework for the provision of ecosystem services from soil natural capital	26
Figure 2-3	Simplified relationships between some soil components (hexagons) and properties (rectangles)	28
Figure 3-1	Detail of the conceptual framework applied to the provision of food, wood and fibre	43
Figure 3-2	Drivers and soil properties influencing the provision of food, wood and fibre	45
Figure 3-3	North Island cobalt deficient soils	52
Figure 3-4	Body width of soil fauna	56
Figure 3-5	Earthworm functional groups	57
Figure 3-6	Food-web of selected soil faunal groups	59
Figure 3-7	Relative pasture yield as a function of Olsen P for two different soil orders	68
Figure 3-8	Detail of the conceptual framework applied to the provision of support	71
Figure 3-9	Drivers and soil properties influencing the provision of support for human infrastructure and animals	72
Figure 3-10	Relationship between soil water content and bulk density for different soils	74
Figure 3-11	The Atterberg consistency limits (schematic)	74
Figure 3-12	Methods of measuring soil strength	75
Figure 3-13	Detail of the conceptual framework applied to the provision of raw materials	78
Figure 4-1	Detail of the conceptual framework applied to flood mitigation	84
Figure 4-2	Drivers and soil properties influencing flood mitigation	87
Figure 4-3	Detail of the conceptual framework applied to the filtering of nutrients and contaminants	91
Figure 4-4	Drivers and soil properties influencing the filtering of nutrients	92
Figure 4-5	Quantification of the filtering of nutrients	100
Figure 4-6	Total number of cows in New Zealand and herd size since 1975	102
Figure 4-7	Detail of the conceptual framework applied to detoxification and the decomposition of wastes	104
Figure 4-8	Drivers and soil properties influencing detoxification and the recycling of wastes	106
Figure 4-9	Detail of the conceptual framework applied to carbon storage and greenhouse gases regulation	114
Figure 4-10	Drivers and soil properties influencing carbon storage and greenhouse gases regulation	115
Figure 4-11	Organic carbon as percentage of soil mass in different New Zealand soil orders	116
Figure 4-12	Soil carbon cycle	120

Figure 4-13	The major flows of C through plants and animals in grazed pastures	125
Figure 4-14	Typical life cycle of most internal parasites	139
Figure 4-15	Detail of the conceptual framework applied to the regulation of pest and disease populations	142
Figure 4-16	Hypothetical model of the effects of management intensity on the diversity of soil fauna in agricultural grasslands	144
Figure 4-17	Drivers and soil properties influencing the regulation of pest and disease populations	149
Figure 5-1	Total number of cows in New Zealand and herd size since 1975	160
Figure 5-2	New Zealand dairy cattle breeds	160
Figure 5-3	Regional distribution of dairy cattle (2008/09)	161
Figure 5-4	High class soils in New Zealand	162
Figure 5-5	Distribution of soil orders in the North Island of New Zealand	164
Figure 5-6	Different steps of the modelling process	167
Figure 5-7	Grass utilised and buried according to the volumetric soil water content	175
Figure 5-8	Relationship between soil consistency and gravimetric water content	178
Figure 5-9	Data used to build the macropore loss function	180
Figure 5-10	Function calculating the macropore loss after a treading event as a function of soil water content	182
Figure 5-11	Macropore loss (%): data versus simulated model outputs	183
Figure 5-12	Example of model output: Macroporosity recovery after a treading event that decreased macroporosity from 12% to 4%	185
Figure 5-13	Decision tool to determine the loss in pasture yield potential from stocking rate (SR) and grazing time (GT) for a range of soil orders	188
Figure 5-14	Loss of pasture growth potential depending on treading intensity (TI): data and model fit	189
Figure 5-15	Actual loss of pasture growth function	190
Figure 5-16	Actual loss of pasture growth (ALp) and recovery depending on the number of days after treading	191
Figure 5-17	Relationship between daily rainfall amount (mm) and rainfall erosivity	194
Figure 6-1	Conventional supply and demand curves for a typical marketed good or service	199
Figure 6-2	Supply and demand curves for ecosystem services	200
Figure 6-3	Total economic value	201
Figure 7-1	Modelled pasture yield for the typical dairy farm on a Horotiu silt loam	251
Figure 7-2	Pasture utilisation (grass eaten / total yield) (%)	252
Figure 7-3	Relative pasture yield as a function of Olsen P for an Allophanic Soil	253
Figure 7-4	Annual pasture yield (kgDM/ha/yr) from natural capital (NC) and added capital	254
Figure 7-5	Economic value (\$/ha/yr) of the provision of food from natural Capital (NC)	255
Figure 7-6	Definition of the value of the provision of support for human infrastructure	258
Figure 7-7	Percentage of days between May and October when $SWC < (FC + Sat) / 2$ for the base case scenario	262

Figure 7-8	Maintenance cost of a standoff pad (\$/ha/yr) depending of the number of days in use and stocking rate	263
Figure 7-9	Total cost of a standoff pad and value of the provision of support to animals depending on the number of days when $SWC > (FC + Sat) / 2$ between May and October (schematic)	264
Figure 7-10	Runoff (mm/ha/year) outputs from SPASMO for the base case scenario	266
Figure 7-11	Relationship between rainfall, runoff and the flood mitigation service	267
Figure 7-12	Maximum annual amount (mm) of water stored by the soil (rainfall - runoff) for seven consecutive days	268
Figure 7-13	Max N loss and modelled N loss outputs from SPASMO over 35 years	270
Figure 7-14	Amount of N filtered (kgN/ha/yr)	271
Figure 7-15	Max P loss (P drainage) modelled with SPASMO	272
Figure 7-16	P runoff outputs from SPASMO over 35 years	273
Figure 7-17	Method for the valuation of the filtering of nutrients	274
Figure 7-18	Mitigation function for N leaching for a Horotiu silt loam	276
Figure 7-19	Mitigation function for P losses for a Horotiu silt loam	277
Figure 7-20	Yearly rainfall and runoff (mm/ha) within five days after a grazing event	279
Figure 7-21	Maximum amount (mm/ha) of filtered water (FCt) for each year	280
Figure 7-22	Percentage of dung deposited in restricting conditions over 35 years	283
Figure 7-23	Net variations of C stocks for 1m depth over 35 years	285
Figure 7-24	IPCC methodology to calculate N <sub>2</sub> O emissions from grazed pastures	288
Figure 7-25	Annual-measured, model-predicted and IPCC-calculated N <sub>2</sub> O emissions from two ungrazed and dairy grazed sites	291
Figure 7-26	Max and modelled N <sub>2</sub> O emissions calculated from SPASMO	292
Figure 7-27	CH <sub>4</sub> oxidation over 35 years	293
Figure 7-28	Life cycles of porina and grass grub	295
Figure 7-29	Value (\$/ha/yr) of the regulation of pest populations by soils	299
Figure 8-1	Modelled pastures yield for the two soils over 35 years	306
Figure 8-2	Value (\$/ha/yr) of the provision of food from the two soils over 35 years	307
Figure 8-3	Relationship between yield from natural capital and rainfall for the two soils	307
Figure 8-4	Number of days per year when $SWC < (FC + Sat) / 2$ for the two soils over 35 years	308
Figure 8-5	Value (\$/ha/yr) of the provision of support to animals for the two soils over 35 years	309
Figure 8-6	Maximum weekly RF-RO per year (mm/ha/yr) for the two soils over 35 years	310
Figure 8-7	Value (\$/ha/yr) of flood mitigation for the two soils over 35 years	310
Figure 8-8	Amount of modelled N (kg N/ha/yr) leached and filtered by the two soils over 35 years	311
Figure 8-9	Value (\$/ha/yr) of the filtering of N for the two soils over 35 years	311

Figure 8-10	Relationship between, the modelled N filtered (kg N/ha/yr) and rainfall (mm) for the two soils	312
Figure 8-11	Measures of modelled P runoff and P filtered (kg P/ha/yr) by Horotiu silt loam over 35 years	312
Figure 8-12	Measures of modelled P runoff and P filtered (kg P/ha/yr) by Te Kowhai silt loam over 35 years	313
Figure 8-13	Value (\$/ha/yr) of the filtering of P for the two soils over 35 years	314
Figure 8-14	Measure of the maximum 5 days RF-RO per year (mm/ha/yr) for the two soils over 35 years	314
Figure 8-15	Value (\$/ha/yr) of the filtering of contaminants for the two soils over 35 years	315
Figure 8-16	Percentage of dung deposited in ideal degradation conditions for the two soils over 35 years	315
Figure 8-17	Value (\$/ha/yr) of the recycling of wastes for the two soils over 35 years	316
Figure 8-18	Net C flows (kg C/ha/yr) for the two soils over 35 years	316
Figure 8-19	Value (\$/ha/yr) of C flows for the two soils over 35 years	317
Figure 8-20	N <sub>2</sub> O emissions (kg N <sub>2</sub> O/ha/yr) regulated by the two soils over 35 years	318
Figure 8-21	Value (\$/ha/yr) of N <sub>2</sub> O regulation for the two soils over 35 years	318
Figure 8-22	Value (\$/ha/yr) of methane oxidation for the two soils over 35 years	319
Figure 8-23	Number of favourable days for pest development from October to March for the two soils over 35 years	319
Figure 8-24	Value (\$/ha/yr) of the regulation of pest and disease populations for the two soils over 35 years	320
Figure 8-25	Total value (\$/ha/yr) of soil services for the two soil types over 35 years	321
Figure 9-1	Average yield (kg DM/ha/yr) from natural capital stocks for all scenarios	324
Figure 9-2	Average percentage of total yield from natural capital for all scenarios	325
Figure 9-3	Value (\$/ha/yr) of the provision of food for all scenarios	325
Figure 9-4	Average number of days between May and October when $SWC < (FC + Sat)/2$ over 35 years for all scenarios	327
Figure 9-5	Value (\$/ha/yr) of the provision of support to animals for all scenarios	327
Figure 9-6	Average of modelled annual runoff (mm) over 35 years for all scenarios	328
Figure 9-7	Average annual maximum of 7 days rainfall - runoff (mm/ha) for all scenarios over 35 years	328
Figure 9-8	Value (\$/ha/yr) of flood mitigation for all scenarios over 35 years	329
Figure 9-9	Average modelled N filtered (kgN/ha/yr) for all scenarios over 35 years	330
Figure 9-10	Average modelled N leached (kgN/ha/yr) for all scenarios over 35 years	330
Figure 9-11	Value (\$/ha/yr) of filtering of N for all scenarios over 35 years	331

Figure 9-12	Average modelled annual P filtered (kg P/ha/yr) for all scenarios over 35 years	332
Figure 9-13	Average modelled annual P runoff (kg P/ha/yr) for all scenarios over 35 years	332
Figure 9-14	Value (\$/ha/yr) of the filtering of P for all scenarios over 35 years	333
Figure 9-15	Average annual contaminated runoff (mm) 5 days after a grazing event for all scenarios over 35 years	334
Figure 9-16	Average percentage of annual contaminated rainfall 5 days after a grazing event for all scenarios over 35 years	334
Figure 9-17	Value (\$/ha/yr) of filtering of contaminants for all scenarios over 35 years	335
Figure 9-18	Average percentage of dung potentially well decomposed for all scenarios over 35 years	336
Figure 9-19	Value (\$/ha/yr) of the decomposition of wastes for all scenarios over 35 years	336
Figure 9-20	Average net C flows (kg C/ha/yr) for all scenarios over 35 years	337
Figure 9-21	Value (\$/ha/yr) of net C flows for all scenarios over 35 years	338
Figure 9-22	Average N <sub>2</sub> O emissions and N <sub>2</sub> O mitigated (kg N <sub>2</sub> O/ha/yr) for all scenarios over 35 years	339
Figure 9-23	Value (\$/ha/yr) of N <sub>2</sub> O emissions regulation for all scenarios over 35 years	340
Figure 9-24	Average CH <sub>4</sub> oxidation (kg CH <sub>4</sub> /ha/yr) for all scenarios over 35 years	340
Figure 9-25	Value (\$/ha/yr) of CH <sub>4</sub> oxidation for all scenarios over 35 years	341
Figure 9-26	Average number of favourable days to pasture pest development between October and December for all scenarios over 35 years	342
Figure 9-27	Value (\$/ha/yr) of the regulation of pest and disease populations for all scenarios over 35 years	342
Figure 9-28	Total value (\$/ha/yr) of soil services for the twelve scenarios studied over 35 years	345
Figure 9-29	Total value (\$/ha/yr) of soil services for all scenarios (P<0.05)	345
Figure 9-30	Difference in value (\$/ha/yr) between scenarios with and without a standoff pad	348
Figure B.1	Simple relationship describing P sorption at saturation (Q, mg/kg) as a function of P retention (%)	396
Figure B.2	Exponential function between Q <sub>max</sub> (P adsorbed at saturation) times d (depth, m) and the fitting parameter b (L/mg) of the Langmuir isotherm	396
Figure B.3	Langmuir isotherm for P retention from the A horizon (0-20 cm deep) of the soil profile at Tararua Road, Levin	397
Figure D.1	Calibration curves between Olsen P and relative yield for a Allophanic and a Gley Soil	401
Figure D.2	Calibration curve for a Allophanic Soil	402
Figure D.3	Calibration curve for a Gley Soil	402
Figure F.1	N mitigation function for Horotiu and Te kowhai silt loams	414
Figure F.2	P mitigation functions for Horotiu and Te kowhai silt loams	415

## List of Tables

Table 2-1	Ecosystem roles mentioned by different classification systems	18
Table 2-2	Soil ecosystem services and agro-ecosystem services classifications and the concordances between them	22
Table 3-1	Classification of pores according to size and function	46
Table 3-2	Some dairy livestock pest and disease and their relation to soils	53
Table 3-3	Summary of soil natural capital stocks behind provisioning services and parameters chosen for the quantification	81
Table 4-1	Soil pores function in relation to their size	85
Table 4-2	Estimated major stores of C on the Earth	113
Table 4-3	Areal extent of major land-cover types in New Zealand in 2000	117
Table 4-4	Soil (0-0.3 m) C stocks for different land uses (1990)	117
Table 4-5	Soil properties in dairy-grazed pasture under three stocking rates on two soil types, Waikato, New Zealand	118
Table 4-6	Change in total C of grazed land for different land categories (tC/ha/yr) for 0-30 cm depth	118
Table 4-7	National values of net ecosystem production by land cover	122
Table 4-8	CH <sub>4</sub> and N <sub>2</sub> O emissions from agriculture, from New Zealand GHGs inventory	127
Table 4-9	Improved pastures soil C values (0-0.3 m) (tC/ha)	133
Table 4-10	Carbon losses rates from pastures	134
Table 4-11	Seasonal methane uptake (sink) from two soil types	135
Table 4-12	Pasture pests and diseases and their relation to soils	137
Table 4-13	Main pasture pests of New Zealand	138
Table 4-14	Some dairy livestock pests and diseases and their relation to soils	141
Table 4-15	Summary of the quantification of soil regulating services	154
Table 4-16	Parameters used to quantify the provision of regulating services from soils	155
Table 5-1	Dairy cattle breeds characteristics (season 2008/2009)	161
Table 5-2	Average dairy farm data (season 2008/2009)	163
Table 5-3	Soil properties (0-10cm) of Horotiu and Te Kowhai	165
Table 5-4	Farm data as inputs to SPASMO	170
Table 5-5	Fertiliser best management practices	170
Table 5-6	Data used for the quantification of each of the parameters chosen	172
Table 5-7	Gravimetric soil moisture (0-10cm) for Horotiu and Te Kowhai	179
Table 5-8	Thresholds of soil sensitivity to treading damage (mm) by gravimetric (GSWC) and volumetric (VSWC) soil water content	181
Table 5-9	References of soil macroporosity recovery	184
Table 5-10	Soil conservation service curve number for a grazed pasture	186
Table 6-1	Links between ecosystem services and the total economic value framework	203
Table 6-2	Valuation techniques classified according to method and market type	213
Table 6-3	Market prices versus criteria for soil valuation	215
Table 6-4	Productivity change approach versus criteria for soil valuation	217
Table 6-5	Defensive expenditures versus criteria for soil valuation	219

Table 6-6	Replacement cost approach versus criteria for soil valuation	221
Table 6-7	Provision cost approach versus criteria for soil valuation	222
Table 6-8	Hedonic pricing versus criteria for soil valuation	225
Table 6-9	Travel cost method versus criteria for soil valuation	227
Table 6-10	Contingent valuation method versus criteria for soil valuation	230
Table 6-11	Choice modelling variants	232
Table 6-12	Level of attribute	232
Table 6-13	Choice modelling versus criteria for soil valuation	234
Table 6-14	Group valuation versus criteria for soil valuation	236
Table 6-15	Types of benefit transfer methods	237
Table 6-16	Summary of valuation techniques versus criteria for soil valuation	240
Table 6-17	Possible valuation techniques considered for the valuation of soil services	242
Table 7-1	Characteristic of the typical dairy farm for the base case scenario	248
Table 7-2	Overview of the proxies and valuation techniques used for each soil service	250
Table 7-3	Costs of prevention of trace-elements deficiencies	256
Table 7-4	Bulk density (g/cm <sup>3</sup> ) of a Horotiu silt loam	258
Table 7-5	Aggregate surface thickness and construction costs by soil type	260
Table 7-6	Mitigation options to reduce N losses and costs for 3 cows/ha	275
Table 7-7	IPCC factors used in this study	287
Table 7-8	Detail of the Calculation of N <sub>2</sub> O emissions from soils	290
Table 7-9	Seasonal methane uptake (sink) from two soil types	293
Table 7-10	Ideal conditions for pest development	296
Table 7-11	Number of favorable days for pest development between October and March and infestation levels	296
Table 7-12	Costs of application for the insecticide Diazinon 800 EC (\$460.45 for 20L) for a well-established pasture	298
Table 7-13	Different values of soil services for the Horotiu silt loam under a dairy operation, and capital values	302
Table 7-14	Value of some of the infrastructure of a dairy farm	303
Table 8-1	Soil properties (0-10cm) of the Horotiu and Te Kowhai silt loams (New Zealand National Soil Database)	305
Table 8-2	Average direct and indirect emissions of N <sub>2</sub> O (kg N <sub>2</sub> O/ha/yr) from the two soils over 35 years	317
Table 8-3	Average value (\$/ha/yr and % of total value) of soil services for the two soils, under a typical dairy farm operation over 35 years	321
Table 8-4	Comparison of the value (NZ\$/ha/yr) of soil services between different studies	322
Table 9-1	Detail of the twelve scenarios studied	324
Table 9-2	Average value (\$/ha/yr) over 35 years of each soil service for each scenario	344
Table 9-3	Average value of soil services (\$/ha/yr) over 35 years	345
Table 9-4	Contribution (in %) of each service to the total value of soil services	346
Table A.1	Notes on interpreting Virtual Climate Station Data	391
Table A.2	Climate input file for the Ruakura station in the Waikato	392

Table A.3	Soil input file for a Horotiu silt loam	394
Table C.1	Water cycle outputs from SPASMO	399
Table C.2	Macroporosity outputs from SPASMO	400
Table D.1	Calculated minimum relative yield by Olsen P	402
Table F.1	Data on costs of a pad from case studies dairy farms	406
Table F.2	Calculations of wintering pad costs	407
Table F.3	Calculation of the needed volume of an effluent pond	409
Table F.4	Calculations of effluent system costs	410
Table F.5	Mitigation costs to reduce N losses (\$/ha/yr)	412
Table F.6	Efficiency of the three combinations of mitigation techniques to reduce N losses	413
Table F.7	Efficiency of a pad to reduce P losses	414
Table F.8	Calculations of the cost of a constructed wetland	416

## Acronyms and Symbols

### Acronyms:

ASC: Anion storage capacity

AWC: Available water capacity

BCA: Benefit cost analysis

BD: Bulk density

CEC: Cation exchange capacity

DFE: Dairy farm effluents

DM: Dry matter

DOC: Dissolved organic carbon

DOM: Dissolved organic matter

DON: Dissolved organic nitrogen

DOP: Dissolved organic phosphorus

EDCs: Endocrine-disrupting chemicals

ES: Ecosystem services

FC: Field capacity

GHG: Greenhouse gas

GHGs: Greenhouse gases

GT: Grazing time

HM: Heavy metals

HR: Horotiu silt loam

IPCC: Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change

K sat: Hydraulic conductivity

MAF: Ministry for agriculture and forestry in New Zealand

MEA: Millennium ecosystem assessment

MfE: Ministry for the environment in New Zealand

Mp: Macroporosity

MS: Milk solids

NC: Natural capital

NZ: New Zealand

OM: Organic matter

PL: Plastic limit

RF: Rainfall

RO: Runoff

Sat: Saturation

SP: Stress point

SPASMO: Soil plant atmosphere model  
SR: Stocking rate  
SWC: Soil water content  
TDF: Typical dairy farm  
TEV: Total economic value  
TK : Te Kowhai silt loam  
WFPS: Water-filled pore space  
WP: Wilting point  
WTA: Willingness to accept compensation  
WTP: Willingness to pay

**Symbols:**

Ammonia:  $\text{NH}_3$   
Ammonium:  $\text{NH}_4^+$   
Boron: B  
Calcium: Ca  
Carbon dioxide:  $\text{CO}_2$   
Carbon: C  
Chloride: Cl  
Cobalt: Co  
Copper: Cu  
Hydrogen: H  
Iron: Fe  
Magnesium: Mg  
Manganese: Mn  
Methane:  $\text{CH}_4$   
Molybdenum: Mo  
Nitrate:  $\text{NO}_3^-$   
Nitrogen: N  
Nitrous oxide:  $\text{N}_2\text{O}$   
Oxygen:  $\text{O}_2$   
Phosphorus: P  
Potassium: K  
Silicon: Si  
Sodium: Na  
Sulphur: S  
Zinc: Zn

