Acronyms and definitions

**DBH** = diameter at breast height.

**Ndep** = nitrogen deposition, input of reactive nitrogen from the atmosphere to the biosphere both as dry deposition and in precipitation, or wet deposition.

**SF** = stemflow, flow of intercepted water down the stem or trunk of a plant.


**TF** = throughfall, excess precipitation shedded by wet leaves onto the ground.

# Site description and methodology


## Site description

The experiment site is located in Griffin Forest, Perthshire (Scotland, UK), on the north facing slope of the Tay Valley at about 4 km from the town of Aberfeldy.

Figures 1 shows the monthly average temperature for Aberfeldy. This area is characterised by relatively cool winters and warm summers, compared to Scotland. The average annual rainfall for the same period is about 1050 mm per year, with a maximum in 2014 of 1376.2 mm and a minimum in 2016 of768.6 mm (fig. 2).




*Fig. 1: average monthly temperatures in Aberfeldy, years 2012-2016. Source: weatheronline.com*




*Fig. 2: average monthly precipitation in Aberfeldy, years 2012-2016. Source: weatheronline.com*

Rocks in the area of Aberfeldy belong to the Dalradian supergroup, metamorphosed marine sediments of late-Precambrian and Lower Palaeozoic age (Craig 1925).

The bedrock under the forest is characterised by Psammite and Semipelite with minor inclusions of metalava and metatuff, covered by Devensian till deposits (see fig. 3 and 4).



*Fig:3 geological map of the bedrock in the Griffin Forest area (1:50000). Source: Edina digimap.*

**

*Fig:3 geological map of the superficial deposits in Griffin Forest area (1:50000). Source: Edina digimap.*

The main factors determining the maximum height at which trees can grow are altitude, climate (especially wind exposure) and soil quality. The potential maximum height of the tree line exceeds only slightly the 600 meters in the Cairngorms, north of the case study area, which is sensible lower than what can be found in Northern America and Scandinavia at similar latitudes. This can be due to the combination of the cool and wet oceanic climate and the wind exposure; soil types also indirectly reflect these two factors, as a direct combination of relieves and rainfall pattern. The formation of peat blankets in the Scottish uplands, started after the last glaciation, is another limiting factor to the growth of trees that has been changed with the use of drainages in plantations to make the growth of tree roots possible (Conquering the Highlands)

### Before afforestation: brief history of forest cover in Scotland

The present status of Scottish forest cover reflects a very recent afforestation process started on the second decade of the 20th century: at the start of the past century, in fact, less than 5% of the UK were covered by forests (cit. needed?). When thinking of the Highlands, one might think that the typical world known scenery of naked mountains, whose rocks have been modelled by the force of Nature are the effect of the combined pressure of the climatic conditions and human pressure in a relatively recent past. In fact, after the last Ice Age different types of forests covered the Highlands, mainly pine and oak, except the extreme northern portion and the islands where the forest cover was mainly consisting of birch and hazel. The forests extent reached its maximum peak about 6,000 years ago, when an educated guess based on palynological investigations suggest that at least the 60% of Scotland was covered by some sort of vegetation. In that same era proofs of massive utilisation and deforestation dates 4000 years ago by the hand of early farming communities (CtH). In fact, whilst in north-west Scotland the pine forests were largely replaced by blanket-bog before any large impact by man, in the Eastern Highlands human activity was the main destructive agent, stretching over a period from about 1700 BC to about 1000 AD: the fire, the cattle, the sheep and the goats of the Highland peasants, aided by a period of climatic deterioration (the “Little Ice Age” started in the later fourteenth century and not really over before the late seventeenth century) reduced the estimated 50-60% of forest cover during the Mesolithic period to about the four percent during the Middle Ages (Scottish Woodland History).

As written above, at the beginning of the 20th century forests counted for about 5% of the total land in UK. When the WWI burst about 182,000 ha of mostly broadleaved woodland were felled and the urge for a strategic policy to create and maintain a woodland stock brought to what can be considered the foundations of today’s forestry policy and practices: the Forestry Act of 1919. The Forestry Commission (FC) was created and a target of 0.75 million ha of new forests was set, so that the country had not to rely anymore on timber imports. Due to the second Wolrd War conflict, and the consequent need for more timber, In 1943 the FC set a new ambitious target: 1.2 million ha to be afforested and a further 0.8 million ha of “effective” forest to be created by restocking existing woodlands. Afforestation continued undisturbed despite of the loss of strategic interest. At the end of the 1970s the 1943 target was about to be passed. In December 1980 a ministerial statement announced a forestry policy that did not mention a total area of plantations anymore, but envisaged an afforestation rate of 20,000-25,000 ha per year, later increased to 30,000 ha in March 1986. Since 1919 upland afforestation has continued inexorably. Over the last 60 years nearly 18,000 ha have been planted each year.

The area of woodland in the UK at 31st March 2017 exceeds the 3 million hectares, 1.4 of which is located in Scotland. Conifers account for the 51% of the overall forest cover and almost three quarters in Scotland. Sitka spruce accounts for around a half of the conifer area in UK, about 58% in Scotland (ForestryCommission 2017).

### The plantation

Tompkins, Steve. Forestry in crisis. The battle for the hills. 1989. Christopher Helm, London.

“The vocabulary of an upland forester draws irresistible comparisons with agriculture. Afforestation of a bare hillside requires fencing, the elimination of wildlife such as hares and deer (regarded as vermin), deep ploughing and drainage, planting, fertilising and weeding. Today’s foresters talk of rotations, crops and harvests. Their crops have become steadily more dependent on a single, alien species, the Sitka spruce, with lodgepole pine used where the ground is poorest. Tree-breeding programmes are also ensuring that the genetic base of the plants used will steadily decrease. Blanket afforestation consists of even aged conifer monocultures, that are harvested and replanted, like any crop of surplus grain, except that the trees take decades to grow.

The second basic ingredient of British forestry is that the rapid expansion of coniferous plantations has occurred on land where tree growth is least satisfactory – in the uplands. This was due to avoid competition with agriculture, as the production of food was seen to be of key importance, and to take place on cheap land and on a large scale, to reduce unit costs. As to 1986, 34% of hill, moor and rough grazing in Scotland had been afforested (source: NCC 1986).

Numbers of forest plantation – Sitka – Scotland and Tayshire (Forest Commission)

The Griffin Forest plantation was established in 1980-1981 over an area classified as heather moorland. \* Qui va la spiegazione della preparazione del terreno.

The about 4,000 ha were planted a dominance (80%) of Sitka spruce (*Picea sitchensis* (Bongard) Carriere 1855) and additional species such as Douglas fir (*[Pseudotsuga menziesii](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Douglas_fir" \o "Douglas fir)* ([Mirb.](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Charles-Fran%C3%A7ois_Brisseau_de_Mirbel" \o "Charles-François Brisseau de Mirbel)) [Franco](https://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=Jo%C3%A3o_Manuel_Antonio_do_Amaral_Franco&action=edit&redlink=1)), Japanese larch (*[Larix kaempferi](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Larix_kaempferi" \o "Larix kaempferi)* (Lamb.) Carr.), Scots pine (*Pinus sylvestris* L.) and downy birch (*Betula pubescens* Ehrh.). The trees were planted at 1.9 m from each other for a total of 2770 trees per hectare.

Thinning was carried out in 2003/4 on the east side of the forest and 2005 on the west side by removing every 5th row and cutting every 3rd tree on the two rows aside of the thinned row; one third of trees were removed, bringing the present density to 1754 trees per hectare.

Before afforestation: treatment and 3 different soil features.

Reasons to choice the site.

Topographic description (Clement paper, Ecocraft).

Rationale of forest plantation: Jarvis jpg from carbon experiment.

A dbh survey in 2010 (updated to 2016) was the basis to divide the plots in 8 class of diameter bla bla **Forest description** (dbh from Amy Harbinson 2010 (nested Anova to analyse the data. ???), my update 2016).

Soil description. Richard Nair plots.

## Experimental design

Separate description for each experiment here or to be restructured on an “experiment” base?

### The plots

The originary project aimed to compare two plots with similar features, one of them set as control plot (C) and a treatment plot (T) where a solution containing 15N-labelled NH4NO3 had to be sprayed over the canopy, similarly to Gaige et al (2017) experiment. Due to some costraints, the idea of the treatment was abandoned and the two plots have become a replica. Within the Griffin forest, two plots have been set, at a similar altitude and orientation.

T plot: 56°36’22’’ N, 3**°**47’41’’ W

C plot: 56°36’38’’ N, 3**°**47’40’’ W

In each of the plot 3 subplots were identified, each of these covering similar features of forest cover. A storm in ???? caused a major damage at the C site. As a result, the C plot could show different soil and air temperature than the T plot due to the reduced forest cover, especially in the subplots C10 and C11.

### Water and litter samples collection

The core of the experiment aimed(s) to compare the nitrogen input from the atmosphere to the nitrogen recovered below the canopy. Two rainfall gauges, one “harp-wire” fog collector (pictures?), 18 throughfall/litter and 22 stemflow collectors and 4 streamflow flux and sample collection points were set. The sample collection started on October 2011 and ended on April 2017.

Rainfall gauges. Two rainfall gauge was installed over the “T” plot (56°35'59.8"N 3°47'21.5"W, elevation: 440m) and a second one below the “C” plot (56°37'11.0"N 3°48'21.6"W, elevation: 286 m) in two open areas, sufficiently far from the plantation so to minimise any turbulence due to the presence of high obstacles. In the upper rain gauge station the “harp-wire” collector was installed at short distance from the rainfall gauge. In each of the bottles 2.5 ml (5 ml in the bigger bottle for the cloud water collection) of concentrated ortho-phosphoric acid was added as biocide agent. No biocide agent was used in the throughfall and stemflow collectors, due to the high volumes of sample collected and the need to discharge in situ most of the sample.

Throughfall collection. 18 collection points have been set, 9 per each plot, 3 per each subplot, representing different positions within the canopy (thinning lines, full density and intermediate) and different wind directions. Throughfall is collected through two inclined gutters of a fixed length (4.02 m) and width (0.234 m) collecting throughfall and draining it to a barrel. The barrel is covered but lets the throughfall drain through a central sieve (r=12,25 cm) which works as a filter, retaining litter or other undesired objects or animals to pass into the barrel. The depth of the water collected is measured as close as possible from the centre of the barrel and turned into a volume through an algorithm formulated by testing in the labs each of the 3 barrel types deployed in field (small, round and square barrels). This volume is then turned into mean throughfall deposition by dividing each water volume by the total surface projection of the gutters (each gutter has slightly different gradient) and the sieve, as follows:

\*\*

Stemflow samples. Kate doc. The rationale of the sample distribution follows the information gathered through a DBH survey conducted in 2011 in both plots - updated in winter 2016\*- and assumes that there is a linear relationship between volume of stemflow and diameter. The surveyed trees have been divided in 8 classes, each class is proportionally represented in the stemflow sample trees (meglio pigliare da Kate). The 22 trees selected represent this variability. 18 of them follow the distribution of the throughfall collectors. 4 extra collectors were deployed to better represent trees facing the thinning lines.

Streamflow samples. Thin plate weir doc. Hydrological balance (T plot). Monthly instant measure: limits.

Water sample processing after collection

Samples were stored at 4 °C in the labs until the filtration, usually not more than 24 hours after the collection. Per each sample bottle (250 ml, 1 l for the streamwater) for 30 ml of each sample were withdrawn from each Nalgene bottle with a 60ml syringe after rinsing it 3 times with the same amount of sample. \* Sample filtered through nome prodotto e messo in 25ml sbroz, stored at 4 °C until it gets analysed. Colorimetric analysis for NH4 and NO3 concentrations characteristics.

### Experiment “15N-labelled simulated Ndep”

Three Sitka spruce trees have been selected around the existing eddy covariance tower in the T plot so the be easily reachable with an extension lance (maximum length = 5.4 m) and were sprayed with a 15N-labelled enriched NH4NO3 solution (δ15N = +1000) by applying it over the tree crown. Under each spruce one stemflow and four throughfall collectors were placed so to cover approximately 1/5 of the crown projection. Similarly to the existing experiment, the depth of the water in each barrel was measured and a sample of at least 5 liters (when available) of throughfall and stemflow were withdrawn. When the volume of the sample exceeded the volume of the sampling

### Experiment “15N-labelled application on branches”

Brief explanation of the gas chambers collection too.

15N – labelled

Description of the main sample collection – rationale: choice of trees by dbh classes, prolisso sulla descrizione di TF e SF. Streamwater: British standard plate weirs. Litter collection. In the labs: water filtering. Colorimetric analysis

Open questions: ma la rationale, Magnani e pippe varie, da dove era partito il progetto, vanno qui? Secondo me, si. In that case, see the PhD offer document.

Brief description of some of the previous experiments.

Notes for later:

Mitchell work with 87-93 of CNU!

Results for the 5 years dataset: Descrizione del database ottenuto -> fieldwork and lab methodology, data quality (NAs), data treatment, outliers, regression and interpolation.

References

Craig, G. Y. (1925). Geology of Scotland, Edinburgh: Scottish Academics.

ForestryCommission (2017, 28th September 2017). "Forestry statistics and Forestry in facts and figures." Retrieved 6 October, 2017, from <https://www.forestry.gov.uk/forestry/infd-7aqdgc>.