



UNIVERSITY OF LEEDS

This is a repository copy of *Spatial variability of fluvial blanket peat erosion rates for the 21st Century modelled using PESERA-PEAT*.

White Rose Research Online URL for this paper:  
<http://eprints.whiterose.ac.uk/109436/>

Version: Supplemental Material

---

**Article:**

Li, P, Irvine, B, Holden, J [orcid.org/0000-0002-1108-4831](http://orcid.org/0000-0002-1108-4831) et al. (1 more author) (2017)  
Spatial variability of fluvial blanket peat erosion rates for the 21st Century modelled using PESERA-PEAT. CATENA, 150. pp. 302-316. ISSN 0341-8162

<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.catena.2016.11.025>

---

© 2016 Elsevier B.V. Licensed under the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives 4.0 International  
<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>

**Reuse**

Unless indicated otherwise, fulltext items are protected by copyright with all rights reserved. The copyright exception in section 29 of the Copyright, Designs and Patents Act 1988 allows the making of a single copy solely for the purpose of non-commercial research or private study within the limits of fair dealing. The publisher or other rights-holder may allow further reproduction and re-use of this version - refer to the White Rose Research Online record for this item. Where records identify the publisher as the copyright holder, users can verify any specific terms of use on the publisher's website.

**Takedown**

If you consider content in White Rose Research Online to be in breach of UK law, please notify us by emailing [eprints@whiterose.ac.uk](mailto:eprints@whiterose.ac.uk) including the URL of the record and the reason for the withdrawal request.



[eprints@whiterose.ac.uk](mailto:eprints@whiterose.ac.uk)  
<https://eprints.whiterose.ac.uk/>

**Table 1** Methods used for baseline climate interpolation, taking January as an example. P, P<sub>pday</sub>, CV<sub>pday</sub>, T and T<sub>range</sub> represent monthly total precipitation (mm), mean precipitation per precipitation day (mm), coefficient of variation of precipitation per precipitation day (unitless), monthly temperature (°C) and monthly temperature range (°C) respectively. The coefficient of determination (R<sup>2</sup>) and statistical significance (p) are given for the regression equations, in which H represents elevation (m) while E and N represent six-digit easting and northing grid references (unitless) in the UK National Grid respectively. n indicates the number of MIDAS stations used. IDW is the abbreviation of Inverse Distance Weighted interpolation method.

Variables	Method	R <sup>2</sup>	p	n
P	$P = 286 + 0.21 H - 0.00058 E$	0.70	< 0.001	27
P <sub>pday</sub>	$P_{pday} = 24.1 + 0.0069 H - 0.000026 E - 0.000019 N$	0.75	< 0.001	27
CV <sub>pday</sub>	IDW	-	-	27
T	$T = 3.78 - 0.0064 H$	0.88	0.001	8
T <sub>range</sub>	$T_{range} = -6.79 - 0.0032 H + 0.000034 E$	0.87	0.006	8

**Table 2** Validation of baseline climate variable interpolation based on the ratio of root mean square error (RMSE) to the average value of the climate variable at validation stations (Average), and R<sup>2</sup>. The abbreviations for climate variables are the same as those in Table 1. n is the size of the sample for RMSE and R<sup>2</sup> calculation, and equals the number of stations employed for the validation \* 12 (i.e. Jan - Dec).

Variables	RMSE	Average	RMSE / Average	R <sup>2</sup>	p	n
P	17.59	98.71	0.18	0.83	< 0.001	60
P <sub>pday</sub>	0.76	5.05	0.15	0.78	< 0.001	60
CV <sub>pday</sub>	0.13	1.37	0.10	0.46	< 0.001	60
T	0.27	5.63	0.05	0.98	< 0.001	48
T <sub>range</sub>	0.54	5.88	0.09	0.92	< 0.001	48

**Table 3** Environmental scenarios employed in this study. As shown in 'Name' column, the scenarios are a combination of climate scenarios (i.e. baseline (1961-1990), 2020s (2010-2039), 2050s (2040-2069), and 2080s (2070-2099)) and management scenarios (i.e. BAU (Business\_As\_Usual, Figure 1d), Carbon (Carbon storage) and Food (Food security)). The configuration of management scenarios is given in the rightmost three columns. X represents drainage density in the BAU scenario and 2X represents two times X. Area Changes in the area drained or burned were not modeled in these scenarios. In the food security scenario, areas with light grazing in the BAU were overgrazed.

<b>Scenario category</b>	<b>Name</b>	<b>Drainage Density (km km<sup>-2</sup>)</b>	<b>Grazing level</b>	<b>Burning frequency (years)</b>
<b>Base</b>	Baseline_BAU	X	Light grazing, Overgrazing	10
<b>Climate change</b>	2020s_BAU	X	Light grazing, Overgrazing	10
	2050s_BAU	X	Light grazing, Overgrazing	10
	2080s_BAU	X	Light grazing, Overgrazing	10
<b>Land Management Interactions</b>	Baseline_Carbon	No drainage	No grazing	No burning
	Baseline_Food	2X	Overgrazing	5
	2020s_Carbon	No drainage	No grazing	No burning
	2020s_Food	2X	Overgrazing	5
	2050s_Carbon	No drainage	No grazing	No burning
	2050s_Food	2X	Overgrazing	5
	2080s_Carbon	No drainage	No grazing	No burning
	2080s_Food	2X	Overgrazing	5

**Table 4** Percentage (%) of blanket peat-covered areas in the North Pennines predicted to have a different erosion rate ( $\text{t ha}^{-1} \text{yr}^{-1}$ ) under environmental scenarios including (a) Business-As-Usual scenarios (BAU), (b) carbon storage scenarios (Carbon), (c) food security scenarios (Food).

<b>a</b>				
<b>Erosion category (<math>\text{t ha}^{-1} \text{yr}^{-1}</math>)</b>	<b>Baseline _BAU</b>	<b>2020s _BAU</b>	<b>2050s _BAU</b>	<b>2080s _BAU</b>
<1.5	6.86	5.44	5.19	5.16
1.5-2	21.20	27.16	18.62	18.44
2-2.5	48.88	50.80	50.74	48.06
2.5-3	16.36	10.03	18.62	21.45
>3	6.70	6.56	6.83	6.89

  

<b>b</b>				
<b>Erosion category (<math>\text{t ha}^{-1} \text{yr}^{-1}</math>)</b>	<b>Baseline _Carbon</b>	<b>2020s _Carbon</b>	<b>2050s _Carbon</b>	<b>2080s _Carbon</b>
<1.5	98.95	98.95	98.95	98.94
1.5-2	0.02	0.01	0.01	0.03
2-2.5	0.04	0.05	0.04	0.04
2.5-3	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.02
>3	0.98	0.98	0.98	0.98

  

<b>c</b>				
<b>Erosion category (<math>\text{t ha}^{-1} \text{yr}^{-1}</math>)</b>	<b>Baseline _Food</b>	<b>2020s _Food</b>	<b>2050s _Food</b>	<b>2080s _Food</b>
<1.5	4.83	4.60	4.57	4.57
1.5-2	1.13	0.43	0.31	0.29
2-2.5	2.03	1.01	0.83	0.78
2.5-3	18.36	26.60	18.77	18.94
>3	73.64	67.35	75.52	75.42

**Table 5** Percentage (%) of blanket peat-covered areas in the North Pennines with different levels of mean annual potential wildfire severity (PFS) under environmental scenarios including (a) Business-As-Usual scenarios (BAU), (b) carbon storage scenarios (Carbon), (c) food security scenarios (Food). A zero value indicates the percentage of the area is less than 0.005%.

**a**

<b>PFS category</b>	<b>Baseline _BAU</b>	<b>2020s _BAU</b>	<b>2050s _BAU</b>	<b>2080s _BAU</b>
<b>&lt;0.3</b>	47.84	26.70	17.40	11.49
<b>0.3-0.5</b>	47.60	68.74	78.03	83.93
<b>&gt;0.5</b>	4.56	4.56	4.56	4.58

**b**

<b>PFS category</b>	<b>Baseline _Carbon</b>	<b>2020s _Carbon</b>	<b>2050s _Carbon</b>	<b>2080s _Carbon</b>
<b>&lt;0.3</b>	0.98	0.98	0.98	0.98
<b>0.3-0.5</b>	0	0	0	0
<b>&gt;0.5</b>	99.02	99.02	99.02	99.02

**c**

<b>PFS category</b>	<b>Baseline _Food</b>	<b>2020s _Food</b>	<b>2050s _Food</b>	<b>2080s _Food</b>
<b>&lt;0.3</b>	95.44	95.44	95.44	95.44
<b>0.3-0.5</b>	0	0	0	0
<b>&gt;0.5</b>	4.56	4.56	4.56	4.56