

Installation of submerged drains (Jan van den Akker)

Submerged drains (Netherlands)

Onderwaterdrains (NL)

DESCRIPTION

Submerged drains are drains installed in grassland on peatsoils with the aims to decrease soil subsidence and emission of CO2 and N2O due to the oxidation of peat soil, and to maintain suitable groundwater levels in fields for grassland production and grazing.

Contrary to usual drains, submerged drains are installed below ditchwater level. Submerged drains diminish the differences between ditch level and groundwater level in the fields by enabling the infiltration from ditch to field and the drainage from field to ditch. In summer and dry periods the infiltration from ditch to field is much lower than the evapotranspiration of the grass, resulting in a lowering of the groundwater level some decimetres below ditch water level. With submerged drains the groundwater level is lowered less drastically because infiltration from ditch to field is improved. In winter and wet periods, fields are drained more quickly compared to conventional drainage.

Purpose of the Technology: Submerged drains diminish the differences between ditch level and groundwater level in the fields by enabling the infiltration from ditch to field and the drainage from field to ditch. Under peak rainfall events groundwater levels become less high and remain at high levels for shorter times than in fields without submerged drains. Due to the increased groundwater level in summer the decomposition of the peat soil is reduced. As a result, the rate of soil subsidence is decreased and also the emission of greenhouse gases and of N and P released to the surface water.

Establishment / maintenance activities and inputs: The installation of submerged drains is done with common drainage installation machines. Submerged drains should be installed between 15 and 25 cm below the ditch water level, and between 45 and 75 cm below the soil surface. The drain pipes should have a diameter of at least 6 cm. The distance between drains is at most 6 m. Drain length is at most 300 m. Submerged drains can be installed in the length or width direction of a field. Drains must be installed level.

Natural / human environment: Submerged drains were designed for peat soils under permanent pasture for dairy farming. More than 70 % of Dutch peat soils are under this land use. Drainage of these peat soils results in subsidence, mainly by decomposition (oxidation) of the peat (partly by shrinkage and consolidation). This is an ongoing process, because every 10 to 15 year ditchwater levels are adapted to the lowered surface in order to enable dairy farming and to prevent the conversion to wetlands. Soil subsidence causes several problems: decreased suitability for grazing and grassland farming, increased flood risk, emission of greenhouse gases, damage to infrastructure (dikes, roads, foundations, sewerage networks) and increased cost of water management.

Submerged drains were tested with a network of practitioners and 10 dairy farmers in the Dutch peat soil area between 2011 and 2013 on an area of 20 ha.

LOCATION



Location: Krimpenerwaard, The Netherlands/Province of Zuid-Holland, Netherlands

No. of Technology sites analysed:

Geo-reference of selected sites4.72384, 51.94813

Spread of the Technology: evenly spread over an area (0.054 km²)

In a permanently protected area?:

Date of implementation: less than 10 years ago (recently)

Type of introduction

- through land users' innovation
- as part of a traditional system (> 50 years)
- during experiments/ research
- through projects/ external interventions
- stimulated by regional authorities

CLASSIFICATION OF THE TECHNOLOGY

Main purpose

improve production reduce, prevent, restore land degradation conserve ecosystem

Land use



Grazing landImproved pastures

Submerged drains

- protect a watershed/ downstream areas in combination with other Technologies
 preserve/ improve biodiversity
 - reduce risk of disasters
 - adapt to climate change/ extremes and its impacts
 - mitigate climate change and its impacts
 - create beneficial economic impact
- create beneficial social impact

Purpose related to land degradation

prevent land degradation
 reduce land degradation
 restore/ rehabilitate severely degraded land
 adapt to land degradation
 not applicable

Water supply

rainfed
 mixed rainfed-irrigated
 full irrigation

Degradation addressed



chemical soil deterioration - Cn: fertility decline and reduced organic matter content (not caused by erosion)



physical soil deterioration - Pw: waterlogging, Ps: subsidence of organic soils, settling of soil



water degradation - Hg: change in groundwater/aquifer level, Hp: decline of surface water quality

SLM measures



structural measures - S4: Level ditches, pits



management measures - M7: Others

TECHNICAL DRAWING

• water diversion and drainage

• ground water management

Technical specifications

SLM group

The picture shows a cross section through an agricultural field, bounded by two ditches. A submerged drain (yellow bar in the picture) is installed at 80 cm below the soil surface. It ends in the ditch on the left side at 20 cm below the water level in the ditch. The dotted line indicates the position of the groundwater table in the situation without the submerged drain; the continuous blue line indicates the position in the situation where the submerged drain is installed. The lines show that in summer the groundwater level is raised to nearly the level of the ditch water by the submerged drain, whereas the level would be approximately 30 cm lower without the drain. In winter, in the situation with the submerged drain, the groundwater level is around 40 cm below the soil surface. This enables the farmer to use the field for grazing or to traffic the field. However, in the situation without the drain, the groundwater level nearly reaches the soil surface in the centre of the field, impeding traffic or grazing on the field.

Technical knowledge required for field staff / advisors: moderate (Estimates of economic benefits due to increased grass production and grazing periods vary between years with meteorological conditions.)

Technical knowledge required for land users: moderate (Specific conditions apply to the dimensions and positioning of submerged drains in the fields. Level position and lebgth are critical.)

Technical knowledge required for companies installing the drains: moderate (Specific conditions apply to the dimensions and positioning of submerged drains in the fields. Level position and lebgth are critical. Soil must have sufficient bearing capacity during installation.)

Technical knowledge required for water board: moderate (submerged drains increase the water supply and discharge from groundwater level management units. Additional pumping effort can be prevented by informed water level management.)

Technical knowledge required for researchers: (the implications of submerged drains on the water management in an entire management unit should be explored using coupled hydraulic and rainfall-runoff models.)

Main technical functions: improvement of topsoil structure (compaction), maintaining soil organic matter

Secondary technical functions: increase of infiltration, increase / maintain water stored in soil, drainage of excess rainfall

Other type of management: Maintaining high groundwater levels.

ESTABLISHMENT AND MAINTENANCE: ACTIVITIES, INPUTS AND COSTS

Calculation of inputs and costs

- Costs are calculated:
- Currency used for cost calculation: euro
- Exchange rate (to USD): 1 USD = 1.09 euro
- Average wage cost of hired labour per day: n.a

Most important factors affecting the costs

We do not have information on specific cost items, only on establishment costs ad between 1500 and 1800 euro/ha, and annual cost of 117 €/ha incl maintenance, assuming a 20-year life time. Establishment costs can also be expressed per m of drain, i.e. 1.10 EURO per m including materials (drain of 6 cm diameter). Determinate factors include size and geometry of fields; installation in the length direction is cheaper, and results in fewer outlets in the receiving ditch.

Establishment activities

1. maintenance of drains and outlet in ditch (Timing/ frequency: None)

2. installation of submerged drains (Timing/ frequency: in dry periods)

Establishment inputs and costs

Specify input	Unit	Quantity	Costs per Unit (euro)	Total costs per input (euro)	% of costs borne by land users
_abour					
maintenance of drains and outlet in ditch	ha	1.0	30.14	30.14	100.0
installation of submerged drains	ha	1.0	1980.0	1980.0	100.0
Total costs for establishment of the Technology			2'010.14		
Total costs for establishment of the Technology in USD			1'844.17		

cm -soil surface 0 With drains 30 60 90 120 Without drains b. groundwater level in winter cm -soil surface 0 30-60-90-Submerged drain 120-

a. groundwater level in summer



Maintenance activities

1. maintenance of submerged drains (Timing/ frequency: several times in lifetime of drains (30 y))

Maintenance inputs and costs Total costs % of costs Costs per Unit Unit Specify input Quantity borne by land per input (euro) (euro) users Other Annual cost incl maintenance ha 1.0 127.0 127.0 100.0 127.0 Total costs for maintenance of the Technology Total costs for maintenance of the Technology in USD 116.51 NATURAL ENVIRONMENT Average annual rainfall Agro-climatic zone Specifications on climate humid < 250 mm Distribution of rainfall over the year: 23% (winter), 19% (spring), 27% 251-500 mm sub-humid (summer) and 31% (autumn) 1 501-750 mm semi-arid Thermal climate class: temperate 751-1,000 mm arid 1 1,001-1,500 mm 1.501-2.000 mm 2,001-3,000 mm 3,001-4,000 mm > 4.000 mm Landforms Altitude Technology is applied in Slope ✓ 0-100 m a.s.l. 🗸 flat (0-2%) plateau/plains convex situations gentle (3-5%) ridges 101-500 m a.s.l. concave situations moderate (6-10%) mountain slopes 501-1,000 m a.s.l. not relevant rolling (11-15%) hill slopes 1,001-1,500 m a.s.l. hilly (16-30%) 1,501-2,000 m a.s.l. footslopes steep (31-60%) valley floors 2,001-2,500 m a.s.l. very steep (>60%) 2.501-3.000 m a.s.l. 3,001-4,000 m a.s.l. > 4,000 m a.s.l. Soil depth Soil texture (topsoil) Soil texture (> 20 cm below Topsoil organic matter content very shallow (0-20 cm) coarse/ light (sandy) high (>3%) surface) shallow (21-50 cm) medium (loamy, silty) medium (1-3%) coarse/ light (sandy) moderately deep (51-80 cm) fine/ heavy (clay) low (<1%) 1 medium (loamy, silty) deep (81-120 cm) fine/ heavy (clay) 🔽 very deep (> 120 cm) Groundwater table Availability of surface water Water quality (untreated) Is salinity a problem? on surface excess good drinking water Ja Nee poor drinking water < 5 m 🗸 good \checkmark 5-50 m medium (treatment required) > 50 m poor/ none for agricultural use only 1 Occurrence of flooding (irrigation) unusable la Nee Water quality refers to: Species diversity Habitat diversity high high medium medium 1 low CHARACTERISTICS OF LAND USERS APPLYING THE TECHNOLOGY Market orientation Off-farm income Relative level of wealth Level of mechanization less than 10% of all income subsistence (self-supply) very poor manual work mixed (subsistence/ 10-50% of all income animal traction poor average mechanized/ motorized commercial) > 50% of all income commercial/ market rich very rich Sedentary or nomadic Individuals or groups Gender Age individual/ household women children Sedentary Semi-nomadic groups/ community youth men Nomadic cooperative middle-aged employee (company, elderly government) Area used per household Scale Land ownership Land use rights < 0 5 ha small-scale open access (unorganized) state

company

Submerged drains

medium-scale

0.5-1 ha

communal (organized)



neurth	poor		gooa
education	poor	1	good
technical assistance	poor	1	good
employment (e.g. off-farm)	poor	1	good
markets	poor	1	good
energy	poor	1	good
roads and transport	poor	1	good
drinking water and sanitation	poor	1	good
financial services	poor	1	good

IMPACTS

Socio-economic impacts fodder production



leasedindividual

leased

1

Water use rights

open access (unorganized)

communal (organized)

implementation of the technology. Participating farmers continue to exchange knowledge and intend to extend the area under SMD. As a result of the pilots and the activities of the Community of Practice, interest for submerged drainage was raised among other dairy farmers, policy makers and authorities.

Ecological impacts water quality		
	decreased A A A A A A A A A A A A A A A A A A A	slight decrease of export of N, P and SO4 to the surface water
excess water drainage	reduced reduced improved	SMD increased drainage by 20-65 mm per year in 2011 and 2012
soil moisture		2012
	decreased increased	SMD increased infiltration by 8-93 mm per year in 2011 and 2012
soil compaction		
	increased reduced	decreased soil subsidence to 50% (reductions of 3-6 and 5-8 mm/year)
animal diversity	decreased 🗾 🖌 increased	no direct impact on breeding conditions for meadow birds
emission of carbon and greenhouse gases	increased decreased	decreased GHG emissions in CO2 eq: 6.8-13.5 t/ha per year (pilot Keulevaart) and 11.3-18.1 (pilot Demmeriksekade)
Hazard towards adverse events		
	improved Freduced reduced	quicker lowering of groundwater table after extreme rainfall events (1-5 days)
Water management		
	harder 🗾 🖌 🖌 easier	More easy water management in polders: Fewer sub- polders with fixed ditch water level; possibility to create areas with high and low surface levels
Off-site impacts		
damage on public/ private		
infrastructure	increased reduced	reduced costs of infrastructure protection (30% or 3.5 M€/year until 2100 in the Frisian peat meadow area)

COST-BENEFIT ANAL	′SIS	
Benefits compared with est Short-term returns Long-term returns	blishment costs very negative very positive very negative very positive	
Benefits compared with ma Short-term returns Long-term returns	ntenance costs very negative very positive very negative very positive	

A longer grazing season and the extra yield of fodder are the basis for a viable implementation of submerged drainage for land users. The CBA considers establishment and maintenance costs together: establishment costs of \leq 1800,-/ha, discounted over 20 years, including maintenance, result in annual cost of \leq 117,-/ha (6.5% of the investment). Benefits include 500 kg DM/ha extra grass use and 30 extra grazing days. This would yield \leq 171/ha, resulting in a net saldo of \leq 54,-. In addition SMD are an investment in sustainable soil management, resulting in an increased economic value of the land in the long term.

CLIMATE CHANGE	
Gradual climate change annual temperature increase	not well at all 🔽 🖌 very well
Climate-related extremes (disasters) local rainstorm local windstorm drought general (river) flood	not well at all very well not well at all very well
Other climate-related consequences reduced growing period	not well at all 🖉 🖉 very well
ADOPTION AND ADAPTATION	

Percentage of land users in the area who have adopted the Technology

single cases/ experimental

1-10% 11-50% > 50%

Number of households and/ or area covered

13

Has the Technology been modified recently to adapt to changing conditions?

Ja Nee

To which changing conditions?

- climatic change/ extremes
- changing markets
- labour availability (e.g. due to migration)

CONCLUSIONS AND LESSONS LEARNT

Strengths: land user's view

- Submerged drains increase the number of days with a good bearing capacity of grassland, and therefore enable a longer grazing season and less trampling of grass.
- Higher effective yield in total.
- Short term: slightly cost effective. Long term: good cost effective.

Strengths: compiler's or other key resource person's view

Submerged drains allow a strong reduction of soil subsidence and GHG emissions (at least 50%, even >50% if combined with higher ditch water levels).

How can they be sustained / enhanced? Further implementation by dairy farmers in the peat-meadow area. For this purpose the Community of Practice is recommended, as well as the arrangement of subsidies and the active involvement of regional government and water board. This applies to all mentioned advantages.

- The quality of surface water in ditches will slightly improve.
- Less problems with difference between subsiding soil surfaces and constant water levels in lakes and high water ditches (along houses).
- Less sub-polders with a certain fixed ditch water level, and possibility to create areas with a high surface level (with submerged drains) and a low surface level (without SD).

Of all those who have adopted the Technology, how many have done so without receiving material incentives?



91-100%

Weaknesses/ disadvantages/ risks: land user's viewhow to overcome

• Grass yield is lower due to reduced mineralization of nitrogen. Yield could be increased due to better usage of manure (better NUE). On the other hand yield is increased due to increased number of days with a good bearing capacity of grassland, and a longer grazing season and less trampling of grass.

Weaknesses/ disadvantages/ risks: compiler's or other key resource person's viewhow to overcome

- Submerged drains require more inlet water to polders. Reduction of inlet requirement is possible by smart water management. This implies water level margins of +/- 10 cm and the use of weather forecasting.
- Submerged drains require a bit more pumping to drain water • under extreme rain events.

REFERENCES

Compiler

Simone Verzandvoort

Editors

Reviewer Fabian Ottiger Alexandra Gavilano

Last update: Junie 5, 2019

Date of documentation: Okt. 30, 2015

Resource persons

Jan J.H. Van de Akker - SLM specialist Simone Verzandvoort - SLM specialist

Full description in the WOCAT database

https://qcat.wocat.net/af/wocat/technologies/view/technologies_1704/

Linked SLM data

n.d.

Documentation was faciliated by

Institution

- LTO NOORD Netherlands
- Provincie Holland Zuid Netherlands
- Provincie Utrecht Netherlands
- Wageningen Environmental Research (Alterra) Netherlands
- Waterschap Amstel, Gooi en Vecht Netherlands

Project

• Preventing and Remediating degradation of soils in Europe through Land Care (EU-RECARE)

Key references

Several reports on submerged drainage are available from Alterra, Wageningen UR (in Dutch). The report used for this WOCAT QT is:Effecten van onderwaterdrains in peilvak 9 van polder Groot-Wilnis Vinkeveen : modelstudie naar de effecten van onderwaterdrains op maaivelddaling, waterbeheer, wateroverlast en waterkwaliteit in peilvak 9 Author(s)Hendriks, R.F.A.; Akker, J.J.H. van den; Jansen, P.C.; Massop, H.Th.L. SourceWageningen : Alterra Wageningen UR, 2014 (Alterra-rapport 2480) - p. 124Other literature (in Dutch): Waarheen met het veen. Woestenberg, M. 2009. Uitegeverij Landwerk and Alterra, Wageningen

URhttp://www.levenmetwater.nl/static/media/files/Boek_wmhv_def.pdf: Alterra Reports are available atlibrary.wur.nl

This work is licensed under Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-ShareaAlike 4.0 International

