The Monetary Value of Changes in Ecosystem Services Associated with River Restoration



Chris Mellor



Key thing to remember when trying to put a value on Ecosystem Services is that any value produced will be wrong but...

*'…measures need not be perfect to be useful, indeed the perfect may be the enemy of the good here*².

Realising nature's value: The Final Report of the Ecosystem Markets Task Force March 2013



What are ecosystem services?

• 'Ecosystem services are the direct and indirect contributions of ecosystems to human well-being.' (*The Economics of Ecosystems and Biodiversity, 2010*)



Ecosystem Services a brief history

- Discussed in the scientific literature since the 1960s and talked around by Westman (1977) 'How much are natures services worth?'
- 'Ecosystem services' first coined in 1981 by Ehrlich and Ehrlich.
- Costanza *et al.*, (1997) 'The value of the world ecosystem services and natural capital'

Overall global value of \$33 trillion

• Millennium Ecosystem assessment in 2005



Scottish Natural Heritage Dualchas Nàdair na h-Alba



Number of papers using the term "ecosystem services" or "ecological services" in an ISI Web of Science search in 2007. Fisher *et al.*, (2009)



Key publications:

- Millennium Ecosystem Assessment (MA)
- The Economics of Ecosystems and Biodiversity (TEEB)
- UK National Ecosystem Assessment (UK NEA)
- Common International Classification for Ecosystem services (CICES)

ES as viewed by MA

High

Strong





Reproduced from the Millennium Ecosystem Assessment (2005)

Dualchas Nàdair na h-Alba **Scottish Natural Heritage**

		Other capital inputs		People	
		•		•	
			W	/ell-being valu	e
Ecosystem processes/ Intermediate services	Final ecosystem services	Good(s)*	Economic	Health	Shared social
	Crops, livestock, fish	Food	2	+/-	6/8
Primary production	Trees, standing vegetation, peat	Fibre	3	+/-	6/8
Water cycling	Water supply	Energy	2	+/-	6/8
Soil formation	Climate regulation	Drinking water Natural medicine	2	+/-	0/0
Nutrient cycling	Disease & pest regulation	Recreation/Tourism	2	+/-	6/8
Deserveiller	Detoxificaton & purification in air, soils & water	Pollution/noise control	E E	+/-	6/8
Decomposition	Pollination	Disease/pest control			040
Weathering	Hazard regulation	Equable climate	1	+/-	e/8
Ecological interactions	Noise regulation	Flood control	2	+/-	6/8
Evolutionary processes	Wild species diversity	Aesthetic/Inspiration	2	+/-	6/8
Un browned	Environmental settings	Spiritual/Religious	2	+/-	6/8
Undiscovered	Undiscovered services	Undiscovered	3	+/-	6/8

The full set of ecosystem processes, services, goods/benefits and values used in the UK NEA. Note that some ecosystem services can be both intermediate and final services. For simplicity, in this figure, services are shown only in the most final position that they occupy. Services such as pollination and climate regulation that also play important roles further back in the chain are not represented here. Cells with no colour are ecosystem processes/services that were not in the Millennium Ecosystem Assessment classification. *Note that the term good(s) includes all use and non-use, material and non-material outputs from ecosystems that have value for people. Source: adapted from Fisher et al. (2008).



Ecosystem

categories



ES as viewed by CICES





Reproduced from Haines-Young and Potschin (2013)

CICES Ecosystem Services Classification

Section	Division	Group
Provisioning	Nutrition	Biomass
		Water
	Materials	Biomass, Fibre
		Water
	Energy	Biomass-based energy sources
		Mechanical energy
Regulation & Maintenance	Mediation of waste, toxics and other nuisances	Mediation by biota
		Mediation by ecosystems
	Mediation of flows	Mass flows
		Liquid flows
		Gaseous / air flows
	Maintenance of physical,	Lifecycle maintenance, habitat and gene pool
	chemical, biological conditions	protection
		Pest and disease control
		Soil formation and composition
		Water conditions
		Atmospheric composition and climate regulation
Cultural	Physical and intellectual	Physical and experiential interactions
	interactions with ecosystems	
	and land-/seascapes	
		Intellectual and representative interactions
	Spiritual, symbolic and other	Spiritual and/or emblematic
	interactions with ecosystems and land-/seascapes	
		Other cultural outputs



<u>Methodology</u>

- Discussion with stakeholders to identify ES
- Estimate monetary value of identified developments in ES
- Apply a 3.5% discount rate (HM Treasury, 2011) to get 25 year 'lifetime' Following Everard (2009) and annual marginal value for the restoration







<u>Methodology</u>

- Discussion with stakeholders to identify ES
- Estimate monetary value of identified developments in ES
- Apply a 3.5% discount rate (HM Treasury, 2011) to get 25 year 'lifetime' Following Everard (2009) and annual marginal value for the restoration



Dualchas Nàdair na h-Alba **Scottish Natural Heritage** Total Economic Value Reproduced from TEEB, 2010 Use values Non-use values Altruism to Philanthropic Option Actual value Value value biodiversity Direct Indirect Altruist Bequest Existence use use value value value Non Consumptive consumptive



Case studies





Case study 1 – Rottal burn

- Tributary of the River South Esk (SAC)
- Rural
- Canalised and dredged
- Good quality salmon spawning grounds

Aims of restoration:

- Enhance habitats for SAC designated species
- Re-instate natural channel processes
- Act as a demonstration site







Case study 2 – Water of Leith

- Flows through North West Edinburgh
- Industrial heritage
- Heavily modified
- Steady improvement in water quality since 1900s
- Enhanced through work by the Water of Leith Conservation Trust and the Volunteer bailiffs





Scottish Natural Heritage

Dualchas Nàdair na h-Alba

Rottal Burn

	Ecosystem Service	Impact
	Cultivated crops	0
	Reared animals and there outputs	-
	Wild plants, algae and there outputs	+
5	A supervision of the supervision	+
.E	Aquaculture	0
ē	Surface/ ground water for drinking	0/-
lisi	Materials from animals and plants for animal use of processing	0
é	Materials from animals and plants for agricultural use	-
Ē		+
	Plant based fuel recourses	0/-
	Animal based fuel resources	0
	Animal based fuel resources	0
	Animal based mechanical energy	0
	Bio-remediation by biola	+
	Reflectation by ecosystems	+
	Mediation of amol/ noise/ viewal impacts	+
e	Mass stabilisation and control of crossion rates	+
õ	Ruffering of mass flows	+
nal	Maintenance of baseline flows	+
Ite	Flood protoction	+
air	Storm protection	+
Ê	Vontilation and transpiration	+
þ	Pollination and cood disportal	+
a	Maintaining pursery populations and babitate	+
LO LO	Post control	+
ati	Disease control	+ 0
Inf	Maintenance of soil fertility through biogeochemical	0
6g		+
	Maintenance of chemical conditions of freshwaters	1
	Maintenance of chemical conditions of saltwater	+ 0
	Global climate regulation	÷
	Local climate regulation by control of micro climate	+
	Experiential use of environment and biota (in-situ)	+
	Physical use of environment and biota (e.g. fishing)	+
	Scientific	+
	Educational	+
<u>a</u>	Heritage	ò
Ē	Entertainment	õ
3	Aesthetic	+
U	Symbolic	+
	Sacred and/ or religious	0
	Existence	+
	Bequest	+

Water of Leith

	Ecosystem Service	Impact
Provisioning	Cultivated crops Reared animals and there outputs Wild plants, algae and there outputs Wild animals and there outputs Aquaculture Surface/ ground water for drinking Fibres (+ other materials) for direct use or processing Materials from animals and plants for agricultural use Genetic materials from all biota Water for non-drinking purposes Plant based fuel resources Animal based fuel resources	0 + + 0 0 0 0 + 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0
Regulation and maintenance	Bio-remediation by biota Remediation by ecosystems Dilution by atmosphere, freshwater and marine ecosystems Mediation of smell/ noise/ visual impacts Mass stabilisation and control of erosion rates Buffering of mass flows Maintenance of baseline flows Flood protection Storm protection Ventilation and transpiration Pollination and seed dispersal Maintaining nursery populations and habitats Pest control Disease control Maintenance of soil fertility through biogeochemical processes Maintenance of chemical conditions of freshwaters Maintenance of chemical conditions of saltwater Global climate regulation Local climate regulation by control of micro climate	0 + 0 + 0 0 0 + + 0 0 0 + + + + + 0 0 0 0 + + 0 0 0 0 + 0 0 0 0 + 0 0 0 0 0 + 0
Cultural	Experiential use of environment and biota (in-situ) Physical use of environment and biota (e.g. fishing) Scientific Educational Heritage Entertainment Aesthetic Symbolic Sacred and/ or religious Existence Bequest	+ + + + + + + + + + + + + + + + +



Key marginal gains associated with the restoration of the Rottal Burn:

- Salmon productivity £ 198,351
- Climate regulation £ 19,319
- Biodiversity £ 125,959
- Flood mitigation £ 83,313
- Education £ 28,146

$$Total = £455, 088$$



Values associated with Salmon production

Angling – benefit transfer

- Maximum smolt production from site estimated at 6/100m² using data from Baum *et al.*, (2012)
- Pre restoration smolt estimate = 5
- Post restoration smolt estimate = 363
- Marginal gain is £148, 492 based on value transfer from Butler et al., (2009)

Capital value – market values

- Marine survival constant at ~ 5.3% (WGNAS, 2013) each fish adds £6000 (CKD Galbraith)
- Fishery sold after 25 years
- Marginal gain is £49, 859



Values associated with **Climate regulation**

- Development of 10.5 ha of riparian woodland
- Carbon stored in different land uses pre and post restoration estimated and run through the InVEST carbon model
- Social value of carbon estimated at £29.2 per tonne following Everard (2009)
- Total marginal value over 25 years = £19, 319



Values associated with **Biodiversity**

- Grants for managing the land market value
 = £39, 164
- Non use value of habitat *benefit transfer*

= **£62, 229** based on values from Bateman *et al.*, (2011)

 Non use value associated with iconic species (salmon and otter) – *benefit transfer*

= **£24, 566** based on values from Lawrence & Spurgeon (2007) and White *et al.*,(1997)



Values associated with Flood Mitigation

 Value of the 12 ha of riparian woodland for flood defence *– benefit transfer*

= **£83, 313** based on a value of is £407/ ha/ yr from Bateman *et al.*,(2011)



Values associated with Education

Value of 5 trips of 20 individuals to the restoration site
 projected Willingness to pay

= **£28**, **146** based on values charged for field visits by the water of Leith and the cost of coach hire.



Key marginal gains associated with work by the Water of Leith Conservation Trust and Bailiffs:

- Habitat improvement £ 16, 977
- Engaging the community £45, 542
- Education £ 9, 071
- Recreational fishing £ 28, 590

Annual Total = \pounds 100, 180 Potential value over 25 years (assuming similar actions continue) = \pounds 1, 708, 907



Annual value associated with Habitat improvement

• Value of the 3302 volunteer hours – *replacement cost*

= £16, 977 based on hourly rates for labourers and apprentices





Annual value associated with **Engaging the** community

- Value of the 3302 volunteer hours replacement cost and Willingness to Pay
- Value of Health benefits from using the Water of Leith walkway – *benefit transfer* from Rabl and De Nazelle (2012)
- Value of CO₂ emissions avoided *benefit transfer* from Walsh *et al.*, (2008)

= £45, 542



Annual Value associated with Education

- Value of school / education visits *market value*
- Value of youth volunteers *replacement cost*
- Value of podcasts *market value* estimated from Rosemarin (2006).

= £9, 071



Annual value associated with **Recreational Fishing**

 Value of permits from volunteer run fishery – Willingness to pay transferred from similar fishery

= **£28, 590** based on cost of an annual trout fishing permit on the River Tweed



Scottish Natural Heritage Dualchas Nàdair na h-Alba

Rottal Burn

Water of Leith



Cumulative value over 25 years $= \pounds455,088$

Cumulative value over 25 years $= \pounds1, 708, 907$



Remarks on the process

- CICES excellent for identifying ES and associated benefits
- Big gap between identification and monetary valuation
- Anthropocentric nature of ES definitions still controversial
- Despite inherent assumptions valuation is a useful tool to aid decision makers



Disclaimer: Although funded through SNH the findings of this project are my own and do not necessarily reflect the thoughts or stance of the organisation as a whole on this subject.

Acknowledgements

The project was funded through an SNH graduate placement.

Time and advice was given by many people involved with fisheries boards, especially Marshall Halliday of the Esk Rivers & Fisheries Trust, Helen Brown of the Water of Leith Conservation Trust and Simon Mckelvey of the Cromarty Firth Fishery Board.



Scottish Natural Heritage Dualchas Nàdair na h-Alba

<u>References</u>

Bateman, I. J., Mace, G. M., Fezzi, C., Atkinson, G. & Turner, K. 2011. Economic Analysis for Ecosystem Service Assessments. Environmental & Resource	
Economics, 48, 177-218.	

Baum, D., McKelvey, S., Laughton, R. & Stephen, A. 2012. How many salmon smolts can a river produce? Poster for the Lochaber Fisheries Trust.

Butler, J. R. A., Radford, A., Riddington, G. & Laughton, R. 2009. Evaluating an ecosystem service provided by Atlantic salmon, sea trout and other fish species in the River Spey, Scotland: The economic impact of recreational rod fisheries. *Fisheries Research*, **96**, 259-266.

Costanza, R., d'Arge, R., De Groot, R., Farber, S., Grasso, M., Hannon, B., Limburg, K., Naeem, S., O'Neill, R. V., Paruelo, J., Raskin, R. G., Sutton, P. & Van den Belt, M. 1997. The value of the world's ecosystem services and natural capital. *Nature*, **387**, 253 - 260.

Ehrlich, P. R. & Ehrlich, A. H. 1981. Extinction: the causes and consequences of the disappearance of species, New York, Random House.

Everard, M. 2009. Ecosystem services case studies. Report No. [SCHO0409BPVM-E-E], Environment Agency. Bristol.

Fisher, B., Turner, R. K. & Morling, P. 2009. Defining and classifying ecosystem services for decision making. Ecological Economics, 68, 643-653.

HM Treasury. 2011. THE GREEN BOOK: Appraisal and Evaluation in Central Government. Report No.

International Council for the Exploration of the Sea (ICES). 2013. Report of the working group on North Atlantic Salmon (WGNAS). Report No.

Lawrence, K. S. & Spurgeon, J. 2007. Economic evaluation of inland fisheries: Welfare benefits of inland fisheries in England & Wales. Report No. [Science Report - SC050026/SR1], Environment Agency. Bristol.

Millennium Ecosystem Assessment 2005. Ecosystems and Human Well-being: Synthesis, Washington DC, Island Press.

Peeblesshire Trout Fishing Association. 2013. Price of Permits and Tickets to fish for trout and grayling in Scotland on the river tweed in the scottish borders [Online]. Peeblesshire Trout Fishing Association. Available: <u>http://www.peeblesshiretroutfishing.co.uk/tickets_prices.html</u> [Accessed 18th November 2013].

Rosmarin, R. 2006. *Who's paying for podcasts*? [Online]. Forbes. Available: <u>http://www.forbes.com/2006/03/03/podcast-apple-itunes-</u> <u>cx rr 0306podcast.html</u> [Accessed 23rd January 2014].

Tallis, H. T., Ricketts, T., Guerry, A. D., Wood, S. A., Sharp, R., Nelson, E., Ennaanay, D., Wolny, S., Olwero, N., Vigerstol, K., Pennington, D., Mendoza, G.,
 Aukema, J., Foster, J., Forrest, J., Cameron, D., Arkema, K., Lonsdorf, E., Kennedy, C., Verutes, G., Kim, C. K., Guannel, G., Papenfus, M., Toft, J.,
 Marsik, M., Bernhardt, J., Griffin, R., Glowinski, K., Chaumont, N., Perelman, A., Lacayo, M., Mandle, L., Griffin, R., Hamel, P. & Chaplin-Kramer, R.
 2013. InVEST 2.6.0 User's Guide Stanford, The Natural Capital Project.

TEEB 2010. The Economics of Ecosystems and Biodiversity Ecological and Economic Foundations, London and Washington, Earthscan.

UK National Ecosystem Assessment 2011. The UK National Ecosystem Assessment: Synthesis of the Key Findings. , Cambridge.

Walsh, C., Jakeman, P., Moles, R. & O'Regan, B. 2008. A comparison of carbon dioxide emissions associated with motorised transport modes and cycling in Ireland. *Transportation Research Part D: Transport and Environment*, **13**, 392-399.

Westman, W. E. 1977. How much are nature's services worth? Measuring the social benefits of ecosystem functioning is both controversial and illuminating. *Science*, **197**, 960-964.

White, P. C. L., Gregory, K. W., Lindley, P. J. & Richards, G. 1997. Economic values of threatened mammals in Britain: A case study of the otter Lutra lutra and the water vole Arvicola terrestris. *Biological Conservation*, **82**, 345-354.

