Mire (SOO) restoration in Estonia



Kaupo Kohv

State Forest Management Center



SFMC manages 25% Estonian land area and 75% of inland protected areas

Important definitions

- Peat organic substance, comprising mineral component less than 35%
- Peatland all areas with some layer of peat
- Mires peatland with more than 30 cm peat layer with active peat formation process







Main mire habitat types in Estonia













Drainage in Estonian landuse history

1915 1932 1962 1981 **1981**





The loss of open mire habitats in Estonia



Mire habitat types

Why it is important?



Sources: Glenk,. K., Martin-Ortega, J., Byg, A. (2017). Peatlands ecological conditions and associated benefits. Open access under the Creative Commons copyright. Piltide autor <u>Ximena Maier</u>.; Fotod: Maa-amet.

Fire safe landscapes



History of mire restoration practices before 2012



Roles of institutions in restoration process



Strategic planning

Nature Conservation Development plan 2020 (2012)

Targets:

Restoration of water regime on 10000 ha of mire habitats Restoration of water regime on 1000 ha of former peat mining areas

Action plan for mire restoration in protected areas (2015)

Priority list of mires in need of restoration

Prioritization





2015

- Wetlands with international importance -Ramsar sites
- Biggest mire complexies in Estonia
- Priority habitas are different fen habitats and transition mires

Site level planning and implementation

1. <u>Describing the scope of planned</u> <u>actions with preliminary impact</u> <u>assessment</u>

2. Going trough planning process (field works, modelling, background studies, technical writing, etc)

3. Implementation of project

4. Monitoring built constructions and ecological changes. Planning corrective actions if needed.

Stakeholder involvment

Ecological aspects of restoration

Cuttings

Restoration of hydrology

Planning for hydrological restoration



Planning for cuttings

Main input:

- 1) Historical aerial photos
- 2) Field works
- 3) Different inventory data about existing values



Why to cut?

- 1) To contribute to recovery of water table (lower evapotranspiration and less water entrapped in canopy)
- 2) To create suitable light conditions for open mire species



Cutting effect on water table?





Implementation. Dams



Dams





Building plastic walls



Biggest dams



Equipment





Voluntary work camps







Dams. Failures.



Implementation



Implementation. Cuttings.





Cuttings















Stakeholder involvement

- 1) Many stakeholders
- 2) Conflict interests
- 3) Big fears
- 4) Changing context
- 5) Never enough
 - information





Stakeholder involment



Monitoring

Water table is monitored with automatic divers Different speacies groups are monitored through general state level monitoring scheme or by project based monitoring schemes



Unmanned aerial systems for monitoring

Platforms •

- Multirotors
- Fixed-wing
- VTOL fixed wing

Sensors

- **RGB** cameras
- Multispectral camera ullet
- Thermal + RGB camera









LIFE Mires Estonia; LIFE14 NAT/EE/000126









Feodorisoo L1

Feodorisoo L2

192

178

768 715 88,9

90,5

16.10.2018

16.10.2018

3D models for implementation monitoring



Mire habitats where retoration actions has been finished



Lessons learned

- Strategic planning phase is very important.
- Modelling is very cost-effective method.
- Peat dams and *"*filling back" is most effective method for restoring the hydrology.
- Cuttings should be avoided if there are risks related with effectivness of hydrological restoration.
- Good planning regarding stakeholder involment is important.
- Solid support from env. authorites, eNGO-s and academia is neccessary for big projects.
- Failures will happen, it is important how quickly they are noticed.
- Site managers have to have resources for fixing errors.
- Weak monitoring concept is problematic.

