# Comparison of models and measurements for whole-farm ammonia emissions

Tom Misselbrook, Sarah Gilhespy Daniel Sandars, Adrian Williams, Colin Burton

Rachel Thorman

**Rob Pinder** 









### **OBJECTIVES**

Compare emissions from on-farm mitigated sources with experimental studies

Estimate emissions using 'whole-farm models' and assess abatement scenarios

### STRUCTURE

Details of 2 study farms

Emission measurement methodology

Models used to estimate emissions

Results

### **STUDY FARMS**

# **DAIRY FARM**

- 180 dairy cows, cubicle housing (slurry) c. 6 months
  Calves and followers on straw bedding (FYM)
  - Slurry lagoon
- Slurry applied to grassland, FYM to maize ground

Mitigation measures: Slurry injection Rapid incorporation of FYM

### **STUDY FARMS**

# **PIG FARM**

- 500 sows, 1800 finishing pigs
- Various housing types (slatted, straw-bedded, natural and mechanical ventilation)
- Slurry lagoon
- Slurry and FYM applied to arable land

Mitigation measures: Slurry lagoon cover Slurry band spread Rapid incorporation of FYM

### **MEASUREMENTS**

### Dairy farm



Manure spreading NOT GRAZING



# **MEASUREMENTS**



### MODELS

- UK Ammonia Emissions Inventory Model UK\_AEI
- MAST
- NARSES
- MEASURES
- Farm Emissions Model (FEM)

## **UK Ammonia Emissions Inventory**

- Spreadsheet model at UK-scale (not easy to use at farm scale)
- Detailed partial emission factors (generally expressed per animal)
- Detailed activity data (livestock census, manure management practices)
- Updated annually
- NOT mass-conservative or N-flow

Pain et al., 1998, Atmospheric Environment 32, 309-313; Misselbrook et al., 2000, Atmospheric Environment 34, 871-880

## MAST

ʻMAST Ammo T	MAST 2000 IN AST 2000	
	Dairy Mode         Beef Mode         Eigs Mode         Sheep Mode         Poultry Mode	

'MAST' - Model for Ammonia Systems Transfer

- Farm-scale model using UK\_AEI emission factors
- Not updated since 2000

### NARSES



'NARSES' – National Ammonia Reduction Strategy Evaluation System

- Based on UK\_AEI structure (detailed partial EF)
- EF expressed as %TAN
- Mass-conservative N-flow model
- Includes cost-curve analysis

Webb and Misselbrook, 2004, Atmospheric Environment 38, 2163-2176

### **MEASURES**

'MEASURES' – Multiple Environmental outcomes from Agricultural Systems

- Includes many components other than ammonia
- Ammonia emission algorithms largely empirical from UK emissions inventory with some revisions

**'FEM' – Farm Emissions Model** 

- Specifically for slurry-based dairy farm
- Mass-conservative N-flow model
- Process-based partial emission factors
- Monthly emissions output

# RESULTS

## **MITIGATION**

### **Dairy farm**

### NONE!!!

- Shallow injector not used (contractor instead)
- Ploughing within 24h not achieved

# **MITIGATION**

### Pig farm

**Covered slurry lagoon** 

**Band spread slurry** 

**Rapid FYM incorporation** 

- emission almost zero
- emission 18-36% TAN applied
- emission 56% TAN applied
- >80% prior to ploughing

Emissions agree well with experimental studies, giving confidence to emission reduction efficiencies determined in controlled experiments

#### Dairy farm – pre abatement

■ MAST ■ UK\_AEI ■ NARSES ■ FEM ■ MEASURES ■ Measured





### Pig farm – pre abatement





## CONCLUSIONS

>Where practised (!), mitigation measures gave reductions equivalent to those from previous experiments

Different models gave different totals and reductions

- national vs. local scenarios
- requirement for process-based models
- importance of correct models for 'pollution swapping'

### ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Funding was provided by the Department for Environment and Rural Affairs (UK)

Support and cooperation of the two farm manegers is gratefully acknowledged