Moths on farmland: changes in diversity and abundance under Entry Level Stewardship



MARC BOTHAM, MATTHEW HEARD, JOHN REDHEAD & RICHARD PYWELL



FARMLAND & BIODIVERSITY

• 70%+ UK is agricultural land





Centre for Ecology & Hydrology NATURAL ENVIRONMENT RESEARCH COUNCIL

Robinson & Sutherland (2002) Journal of Applied Ecology 39: 157-176

AGRI-ENVIRONMENT SCHEMES

- Major aim of these schemes is to mitigate biodiversity loss
- The effectiveness of these schemes has been mixed and evidence for benefits equivocal
 - Eg Kleijn et al (2006)
- Major reason is the way assessed (Kleijn & Suthand Suthand Suthand Suthang Suthan
 - Eg No baselines, low re design





Kleijn & Sutherland (2003). Journal of Applied Ecology **40**: 947-969

HILLESDEN FARM EXPERIMENT



Defra and CEH led: randomised block experiment to evaluate and demonstrate the cost-effectiveness of Environmental Stewardship options in conserving and enhancing biodiversity at the farm scale



HILLESDEN FARM EXPERIMENT





Centre for Ecology & Hydrology

SURVEYING MOTHS AT HILLESDEN

Three main questions

- 1. Does moth abundance and diversity differ between the different treatments?
- 2. What effect is there of ELS on overall moth abundance and diversity at the farm-scale?
- 3. How does the landscape affect moth abundance and diversity in field margins?

SURVEYS:

Trapped each year in May and again in July 2006-2010 (5yrs).

- one block per night trapped
- 125w MV Robinson traps placed in the margin of each treatment

All moths recorded (macros and micros)





MOTHS AND AES

- Merckx et al (2009-2010): AES benefit moths
 - wide margins and hedgerow trees*
 - significant on targeted farms
 - Hedgerow trees especially important for less mobile species
- Fuentes-Montemayor et al (2011): AES benefit macro- and micro-moths compared to conventional farms
 - Especially micro moths







Merckx et al (2009) Agriculture, Ecosystems and Environment **130**:177-182 Merckx et al (2010) Agriculture, Ecosystems and Environment **138**: 147-151 Fuentes-Montemayor et al (2011) Journal of Applied Ecology **48**: 532-542

Farm-scale changes

Counted over 30,000 moths of over 600 species



Abundance

Species richness





Farm-scale changes – weather effects

Accounting for temperature and rainfall:



Small Square-spot Diarsia rubi



Large Nutmeg Apamea anceps





Treatment effects?

Treatment	Response	Macro-moths	Micro-moths	BAP-moths
ELS	Abundance	ELS>CC	ELS>CC	ELS <cc< th=""></cc<>
vs CC	α-diversity	ELS>CC	ELS>CC	ELS <cc< th=""></cc<>
ELSX	Abundance	ELSX>CC	ELSX>CC***	ELSX>CC
vs CC	α-diversity	ELSX>CC	ELSX>CC*	ELSX>CC
ELCV	Abundance	ELSX>ELS	ELSX>ELS**	ELSX>ELS
ELSX vs ELS				
	α-diversity	ELSX>ELS	ELSX>ELS	ELSX>ELS

Large numbers of specialist micros that feed in seed heads eg. *Cochylimorpha straminea* & *Aethes smeathmaniana*





Pictures from ukmoths.org.uk

Scale: landscape?

Mobile species attracted from nearby habitats

Treatments too close together

Ubiquitous presence of hedgerows and hedgerow trees







SUMMARY & CONCLUSIONS

- ELS is likely to benefit moths
 - UK BAP species have increased
 - After poor years nationally moth numbers are increasing at farm-scale
 - Both ES margin types increased abundance and diversity of moths compared to cross compliance
- Type of margins are important
 - ELSX increases abundance and diversity of all moths and significantly micro-moths compared to ELS standard
- Highlights need for longer-term monitoring and consideration of landscape



Acknowledgements



In the field: Nick Greatorex-Davies, Bill Meek, John Redhead Farm manager: Richard Franklin At CEH: Richard Pywell, Matthew Heard, Stephen Freeman



Centre for Ecology & Hydrology NATURAL ENVIRONMENT RESEARCH COUNCIL