

INFORMATION TO USERS

This manuscript has been reproduced from the microfilm master. UMI films the text directly from the original or copy submitted. Thus, some thesis and dissertation copies are in typewriter face, while others may be from any type of computer printer.

The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted. Broken or indistinct print, colored or poor quality illustrations and photographs, print bleedthrough, substandard margins, and improper alignment can adversely affect reproduction.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send UMI a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if unauthorized copyright material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.

Oversize materials (e.g., maps, drawings, charts) are reproduced by sectioning the original, beginning at the upper left-hand corner and continuing from left to right in equal sections with small overlaps.

Photographs included in the original manuscript have been reproduced xerographically in this copy. Higher quality 6" x 9" black and white photographic prints are available for any photographs or illustrations appearing in this copy for an additional charge. Contact UMI directly to order.

Bell & Howell Information and Learning
300 North Zeeb Road, Ann Arbor, MI 48106-1346 USA
800-521-0600

UMI[®]

PREVIEW

Carbon Dioxide and Methane Exchange in a Boreal Wetland

by

Andrew E. Suyker

A DISSERTATION

Presented to the Faculty of

The Graduate College at the University of Nebraska

in Partial Fulfillment of Requirements

For the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy

Major: Agronomy (Agricultural Meteorology)

Under the Supervision of Professor Shashi B. Verma

Lincoln, Nebraska

October, 2000

UMI Number: 9992010

UMI[®]

UMI Microform 9992010

Copyright 2001 by Bell & Howell Information and Learning Company.

All rights reserved. This microform edition is protected against
unauthorized copying under Title 17, United States Code.

Bell & Howell Information and Learning Company
300 North Zeeb Road
P.O. Box 1346
Ann Arbor, MI 48106-1346

DISSERTATION TITLE

Carbon Dioxide and Methane Exchange in a Boreal Wetland

BY

Andrew E. Suyker

SUPERVISORY COMMITTEE:

APPROVED

DATE

Timothy J. Arkebauer
Signature

10/5/00

Timothy J. Arkebauer
Typed Name

Blaine L. Blad
Signature

October 5, 2000

Blaine L. Blad
Typed Name

John W. Doran
Signature

10/5/2000

John W. Doran
Typed Name

Frank G. Ullman
Signature

October 5, 2000

Frank G. Ullman
Typed Name

S. B. Verma
Signature

October 5, 2000

Shashi B. Verma
Typed Name

Signature

Typed Name



Carbon Dioxide and Methane Exchange in a Boreal Wetland

Andrew E. Suyker, Ph.D.

University of Nebraska, 2000

Advisor: Shashi B. Verma

Detailed information on carbon exchange in northern wetlands is needed to improve our understanding of global carbon cycle and predictions of future climatic conditions. For this reason, fluxes of carbon dioxide and methane were measured in a boreal wetland in central Saskatchewan as part of the Boreal Ecosystem Atmosphere Study (BOREAS) in 1994 and 1995. Seasonal patterns of midday CO_2 flux were comparable in the two years. Peak midday CO_2 uptake (about 0.5 to $0.6 \text{ mg m}^{-2} (\text{ground area}) \text{ s}^{-1}$) occurred in early July concurrent with peak LAI (≈ 1.3). The relationship between CO_2 flux (normalized by leaf area) and incident photosynthetically active radiation was similar in both years. High vapor pressure deficit ($1.5 < D < 3.2 \text{ kPa}$) and air temperature ($20 < T_a < 30 \text{ }^\circ\text{C}$) reduced CO_2 flux significantly. Integrated net ecosystem CO_2 uptake was 89 and $108 \text{ g CO}_2\text{-C m}^{-2}$ (890 and $1080 \text{ kg CO}_2\text{-C ha}^{-1}$) in the 1994 and 1995 growing seasons, respectively. Periods of high vapor pressure deficit and air temperature, a brief interval of cloudy/cool conditions, and a brief temporary rise of the water table in 1994 were likely associated with the lower carbon uptake.

Seasonal trends of methane emission showed some similarities in the two years. Maximum seasonal methane emission was of comparable magnitude (19.5 and $16.5 \text{ mg m}^{-2} \text{ h}^{-1}$ in 1994 and 1995, respectively) and occurred about the same time as the highest peat temperatures and water tables. However, peak methane emission occurred much earlier (5 to 6 weeks) in 1995: this was probably linked to the contrasting seasonal trends of peat temperature and water table between

years. Peat temperature and water table also reached their peak values later in the 1994 season. Sensitivity of methane emission to changes in peat temperature and water table was consistent between the two seasons. Seasonally integrated methane emission of 16.3 and 17.9 g CH₄-C m⁻² (163 and 179 kg CH₄-C ha⁻¹) in 1994 and 1995 respectively, was 15-20% of the net ecosystem CO₂ exchange. Thus, for a productive wetland as studied here, carbon loss through methane emission is significant in the overall carbon budget.

PREVIEW

Acknowledgements

I would first and foremost like to thank my dear friend, Monsignor Leonard Kalin. His support and love have been my mainstay and I know I wouldn't have been able to accomplish this without him. I also am thankful to almighty God for giving me the opportunity to help Monsignor so I may at least pay back some of his kindness and guidance to me. Of course the other individual who has been my friend and guide and to whom I owe a great deal is my advisor, Shashi Verma. I think his daughter was still correct however, when she noted how "mean" Shashi was in correcting these and previous manuscripts - I will miss Shashi's insightful comments when I move on. I am also very grateful to Drs. Tim J. Arkebauer, Blaine L. Blad, John W. Doran, and Frank G. Ullman for serving on my graduate committee.

I am very grateful to my family, especially my Father, Art and Mother, Grace. From them I have learned to persevere and to be generous and to try your best in what ever you do and do this all with a smile on your face. I appreciate the support from my brothers and sisters and their patience in getting this finished. Mr. Robert Clement and Dr. Joon Kim have provided me with a fun and challenging work environment and I appreciate all the good conversations we have had over the years and all the good restaurants we have tried and all they have taught me. I am still waiting to become as patient as they are when things go wrong and to be as organized as they are. Sheldon Sharp, Dave Earl, Wen Ma and Eric Hasselbalch provided valuable assistance in maintenance of instruments (and Arro was an outstanding bog-dog). James Hines assisted in data computation for which I am grateful. I would like to thank Dennis Baldocchi for sharing the net

ecosystem CO₂ exchange data with our group. I thank Jill Bubier for her assistance with plant identification. I thank Robert Clement and Dave Billesbach for their valuable assistance in data collection and processing. I am grateful to Evan Jolitz for his collection of leaf area data. I also thank Nigel Roulet for providing the water table sensor and Ross Nelson, Carla Evans, Shaun Stevens, and Mary Dahlman for logistical support and David Marx for his help with the statistical analysis. I am thankful to the faculty and staff of the Bioatmospheric Sciences Group in the School of Natural Resource Sciences for their encouragement and assistance. This study was supported by a grant (ATM-9217843) from the National Science Foundation, a grant (NAG5-2585) from the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, and UNL Center for Laser-Analytical Studies of Trace Gas Dynamics, and the Agricultural Research Division.

Table of Contents

	Page
ABSTRACT	i
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	iii
TABLE OF CONTENTS	v
LIST OF FIGURES	vii
LIST OF TABLES	ix
LIST OF SYMBOLS/ABBREVIATIONS	x
LIST OF CONVERSION FACTORS	xii
CHAPTER 1. INTRODUCTION	1
CHAPTER 2. MATERIALS AND METHODS	4
2.1. Site	4
2.2. Eddy Covariance Flux Measurements	4
2.3. Supporting Measurements	6
2.3.1. Meteorological Variables	6
2.3.2. Leaf Area Index	7
2.3.3. Interpolation (Gap Filling) of Meteorological Data	7
CHAPTER 3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION	9
3.1. Microclimatic Conditions	9
3.2. Carbon Dioxide Exchange	13
3.2.1. 1994 Growing Season	13
3.2.1.1. Canopy Photosynthesis: Environmental Controls	13
3.2.1.2. Canopy Photosynthesis: Diurnal Variation	16
3.2.1.3. Canopy Photosynthesis: Seasonal Variation	18
3.2.1.4. Daily Net Ecosystem Exchange	22

3.2.2. 1994 and 1995 Growing Seasons	25
3.2.2.1. Atmospheric CO ₂ Flux: Seasonal Patterns	25
3.2.2.2. Daytime Atmospheric CO ₂ Flux: Environmental Controls	27
3.2.2.3. Nighttime Atmospheric CO ₂ Flux: Environmental Controls	33
3.2.2.4. Integrated Atmospheric CO ₂ Flux	36
3.3. Methane Exchange	38
3.3.1. 1994 Growing Season	38
3.3.1.1. Seasonal Distribution of Methane Emission	38
3.3.1.2. Time Lag	42
3.3.1.3. Relationships with Peat Temperature and Water Table	45
3.3.2. 1994 and 1995 Growing Seasons	51
3.3.2.1. Diurnal Variation of Methane Emission	51
3.3.2.2. Seasonal Distributions of Methane Emission	54
3.3.2.3. Relating Methane Emission to Environmental Variables	58
3.3.2.4. Seasonally Integrated Methane Emission	62
CHAPTER 4. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS	64
REFERENCES	66

List of Figures

Figure 2.1.	Leaf area index (LAI) measured in 1995 in a concurrent study by E. Jolitz. In 1994, LAI was measured once by J. Chen. The seasonal distribution of LAI in the two years was assumed to be similar.....	8
Figure 3.1.	Midday averages (1130 - 1430 local time) of A) water table (W) above an “average” hollow surface with precipitation, B) air temperature (T_a) at 4.2 m, C) peat temperature (T_p) measured 0.1 m below a hollow surface, D) air vapor pressure deficit (D) at 4.2 m, and E) incident PAR in each growing season. Environmental data estimated during the burn pullout are in the shaded areas	11 and 12
Figure 3.2.	Relationship between canopy photosynthesis (P) and photosynthetically active radiation (PAR) under A) moderate air temperature and air vapor pressure deficit conditions (■) compared with high temperature and and air vapor pressure deficit conditions (o) and B) same as Fig. 3.2A except for an earlier part of the season. Lines are from regression analysis of hyperbolic function following Landsberg (1977).....	14
Figure 3.3.	Diurnal plots of A) canopy photosynthesis, B) incident PAR, and C) air temperature and air vapor pressure deficit on August 13, 1994.....	18
Figure 3.4.	Diurnal plots of A) canopy photosynthesis, B) incident PAR, and C) air temperature and air vapor pressure deficit on July 21, 1994.....	19
Figure 3.5.	Seasonal distribution of midday (1130-1430 local time) canopy photosynthesis (P). Arrows indicate selected time periods discussed in the text.....	20
Figure 3.6.	Seasonal distribution of A) daily integrated net ecosystem- CO_2 exchange, (F), and B) net ecosystem CO_2 exchange integrated during the daytime (F_{day}) and the nighttime (F_{night}) (units on “Y axis” [$\text{g m}^{-2} \text{period}^{-1}$], indicate period of integration either daytime or nighttime).....	23
Figure 3.7.	Seasonal distribution of midday (1130-1430 local time) averaged atmospheric CO_2 flux (F_c) during May 20 to October 6, 1994 and 1995.....	26
Figure 3.8.	F_{cL} -PAR relationship for A) moderate vapor pressure deficit and air temperature in 1994 and 1995 and B) moderate and high air vapor pressure deficit and air temperature in 1994. Note F_{cL} is on a leaf area basis and a rectangular hyperbola was fit to the data (see text for details).....	28

Figure 3.9.	Midday (1130-1430 local time) values of the factor $g(D) = F_{cL}/f(\text{PAR})$ plotted as a function of midday air vapor pressure deficit (D) during mid season (see text for details).....	32
Figure 3.10.	Midday (1130-1430 local time) averaged F_c during June 9 to September 15, 1994 compared to modeled fluxes using the 1995 light response relationship for moderate conditions. Effects of high air vapor pressure deficit and air temperature were incorporated using Fig 3.9 (see text for details). The CO_2 flux is on a leaf area basis	32
Figure 3.11.	Relationship between average nighttime CO_2 flux ($\bar{U} > 1.5$ m/s) and peat temperature (at 0.10 m below an “average” hollow surface) in 1994 and 1995 for A) low-medium water table and B) medium-high water table. The curves are “eye-fit” relationships. Circled points seem to be outliers. See text for details	34
Figure 3.12.	One-to-one plots of average night F_c vs calculated R_s in the 1994 1995 growing season (see text for details).....	35
Figure 3.13.	Seasonal distribution of midday (1130-1430 local time) methane emission (F_m) in 1994. The circled points represent two days, August 11 and 22 (DOY 223 and 234). These days had light rainfall in the morning and after the rain, F_m was about 50% larger than on the previous day. These data are not included in the analysis relating methane emission to peat temperature and water table.....	39
Figure 3.14.	A) Midday (1130-1430 local time) methane emission (F_m) and water table (W) during DOY 175-230 (June 24 to August 18). B) Same as Figure 3.14A except that the water table has been lagged by 12 days. The circled points represent two days of larger F_m , which may partially be attributed to a release of pore water methane with a rapid decrease in the water table. Curves represent “eye-fit” slopes to methane emission trends.....	44
Figure 3.15.	Diurnal patterns of methane emission (F_m) on selected days in 1994 and 1995.....	52
Figure 3.16.	Seasonal distributions of midday (1130-1430 local time) averages of methane emission (F_m) during the 1994 and 1995 growing seasons.....	55

List of Tables

Table 3.1.	Relevant weather information (Source: International Station Meteorological Climate Summary (ver. 2.0) produced jointly by Naval Oceanography Command. Detachment and National Climatic Data Center, Asheville, NC).....	10
Table 3.2.	Model parameters for the CO ₂ flux - PAR relationship (Eq. 3.2b) and 95% confidence limits. Here the CO ₂ flux is mg m ⁻² (leaf area) s ⁻¹ . Ranges of moderate and high air vapor pressure deficits and air temperatures are defined in the text. During mid season in 1995, moderate conditions prevailed most of the time and high D and T _a were not commonly observed.....	30
Table 3.3.	Daytime, nighttime, and net integrated carbon dioxide exchange from May 19 to October 6 in the fen during the 1994 and 1995 growing seasons. Units are g CO ₂ -C m ⁻² season ⁻¹ and kg CO ₂ -C ha ⁻¹ season ⁻¹ in parentheses.....	37
Table 3.4A.	Nonlinear regression results (Equation 3.3) for the entire season.....	47
Table 3.4B.	Nonlinear regression results (Equation 3.3) for the season divided into four periods.....	47
Table 3.4C.	Results of partial <i>F</i> -test to determine if including <i>T_p</i> or <i>W</i> significantly ($\alpha = 0.05$) increases the variability explained in <i>F_m</i>	48
Table 3.5.	Day (0900-1700 local time) and night (2200-0400) average methane emission (mg m ⁻² h ⁻¹) and standard deviation on selected days in 1994 and 1995.....	53
Table 3.6A.	Nonlinear regression results using Equation (3.4) with the 1994 data. Note the <i>r</i> ² term is the linear regression between modeled and measured methane emissions.....	60
Table 3.6B.	Nonlinear regression results using Equation (3.4) with the 1995 data. Note the <i>r</i> ² term is the linear regression between modeled and measured methane emissions.....	60
Table 3.7.	Integrated methane emissions reported in the literature from northern wetlands. Some studies report annually integrated values, but methane emission during winter is generally small (e.g., <5% : e.g., see Melloh and Crill, 1996) so comparisons are reasonable.....	63

List of Symbols/Abbreviations

a, b, c, d, e	regression coefficients for relationship between methane and T_p and W where b is sensitivity to water table and c is a Q_{10} factor
D	midday (1130-1430 local time) average vapor pressure deficit at 4.2 m
F_c	carbon dioxide flux averaged over one half hour
F_c	midday average (1130-1430 local time) of carbon dioxide flux
$F_{cL} (= F_c/LAI)$	atmospheric CO ₂ flux normalized by leaf area (mg m ⁻² (leaf area) s ⁻¹)
F_{cLM}	atmospheric CO ₂ flux (mg m ⁻² (leaf area) s ⁻¹) asymptote
F	daily integrated carbon dioxide flux
F_{day}	daytime integrated carbon dioxide flux
F_{night}	nighttime integrated carbon dioxide flux
F_s	carbon dioxide flux measured from the soil surface using a chamber
F_m	methane emission averaged over one half hour
F_m	midday average (1130-1430 local time) of methane emission
G	soil heat flux (including energy storage in the peat)
$g(D)$	empirical term (function of D) to account for lower CO ₂ flux due to high D
H	sensible heat flux
LAI	leaf area index
LE	latent heat flux
$P = F_c + F_s$	canopy photosynthesis for one half hour
P	midday (1130-1430 local time) average canopy photosynthesis
P_m	canopy photosynthesis asymptote in light response relationship
PAR	photosynthetically active radiation
PAR^*	light compensation point ($P=0$) of the canopy
Q_{10}	relative change in item of interest for a 10 °C change in temperature
R_n	net radiation
R_s	y-intercept of light response curve
R_{sL}	y-intercept of light response curve normalized by leaf area
T_p	midday (1130-1430 local time) peat temperature 0.1m below a hollow bottom
T_a	midday (1130-1430 local time) average air temperature at 4.2m

W	midday (1130-1430 local time) average water table where the datum plane (i.e., $W=0$) is referenced to an “average” hollow bottom
α_L	apparent quantum yield (slope of curve at $F_{cl} = 0$)
η	slope of the photosynthesis-light response curve at $P=0$
NEE	net ecosystem exchange
BOREAS	Boreal Ecosystem Atmosphere Study
TDLS	Tunable diode laser sensor
DOY	Julian day of the year

List of Conversion Factors

$$F_c: \quad 1 \text{ mg CO}_2 \text{ m}^{-2} \text{ s}^{-1} = 14.7 \text{ } \mu\text{mol CO}_2 \text{ m}^{-2} \text{ s}^{-1}$$

$$F_c: \quad 1 \text{ mg CO}_2 \text{ m}^{-2} \text{ s}^{-1} = 235.6 \text{ kg C ha}^{-1} \text{ d}^{-1}$$

$$F: \quad 1 \text{ g CO}_2\text{-C m}^{-2} = 10.0 \text{ kg CO}_2\text{-C ha}^{-1}$$

$$F_m: \quad 1 \text{ mg CH}_4 \text{ m}^{-2} \text{ h}^{-1} = 24.0 \text{ mg CH}_4 \text{ m}^{-2} \text{ d}^{-1}$$

$$F_m: \quad 1 \text{ mg CH}_4 \text{ m}^{-2} \text{ h}^{-1} = 0.180 \text{ kg C ha}^{-1} \text{ d}^{-1}$$

Chapter 1. Introduction

Wetlands in boreal zones are extensive, covering more than 25% of the landscape in Canada and greater than 50% of the landscape in western Siberia (National Wetlands Working Group, 1988; Gorham, 1991). Boreal wetlands store a significant amount of global soil carbon (possibly between 20-33 %: Gorham, 1991; Billings, 1987; Schlesinger, 1996), and produce methane from anaerobic respiration in inundated peat soils. Carbon dynamics in wetlands involve a balance between carbon uptake in photosynthesis or sequestration below the water table and release from microbial and root respiration and methane emission. On a short term basis, day to day variations in environmental parameters (e.g., light, air temperature) have profound effects on carbon exchange via photosynthesis. On a long-term basis, other environmental parameters (e.g., height of the water table, peat temperature) affect carbon exchange via changes in soil/microbial respiration and plant phenology/productivity (Oechel *et al.*, 1998).

Atmospheric concentration of methane has doubled since the industrial revolution (e.g., Pearman *et al.*, 1986, Mitchell *et al.*, 1990) and it continues to increase although at a slower rate since about 1980 (Dlugokencky *et al.*, 1998, Steele *et al.*, 1992). Methane is a potentially important greenhouse gas both directly (efficiently traps outgoing tropospheric radiation: Lashof and Ahuja, 1990, Rodhe, 1990) and indirectly (affects concentrations of O₃ and H₂O - other greenhouse gases: Khalil and Rasmussen, 1992).

Wetlands produce methane from the anaerobic microbial decomposition of organic matter. Methane emission from northern (40-80°N) wetlands contributes an estimated 4-7% of the *global* sources (Bolin, 1994; Vourlitis and Oechel, 1997; Aselmann and Crutzen, 1989), with some

estimates as high as 13% (Matthews and Fung, 1987). During the last 10-15 years, considerable attention has been focused on methane emission in northern wetlands (e.g., Vourlitis and Oechel, 1997). These studies indicate the complex relationships between methane emission and the relevant biotic and abiotic controls. Investigators have considered variables such as substrate productivity, nutrient availability, and vegetative characteristics which control potential production of methane. Environmental factors such as water table and peat temperature have been linked to methane emission in several studies. Such dependence has been explored on a spatial and temporal basis in multiple studies (inter-comparisons among wetlands with different characteristics or temporal methane emission from multiple microsites within a wetland during a season). Estimates of the methane budget indicate a significant source still is unaccounted for (Vourlitis and Oechel, 1997).

Adding to the uncertainty in the methane budget is the large variability associated with most of the available measurements, which have employed small chambers. Better large-scale estimates of methane emission are needed to provide accurate information on the methane budget. Vourlitis and Oechel (1997) suggest that the availability of fast response gas analyzers and the use of the eddy covariance approach (from towers and aircraft) enhance the ability to measure methane emission on a landscape (hectares) and regional (square kilometers) scale. The eddy covariance technique provides a measure of the vertical flux of a transported entity at a point in the atmosphere by correlating the fluctuations in the concentration of that entity with the fluctuations in the vertical windspeed (e.g., Kaimal, 1975; Kanemasu *et al.*, 1979; Businger, 1986; Baldocchi *et al.*, 1988; Wesley *et al.*, 1989; Verma, 1990). This is an *in situ* technique which causes minimal disturbance