



#### Introduction

It is vital to assess the amount of C that is mineralized as  $CO_2$ and  $CH_4$  in Arctic ecosystems, due to  $CH_4$  higher global warming potential. Hydrology and vegetation are known as the most important controls of CH<sub>4</sub> emissions. The extensive Siberian tundra is currently underrepresented in international databases. We performed *in situ* chamber measurements in a polygon containing two sites with distinct hydrological features in Samoylov Island in the Lena River Delta, Northeastern Siberia, and calculated the  $CO_2:CH_4$  production ratios from the measured  $CH_4$  and heterotrophic respiration ( $R_h$ ) fluxes.



Figure 1 -Satellite and aerial images of the study sites.

### **Material and Methods**

**Trenching experiment:** Removal of tundra vegetation. Measurement of plant-mediated  $CH_4$  transport and  $R_h$ .



Figure 2 - Boardwalk and measurement plots at the polygon center. Clipped plots at the left of the boardwalk and vegetated plots at the right.

**Experiment design:** Distribution of plots at the polygon water-saturated center and drained rim.



Figure 3 - Scheme of the study site and the installed measurement plots. From the total 20 PVC collars, 10 were installed at the center and 10 at the rim. From these 10 of each polygon part 6 were clipped and 4 remained with the original vegetation.

\*Contact: leonardo.galera@uni-hamburg.de

**CH**₄ Results



# CH<sub>4</sub> and CO<sub>2</sub> fluxes at sites with different hydrological patterns in the polygonal tundra of Samoylov Island, Northeastern Siberia

# Leonardo de Aro Galera<sup>1</sup>\*, Christian Knoblauch<sup>1</sup>, Tim Eckhardt<sup>1</sup>, Christian Beer<sup>1</sup>, Eva-Maria Pfeiffer<sup>1</sup>



**Figure 4** - CH<sub>4</sub> fluxes between July and September 2015 from a polygon on Samoylov Island at vegetated and clipped plots in the polygon center and polygon rim. Presented are daily means, error bars represent one standard deviation

Median CH<sub>4</sub> emission from vegetated plots at polygon center of 26 mg.m<sup>-2</sup>.d<sup>-1</sup>, and at the polygon rim 1.8 mg.m<sup>-2</sup>.d<sup>-1</sup>.

Distinct behavior of  $CH_{4}$  emissions of wet and dry tundra during the growing season. Emissions at center showed seasonality, while at the rim not.

Importance of plant-mediated transport of CH<sub>4</sub> avoiding oxidation. Clipped plots emissions 80% lower than vegetated at the center, while virtually no difference at the rim (3%).

### $CO_2:CH_4$ production ratios



**Figure 5** - In a), daily mean  $CO_2$ : CH<sub>4</sub> ratios in the polygon center during the growing season in 2015 and results from multivariate regression analysis with active layer depth and soil temperature at 40 cm as influence parameters. Error bars represent the standard deviation. In b), the daily mean active layer depth, which was the best predictor for  $CO_2:CH_4$  at the center.



**Figure 6** - In a), daily mean  $CO_2:CH_4$  ratios in the polygon rim during the growing season in 2015 and results from multivariate regression analysis with active layer depth and soil temperature at 5 cm as influence parameters. Error bars represent the standard deviation. In b), the daily mean soil temperature at 5 cm, which was the best predictor for  $CO_2$ :  $CH_4$  at the rim.

The  $CO_2:CH_4$  ratios at the polygon center vary from around 3 to 100, while at the rim from around 100 to 1000



### $CO_2:CH_4$ production ratios

 $CO_2:CH_4$  ratios at the center that are more influenced by  $CH_4$  production are related to soil temperature at 40 cm, while  $CO_2:CH_4$  ratios at the rim that are more influenced by  $R_h$  are related to soil temperature at 5 cm.

CH<sub>4</sub> emissions are related to processes and changes happening at deeper soil layers, while the R<sub>h</sub> are related to the soil surface and shallower layers.

Deep soil layers mostly anoxic, producing  $CH_4$ , while shallower soil layers mostly oxic, producing  $CO_2$ .

## C budget

**Table 1** –  $R_h$  (CO<sub>2</sub>) and CH<sub>4</sub> emission budget of the polygonal tundra on Samoylov Island for the growing season in 2015

Gas	Unit	Wet tundra	Dry tundra
CO <sub>2</sub> (R <sub>h</sub> )	kg CO₂.ha⁻¹.d⁻¹	10	20
CH₄	kg CO₂-e.ha⁻¹.d⁻¹	7	1
Total	kg CO₂-e.ha⁻¹.d⁻¹	17	20

**Table 2** – Net ecosystem exchange  $(CO_2)$  and  $CH_4$  emission budget of the polygonal tundra on Samoylov Island for the growing season in 2015

Gas	Unit	Wet tundra	Dry tundra
CO <sub>2</sub> (NEE)	kg CO₂.ha⁻¹.d⁻¹	-83	-25
CH <sub>4</sub>	kg CO₂-e.ha⁻¹.d⁻¹	7	1
Total	kg CO₂-e.ha⁻¹.d⁻¹	-76	-24

The wet tundra, represented by the polygon center, has lower R<sub>h</sub> and considerably higher CH<sub>4</sub> emission than the dry tundra. However, when both gases are accounted in CO<sub>2</sub> equivalent basis, their impact in the C budget is not so different.

Both tundra types are C sink during the growing season, with the wet tundra being the strongest one.

The CH<sub>4</sub> emissions offset 9% of the wet tundra C sink capacity, and 2% of the dry tundra C sink capacity. The relevance of  $CH_4$  production and emission in the wet tundra is higher than in the dry tundra, despite of the dry tundra being the largest C source.