Methanotropic bacteria in forest soils

Verena Lang_{1,2} | Valentin Gartiser $_1$ | Nora Anderson $_1$ | Peter Hartmann $_1$ | Alexander Schengel $_1$ | Martin Maier $_{1,2}$

¹ Forest Research Institute Baden-Württemberg (FVA), Germany ² Department of Crop Sciences, Chair of Soil Physics, University of Göttingen, Germany <u>Verena.Lang@forst.bwl.de</u>



Forest Research

Institute Baden-Württemberg

GEORG-AUGUST-UNIVERSITÄT GÖTTINGEN IN PUBLICA COMMODA

Study Sites





FAG

up to 25 years of methane fluxes

Study areas provide:

including 13 longtermmonitoring –

sites

>20 study

sites in

Germany

- tree species comparison (beech / spruce)
- gradients of forest management
- differences in N-deposition and liming
- events (drought/ storms...)

main plots of the FVA (project studies are not included)

Plot	Temp. Ø [°C]	Prec. Ø [mm]	Altitde [m]	tree /treatment	years of data	Soiltype (FAO)	Humustype	Humus- height (cm)	Skel (%)	•
Altensteig	8.5	817	512	Spruce	24	Haplic Cambisol	Mull (MUO)	8	5	13.6
				Beech	12	Stagnic Cambisol	Mull (MUO)	7	1	12.2
Conventwald	8.3	1385	816	Spruce	22	Haplic Cambisol	Moder (MOT)	10	80	22.3
				Beech	12	Skeletic Cambisol	Moder (MOT)	10	50	14.4
Esslingen	9.6	862	345	Spruce	24	Vertic Stagnosol	Moder (MOT)	9	0	22.3
				Beech	12	Haplic Stagnosol	Mull (MUF)	6	2	14.9
Heidelberg	7.4	1113	505	Spruce	24	Haplic Cambisol	Moder (MOT)	7	10	28.9
				Spruce/limed	24	Haplic Cambisol	Moder (MOT)	7	10	30.5
				Beech	12	Haplic Stagnosol	Mull (MUF)	3	1	16.1
Ochsenhausen	8.6	1111	682	Spruce	24	Abruptic Luvisol	Moder (MOR)	9	2	28.4
				Spruce/limed	24	Abruptic Luvisol	Moder (MOR)	9	8	28.4
				Beech	12	Epidystic Luvisol	Moder (MOR)	6	2	19.2
Rotenfels	9	1258	600	Spruce	24	Hyperalbic Podzol	Rawhumus (ROR)	15	25	22.4



Methods







Objective:

To minimize the differences in the absolute amount of gas fluxes.

Consequence:

Parameter fixing (Humus height, TPS, diffusion model parameters) **Focus:**

 CO_2 with seasonal expectation value

How do we do?

soil gas transport model <u>"ConFluxPro"</u>

- inverse method for flux calculation from concentration gradients
- <u>optimization approach</u> for validation with chamber measurements

"ConFluxPro" is published as R-Package on github by Valentin Gartiser <u>https://github.com/valentingar/ConFluxPro</u>

DISCUSSION

STUDY

SITES

FIRST

RESULTS

validation results & analysis of predictors



some good fits



still some work to do



look at some time series

analysis of predictors case study on site Esslingen



effect of validating the gas sampler fluxes with chamber measurements







annual values for CH₄ consumption, soil water content (SWC) and annual precepitation sum

example of 2 plots in Esslingen with beech and spruce stand (ESB and ESS)



case study Esslingen was done by Nora Anderson



temporal analysis of annual values for CH₄ consumption and annual precepitation sum

example of 2 plots in Esslingen with beech and spruce stand (ESB and ESS)



😑 methane 🛛 😑 precipitation

long-term trend?

There is no significant trend in methane oxidation caused by precepitation.

Scatter over time and uncertainty in the mean flux / predictor estimation make statements about a temporal trend impossible.



case study Esslingen was done by Nora Anderson

Discussion



Comparison to other research

Ni & Groffman (2018)

- Investigation of 4 US sites
- Time series: 15-20 years
- + metastudy



 CH_4 uptake appears to be driven by increases in precipitation and soil hydrological flux. Furthermore, an analysis of CH_4 uptake around the globe showed that CH_4 uptake in forest soils has decreased by an average of 77% from 1988 to 2015, particularly in forests located from 0 to 60 °N latitude where precipitation has



Forecast:

long-term decrease in CH₄ oxidation Reason: Precipitation?

Current status of our results:

no clear negative trends in longterm CH₄uptake, due to no significant trend precipitation

What's next?

- individual model development for gap filling on every plot
- Aggregation of <u>annual values</u>
- Investigation <u>of long-term and</u> <u>short-term influencing factors</u>
- In addition to long-term data, evaluation of project-specific sites



Study Sites





Discussion



RETURN

Ni & Groffman (2018): Declines in methane uptake in forest soils

Methane uptake in forest soils retrieved from published studies. (A) Global annual CH₄-uptake in forest soils from 1988 to 2015. The *Inset* represents average CH₄-uptake for the full period from 1988 to 2015. The boxes show median and 5th and 95th percentiles. Error bars denote SEs. (B) Annual CH₄-uptake in forest soils from 0 to 30 °N and 30-60 °N latitude. (C) Annual CH₄-uptake in forest soils from 60 to 90 °N, 0-30 °S and 30-60 °S latitude. All trends with time are statistically significant in A and B (P<0.05) but are not significant in C. The data in A were actually measured annual CH₄-uptake and those in B and C include both actually measured and estimated annual CH₄-uptake.

can not be observed on our sites, yet!

Methods









Methane O Precipitation sums











Esslingen Spruce Plot (ESS)



good correlation between modelled fluxes and chamber measurements



Altensteig Spruce Plot (ASS)



good correlation between modelled fluxes and chamber measurements



RETURN

Conventwald Beech Plot (COB)



- good correlation between modelled fluxes and chamber measurements



Conventwald Spruce Plot (COS)



- Chamber measurements show less variation between measurement days.
- High skeleton content makes further adjustments in the diffusion model necessary





Heidelberg Spruce Plot (HDS)



- underestimation of the methane consumption in modelled fluxes

