Calibration Report: High N Basalt Site Base Case

Kaveh Gholamhossein Siah

18 November 2020

Contents

Soil Solution Results . . . 3
Weathering Results . . . 7
Litter Pool Results . . . 9
Tree Nutrient Content . . . 13
Analysis 1: Stack Flux Data . . . 14
Cation Exchange Capacity . . . 17
Anion Exchange Capacity . . . 18
Other . . . 20

List of Figures

1 Monthly Calcium Concentrations by Soil Layer . . . 3
2 Monthly Magnesium Concentrations by Soil Layer . . . 3
3 Monthly Potassium Concentrations by Soil Layer . . . 4
4 Monthly Sodium Concentrations by Soil Layer . . . 4
5 Monthly Sulfate Concentrations by Soil Layer . . . 4
6 Monthly Aluminum Concentrations by Soil Layer . . . 5
7 Monthly SiO2 Concentrations by Soil Layer . . . 5
8 Monthly Organic Acid Base (R-) Concentrations by Soil Layer . . . 5
9 Monthly pH by Soil Layer . . . 6
10 Yearly Ammonium concentration by Soil Layer . . . 6
11 Yearly Nitrate concentration by Soil Layer . . . 6
12 Calcium Weathering (All Layer) . . . 7
13 Magnesium Weathering (All Layer) . . . 7
14 Potassium Weathering (All Layer) . . . 7
15 Aluminum Weathering (All Layer) . . . 8
16 Phosphate Weathering (All Layer) . . . 8
17 Silica Weathering (All Layer) . . . 8
18 Sodium Weathering (All Layer) . . . 9
19 Forest Floor (O-Layer) Carbon Content Over Simulation Period . . . 9
20 Forest Floor (O-Layer) Carbon Content Over Simulation Period . . . 10
21 Litter Pool Nutrient Content Over Simulation Period . . . 10
22 Base Cation Nutrient Content in Simulated Forest . . . 13
23 N, S, and P Nutrient Contents and biomass per compartment . . . 14
24 Calcium input and output comparison graphs . . . 14
25 Magnesium input and output comparison graphs . . . 15
26 Potassium input and output comparison graphs . . . 15
27 Sulfur input and output comparison graphs . . . 16
28 Nitrogen input and output comparison graphs . . . 16
29 Calcium and Magnesium CEC adsorption over time . . . 17
30 Potassium and Sodium CEC adsorption over time . . . 17
31 Ammonium and Aluminum CEC adsorption over time . . . 17

List of Tables

1 Average Soil Solution Concentrations of Reliable Months (2005-2006) . . . 3

Soil Solution Results

Table 1: Average Soil Solution Concentrations of Reliable Months (2005-2006)

	$\\mu$mol/L															
Soil Layer	Ca	Mg	K	Na	NO3	NH4	SO4	Cl	PO4	DOC	Al	Si	H+	pH	R	HR
Layer 1	27.8	48.9	12.43	39.4	41.2	3.84	27.4	58.7	5.28	661	0.265845	27	22.643	4.65	77.2	33.0
Layer 2	44.1	58.1	19.43	71.3	70.7	8.34	29.4	67.1	8.45	1134	1.126913	231	25.606	4.59	132.0	57.0
Layer 3	56.1	84.0	5.32	80.2	86.6	15.00	29.4	73.0	10.76	1373	0.263560	475	16.849	4.77	175.6	53.1
Layer 4	23.0	45.2	12.49	83.0	71.4	11.27	15.6	65.8	3.08	829	0.062654	390	26.555	4.58	94.6	43.6
Layer 5	20.7	34.9	8.17	92.7	64.4	21.30	13.9	67.5	2.34	733	0.036137	388	21.884	4.66	85.7	36.4
Layer 6	22.3	30.2	14.43	116.3	62.6	30.59	13.9	72.9	2.57	724	0.007249	406	9.279	5.03	94.7	26.0
Layer 7	30.7	36.1	19.44	111.6	59.7	38.75	14.0	78.4	2.55	784	0.001513	417	2.733	5.56	114.2	16.5
Layer 8	24.7	42.1	25.99	126.1	59.5	42.22	13.8	83.4	2.08	777	0.000402	430	0.771	6.11	122.1	7.4



Figure 1: Monthly Calcium Concentrations by Soil Layer



Figure 2: Monthly Magnesium Concentrations by Soil Layer



Figure 3: Monthly Potassium Concentrations by Soil Layer



Figure 4: Monthly Sodium Concentrations by Soil Layer



Figure 5: Monthly Sulfate Concentrations by Soil Layer



Figure 6: Monthly Aluminum Concentrations by Soil Layer



Figure 7: Monthly SiO2 Concentrations by Soil Layer



Figure 8: Monthly Organic Acid Base (R-) Concentrations by Soil Layer



Figure 9: Monthly pH by Soil Layer



Figure 10: Yearly Ammonium concentration by Soil Layer



Figure 11: Yearly Nitrate concentration by Soil Layer

Weathering Results



Figure 12: Calcium Weathering (All Layer)



Figure 13: Magnesium Weathering (All Layer)



Figure 14: Potassium Weathering (All Layer)



Figure 15: Aluminum Weathering (All Layer)



Figure 16: Phosphate Weathering (All Layer)



Figure 17: Silica Weathering (All Layer)



Figure 18: Sodium Weathering (All Layer)

Litter Pool Results



(a) Total forest floor carbon content (kg/ha)



(b) Carbon content of coarse litter (kg/ha)

Figure 19: Forest Floor (O-Layer) Carbon Content Over Simulation Period



(a) Carbon content of fine litter (kg/ha)



(b) Carbon content of humic litter (kg/ha)

Figure 20: Forest Floor (O-Layer) Carbon Content Over Simulation Period

Note that the fine litter pool (the stage between humus and fresh/coarse litter) is growing in this model. This might deviate from observed behavior.



(a) Litter Calcium Content



(b) Litter Magnesium Content

Figure 21: Litter Pool Nutrient Content Over Simulation Period

Obtaining stable and or increasing litter pool nutrient content was achieved by lowering the release factor from 1 to .25. This means that instead of decomposition occurring proportional to the litter concentration, it occurs at 25% of the litter concentration. The decomposition rate values were also calibrated from approximate values, until the model showed net C gain in the forest floor/organic horizon rather than net loss.

As of now, forest floor carbon content and carbon sequestration over time is in line with published literature (if we use certain sites as a kind of rough chronosequence; I will describe more of this in a later update). Furthermore, fine and coarse litter pools seem to be approaching steady state, which is expected of old growth forests, assuming that litterfall quantity stabilizes over the whole stand over time.

The next step was to see how greater litter retention affected S and P dynamics specifically, which have ecosystem retention issues.


S (kg/ha)
20
15
10
5
2000
2050
2100
2150
Date


N (kg/ha)
200
150
100
50
2000
2050
2100
2150
Date



K (kg/ha)
20
18
16
2000
2050
2100
2150
Date



P (kg/ha)
12.5
10.0
7.5
5.0
2000
2050
2100
2150
Date

Tree Nutrient Content



(a) Calcium content in each biomass compartment



(b) Magnesium content in each biomass compartment



(c) Potassium content in each biomass compartment

Figure 22: Base Cation Nutrient Content in Simulated Forest



(a) Nitrogen content in each biomass compartment



(b) Sulfur content in each biomass compartment



(c) Phosphorous content in each biomass compartment



(d) Biomass of each compartment

Figure 23: N, S, and P Nutrient Contents and biomass per compartment

Analysis 1: Stack Flux Data



(a) Ca input and output fluxes over time



(b) Total Average Ca input and output fluxes

Figure 24: Calcium input and output comparison graphs



(a) Mg input and output fluxes over time



(b) Total Average Mg input and output fluxes

Figure 25: Magnesium input and output comparison graphs



(a) K input and output fluxes over time



(b) Total Average K input and output fluxes

Figure 26: Potassium input and output comparison graphs



(a) S input and output fluxes over time



(b) Total Average S input and output fluxes

Figure 27: Sulfur input and output comparison graphs

I tested sulfate by getting rid of absorbed sulfate altogether and only allowing for atmospheric input and uptake dominate SO4 dynamics. This seemed to allow for easy calibration of SO4 concentrations.



(a) N input and output fluxes over time



(b) Total Average N input and output fluxes

Figure 28: Nitrogen input and output comparison graphs

Notice how SOM mineralization starts off highly negative (-358 kg/ha/yr N); implying a large net N uptake in the microbial pool. The mineralization then balances out and steadily returns N to the soil over time, behaving normally. I do need the microbial pool to help calibrate the N cycle, but I may need to reduce the CEC stabilized N and decrease the N-uptake in the microbial pool. These results likely imply too much N is going through the system and that the microbial pool is too large of an N pool.

Cation Exchange Capacity



Figure 29: Calcium and Magnesium CEC adsorption over time



Figure 30: Potassium and Sodium CEC adsorption over time



Figure 31: Ammonium and Aluminum CEC adsorption over time

Anion Exchange Capacity







Phosphate seems stable, generally. It should be noted that P uptake is not being modeled in the foliage (it should remain constant so far) and that phosphate adsorption parameters are completely borrowed from the Burgundy site. As for sulfate, I purged the model of the AEC sulfate pool and relegated all soil S to the SOM organic pool.

I further note that the ALSEA rain chemistry seems to be lacking in Na and Cl, when I completely take away Cl adsorption, I don't get anywhere near the concentration of Cl measured in the lysimeters, like I do for sulfate.

Other



Litter Fall Dry Weight (kg/ha)
2600
2400
2200
2000
2000
2050
2100
2150
Date