Stochastic Simulation and Data Assimilation to Estimate Soil Carbon Content

W.M. Bostick^{‡,*}, J. Koo[‡], J.W. Jones[‡], Jesse Naab[§], W.D. Graham[‡]



Introduction

- Accurate monitoring methods are needed if soil C sequestration is to be an accepted method for offsetting CO₂ emissions.
- It is not practical to estimate soil C dynamics using measurements only (Izaurralde et al., 1998).
- Both simulation and measurement-based estimates are uncertain.
- Stochastic simulation can help quantify uncertainty (Ogle et al., 2003).

Hypothesis

 The Extended Kalman Filter (ExKF: Graham, 2002) data assimilation algorithm is useful to combine stochastic simulations and measurements to improve accuracy and reduce uncertainty in soil C estimates.

Materials and Methods

Test Site

· The ExKF algorithm was tested for estimation of soil C in 12 fields in Wa, Ghana over a 20vear period.

Stochastic Simulation

- · For this test, we used a simple one-pool model (Jones, 2004) for the soil C in the top 20 cm of soil (see below)
- M (kg C ha⁻¹) is the soil C in a field and R (vr⁻¹) is the decomposition rate parameter for M.
- Both M and R are random variables.



• Propagation equations for the expected values (\overline{M} and \overline{R}) and covariances (P) of the random variables of the model are derived using properties of random variables (see below).

Propagation Equations

- $\overline{M}_{r,1} = (1 \overline{R}_{1})\overline{M}_{r,1} + B_{r,1} (P_{men})_{r}$
- $(\mathsf{P}_{\mathsf{MME}})_{\mathsf{K},\mathsf{I}} = (\mathsf{P}_{\mathsf{MME}})_{\mathsf{K}}(1-\overline{\mathsf{R}}_{\mathsf{I}})(1-\overline{\mathsf{R}}_{\mathsf{I}}) (\mathsf{P}_{\mathsf{MEE}})_{\mathsf{K}}(1-\overline{\mathsf{R}}_{\mathsf{I}})\overline{\mathsf{M}}_{\mathsf{K},\mathsf{I}} (\mathsf{P}_{\mathsf{MEE}})_{\mathsf{K}}(1-\overline{\mathsf{R}}_{\mathsf{I}})\overline{\mathsf{M}}_{\mathsf{K},\mathsf{I}} + (\mathsf{P}_{\mathsf{REE}})_{\mathsf{K}}\mathsf{M}_{\mathsf{K},\mathsf{I}},\mathsf{M}_{\mathsf{K},\mathsf{I}} + \mathsf{E}[\eta_{\mathsf{K}}\eta_{\mathsf{K}}]$
- $(\mathsf{P}_{\mathsf{MB}})_{\mathsf{K}_{*}1} = \mathsf{E}[(\mathsf{M}_{\mathsf{K}_{*}11} \overline{\mathsf{M}}_{\mathsf{K}_{*}11})(\mathsf{R}_{1} \overline{\mathsf{R}}_{1})] = (1 \overline{\mathsf{R}}_{1})(\mathsf{P}_{\mathsf{MB}})_{\mathsf{K}} (\mathsf{P}_{\mathsf{BB}})_{\mathsf{K}}\mathsf{M}_{\mathsf{K}_{1}}$
- $(\mathbf{P}_{\mathsf{RIR}})_{\mathsf{K}_{\mathsf{A}}\mathsf{I}} = \mathsf{E}[(\mathsf{R}_{\mathsf{K}_{\mathsf{A}}\mathsf{I}}; -\overline{\mathsf{R}}_{\mathsf{K}_{\mathsf{A}}\mathsf{I}};)(\mathsf{R}_{\mathsf{K}_{\mathsf{A}}\mathsf{I}}; -\overline{\mathsf{R}}_{\mathsf{K}_{\mathsf{A}}\mathsf{I}};)] = (\mathsf{P}_{\mathsf{RIR}})_{\mathsf{K}}$

- September 2004 QuickBird Image of 12 test fields ear Wa, Ghana.

each field $(\hat{X}(-))$, which are conditioned on previous measurements, is updated $\hat{X}_{v}(+) = \hat{X}_{v}(-) + K_{v} V_{v}$

• When a measurement is made, the vector containing values of \overline{M} and \overline{R} for

ExKF Details

$$\boldsymbol{K}_{_{\boldsymbol{K},\boldsymbol{1}}}=\boldsymbol{P}_{_{\boldsymbol{K},\boldsymbol{1}}}(-)\boldsymbol{H}_{_{\boldsymbol{K},\boldsymbol{1}}}^{^{\mathrm{T}}}\big[\boldsymbol{H}_{_{\boldsymbol{K},\boldsymbol{1}}}\boldsymbol{P}_{_{\boldsymbol{K},\boldsymbol{1}}}(-)\boldsymbol{H}_{_{\boldsymbol{K},\boldsymbol{1}}}^{^{\mathrm{T}}}+\boldsymbol{W}\big]^{^{-1}}$$

- The main factors affecting the updated states are the differences between measured and simulated states, expressed in the V vector, the variance and covariance of estimates, expressed in the K matrix, and the measurement variance matrix. W.
- · Spatial covariance between model states is critical for the ExKF to update states at unmeasured locations.



· The ExKF is based on Bayes' Rule of conditional probability. The sketch above illustrates the effect of using the ExKF to condition an estimate of a random variable with a measurement.

Experiment Details

- · Geostatistical analysis with soil C measurements from 2003 showed spatial correlation up to 53 m.
- · A semivariogram model developed from the 2003 data was used with the Unconditional Sequential Gaussian Simulation (Goovaerts, 1997) algorithm to initialize expected values of M, R and their covariance matrix P.



- · In order to test the updating capability of the ExKF, the expected value of R was initialized with biased-low values.
- Three measurement scenarios were investigated:
 - ✓ No filter (no measurement updates)
 - ✓ 12 of 12 fields measured annually
 - ✓ 3 of 12 fields (rotating) measured annually

Results and Discussion

- The expected value in the No-Filter case diverges from the 'true' value.
- The 3 of 12 rotatingmeasurement case compares well with the 12 of 12 measurement case with 75% fewer measurements.





- The effect of the ExKF in reducing the estimate variance can be seen from the graphs above and below.
- · Further work is needed with actual long-term spatiotemporal datasets and more realistic soil C models.
- Another area that needs further research is the estimation of actual change in soil C, rather than accurate simulation of the soil C content at a given time.



Summarv

- The ExKF combined measurements with stochastic simulation to improve aggregate estimates of soil C content.
- The 'smart' sampling scheme, which sampled a 3 different fields each year, each within the range of correlation of other fields, provided good results with with 75% fewer measurements than the most intensive measurement scenario.
- Areas for further research include:
 - ✓ application of the ExKF with more realistic soil C models,
 - ✓ application with real long-term spatiotemporal datasets, and
 - ✓ estimation of changes in soil C at a site.

References

- erts, P. 1997. Geostatistics for Natural Resource Evaluation. Oxford University Press. Oxford
- Graham,W. 2002. Estimation and prediction of hydrogeochemical parameters using Extended Kalman Filtering. p. 327-363. In R.S.Govindaraju (ed.) Stochastic Methods in Subsurface Contaminant Hydrology. ASCE Publications, ASCE Publications.
- Izzurralde,R.C., W.B.McGill, A.Bryden, S.Graham, M.Ward, and P.Dickey. 1998. Scientific challenges in developing a plan to predict and verify carbon storage in Canadian Prairie soils. p. 433-446. In R.Lai, J.M.Kimble, R.F.Follet, and B.A.Stewart (ed.) Managment of Carbon Sequestration in Soils. Lewis Publishers.
- Jones, J.W., W.D.Graham, D.Wallach, W.M.Bostick, and J.Koo. 2004. Estimating soil carbon levels using an Ensemble Kalman filter. Transactions of the ASAE.
- Margulis, S.A., D. McLaughlin, D. Entekhabi, and S. Dunne. 2002. Land data assimilation and soil moisture estimation using measurements from the Southern Great Plains 1997 Field Experiment Water Resources Research 38(12):1299
- Ogle, S.M., F.J.Breidt, M.D.Eve, and K.Paustian. 2003. Uncertainty in estimating land use and management impacts on soil organic carbon storage for US agricultural lands between 1982 and 1997. Global Chance Biology 9:1521-1542.

Acknowledgements

This work was funded by the USAID Soil Management CRSP project.

to $\hat{X}(+)$.

‡ Univ. Florida, Ag. and Bio. Eng. Dept., § Savanna Agricultural Research Institute, Ghana *Corresponding author: W. McNair Bostick - mcnair2@ufl.edu

