Evaluating Changes in Landscape-scale Organic C Due to Tillage

Dennis E. Rolston Land, Air and Water Resources University of California, Davis

Research Team

Faculty

Dennis Rolston Johan Six Chris VanKessel Jan Hopmans Richard Plant Kyaw Tha Paw U Ted Hsiao

PGRs, SRAs, GSRs Amy King **Jeannie Evatt Dianne** Louie **Guy Shaver** Alan Idris Juhwan Lee **Tony Matista** Jim MacIntyre Several undergrads

Grower Cooperators

• Tony Turkovitch and Martin Medina of Button and Turkovitch, Winters, CA

Funding Sources

Kearney Foundation of Soil Science

CA Dept of Food and Agriculture

CA Encioy Commission

Soil Carbon and Tillage

- Studies in the Midwest indicate that considerable C can be sequestered by conservation tillage practices
- How about in California?
 - Need to occasionally reform beds and furrows
 - Higher mean annual soil temperature

Conservation tillage practices have increased by 300% in the Midwest during the last decade.

In California however, less than 0.3% of crop acreage is farmed using conservation tillage practices (courtesy of Jeff Mitchell).

(Conservation tillage Information Center, Lafayette, IN, 2002)

Minimum tillage could have large impacts on water and air quality





"The San Joaquin Valley is currently classified as a serious non-attainment region for PM10 under both state and federal standards. "

> Dec. 30, 2004 San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District

Objectives

- Quantify C input pathways and their spatial and temporal variations at field scale
- Determine effects of tillage on the spatial distribution of short-term rates of C cycling and greenhouse gas emissions
- Improve existing models to predict longterm soil C sequestration and greenhouse gas emissions at field scale following implementation of minimum tillage

Figure 1. Field diagram showing the 140 soil sampling locations. The micromet towers, automated chambers, and below ground sampling locations are located near the west transect in the middle of each field.

Total field area = 30.8 ha

Intensive Soil Sampling with a Geoprobe

- •140 sites sampled 8/03, prior to tillage operations
- •Sampled to 1 m depth with a Geoprobe
- •Soil samples from 5 depths (0-15, 15-30, 30-50, 50-75, and 75-100 cm)
- •Analyzed for physical/chemical properties as well as C and N content

•Intensive sampling again in '06

Turkovich Farm, August 2003 Distribution of soil C and N at the 0-15 cm depth

2600

- 220

- 170

120

Total C (g C/m2), 0-15 cm

Total N (g N/m2), 0-15 cm

Hand harvesting for grain & biomass

Wheat crop prior to tillage

Residue control

Decreased wheat and corn biomass by 40 and 65%, respectively.

Sept.-Oct. 2003

Standard Tillage - October 2003

Minimum till and standard till fields

Measurements

- Soil sampling for physical, chemical, and biological variables including soil C and N
- Environmental variables such as rain + irrigation, ET, air temp, humidity, net radiation
- C inputs from crops and weeds, residue incorporation
- CO₂ exchange with vegetation and soil
- Greenhouse and trace gas emissions from soil – CO₂, N₂O, CH₄, NO

Eddy covariance measurement system One tower in each field Spatial measurement scale=several ha

- -Wind velocity in 3D
- $-CO_2$ concentration and flux
- -Air & surface soil temperature
- -Soil heat flux
- -Net radiation
- -Relative humidity

Automated chamber

-Chamber closed for 1 min, open for 30 min

-Fans to mix gas in chamber

-CO₂ concentration measured by IRGA

-Spatial measurement scale=0.62 m²

-Temporal patterns

Small chambers for CO₂ and N₂O fluxes

•CO₂ concentration in chambers measured by IRGA
•N₂O concentration sampled with syringes and analyzed by GC
•Gas fluxes calculated from increase in concentration with time
•Many small chambers employed to determine spatial patterns

Small, insulated chambers

Spatial measurement scale = 0.012 m²

PVC chambers (0.05 m^2) with portable lids are sampled routinely for both CO₂ and N₂O

Comparisons of flux measurements

- -Mean CO₂ flux in micromoles CO₂ m⁻² s⁻¹ for three measurement systems on November 21, 2003. Standard deviations are in
 - parentheses.
- -Fluxes before tillage were about 1.0 for both micromet & automated chambers
- -Comparisons at other times are in fairly good agreement also

	n	12-8 pm	2-4 pm	3-4:30 pm
No-till tower	1	1.36 (0.55)	1.36 (0.4)	
Till tower	1			1.36
No-till auto chamber	1	1.31	1.47	
Till auto chamber	2	2.51	3.11	
No-till portable	4		1.33 (0.51)	
chamber				
Till portable	4		1.19 (0.17)	
chamber				

Below ground measurements

-Temperature -Water content -Water potential -Air pressure -CO₂ concentration -N₂O concentration

Probes in furrow

Mean monthly CO₂ exchange from eddy-covariance measurements. Positive values are emissions from the soil. Negative values are CO₂ uptake by vegetation.

See Paw U et al. poster

Plant and hand-harvest yield characteristics due to tillage treatment

CO₂ flux & soil temperature are measured 24 hrs/day in automated gas chambers in both treatments.

•Temporal flux related to trends in soil temp. and water content. Large spatial variability (see posters of Lee et al. & Shaver et al.).

- •Late Oct flux occurred 1 day after first rain
- •Little or no difference in flux due to tillage treatment

•Flux during winter from furrows in MT >ST due to large amount of crop residue in furrows

N₂O flux from portable chambers, April - December 2004

•Emissions of N₂O (& NO) occurred only after fertilizer applications

- •Largest emissions occurred directly over the fertilizer injection band
- •Minor differences in flux due to tillage treatment

C and N cycle modeling

- Models as tools to "scale up" from the plot/field to landscape and regional scale
- We plan to use two "landscape-scale" models – DNDC
 - DayCent
- Models tested by comparing simulations to our field data
- Tested models then used to simulate C sequestration and greenhouse gas emissions at landscape and regional scales and connect to economic models

Initial model testing with field data

See poster by Adam Wolf et al.

Initial model test for N₂O

DNDC model versus measured N2O budget Turkovich 2004 (Corn, Standard Tillage)

Conclusions so far

- Eddy-covariance approach allows detection of C inputs and outputs not possible with chambers or soil sampling
- CO₂ fluxes from chambers compare well with fluxes of respiration from eddy covariance
- Could not detect increased CO₂ emission following incorporation of wheat residue
- Measurable N₂O and NO emissions occur only after fertilizer application, and only small differences due to tillage
- Initial simulations with DNDC may indicate some underestimation of CO₂ emission but reasonable estimates for N₂O

Ongoing research

- Continue all measurements described above
- Use spatial statistical tools to visualize and correlate landscape-scale patterns of soil C and N and physical and chemical properties with greenhouse gas emissions and C sequestration
- Compare DNDC and DayCent simulations with field data and couple these models to an economic model