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Abstract

This thesis describes the development and selected applications of a global vegetation model, BIOME4. The model is applied to problems in high-latitude vegetation distribution and climate, trace gas production, and isotope biogeochemistry. It demonstrates how a modeling approach, based on principles of plant physiology and ecology, can be applied to interdisciplinary problems that cannot be adequately addressed by direct observations or experiments. The work is relevant to understanding the potential effects of climate change on the terrestrial biosphere and the feedbacks between the biosphere and climate.

BIOME4 simulates the distribution of 15 high-latitude biomes, including five tundra vegetation types, for the present day using observed climate, and the LGM, mid-Holocene, and a "greenhouse" scenario for 2100 using the output of GCMs. In the LGM simulations, the high-latitudes show a marked increase in the area of graminoid and forb tundra, which is also the predominant feature in the paleodata. This vegetation has no widespread modern analog; it was favored by the cold, dry climate, and supported large mammoth populations. Mid-Holocene simulations indicate a modest, asymmetrical northward advance of the Arctic treeline compared to present, with greatest extension in central Siberia (up to 300 km), and little to no change in the Western Hemisphere. This result is in good agreement with pollen and megafossil data from the same period. Differential warming of the continents in response to increased high-latitude solar radiation is hypothesized to account for the asymmetry. Vegetation changes in the 2100 projection, which assumes a continued exponential increase in atmospheric GHG concentrations, are more radical than those simulated for the mid-Holocene. The year-round forcing due to GHGs increases both summertime and annual temperatures in the high latitudes by up to double the mid-Holocene anomaly. However the potential treeline advances and biome shifts in our simulation are unlikely to be realized within 100 years, because of the time required for migration and establishment of new vegetation types.

Potential natural wetland area for the present day was simulated by BIOME4 as 11.0x10^6 km^2. This value is higher than other estimates but includes small (<50 km^2) and seasonal wetlands which have not been included in previous surveys. The wetland CH4 source was simulated as 140 Tg yr^-1. At the LGM, simulated wetland area was increased by 15% but CH4 emissions were 24% less than the present-day. The simulated reduction in the CH4 source is due to substrate limitation induced by low atmospheric CO2 concentrations at the LGM. The 100% increase in atmospheric CH4 concentrations measured in ice cores between the...
LGM and the preindustrial Holocene may not be due to changes in CH$_4$ source strength alone, as other trace gases influence the atmospheric CH$_4$ sink.

The stable carbon isotope composition of the terrestrial biosphere was simulated by BIOME4 and compared to measurements at the leaf, ecosystem and troposphere scales. Model simulations are correlated within one standard deviation to measured means at the PFT and biome scales, and at six Northern Hemisphere CO$_2$ monitoring stations. Global carbon isotope discrimination in the terrestrial biosphere averaged 18.6‰ for potential natural vegetation and 18.1‰ when an agricultural land-use mask was applied. These simulated values are slightly higher than previous estimates, but consistent with measurements. This information is important for the interpretation of contemporary atmospheric observations in terms of carbon sources and sinks on land and in the ocean.
Populärvetenskaplig sammanfattning på svenska


BIOME4 simulerar fördelningen av 15 biom på höga latituder, inklusive fem olika typer av tundravegetation. För nutiden används observerat klimat i simuleringarna och för den senaste istiden (LGM, Last Glacial Maximum, ca. 21000 år före idag), mitten av Holocene (ca. 6000 år före idag) och ett ”växthusscenario” för år 2100 används resultat från generella cirkulationsmodeller av klimatet (GCM, General Circulation Model). Simuleringarna av LGM visar en markant ökning av områden med graminoid och örtdominerad tundravegetation, vilket även är den dominerande tendensen i paleodata. Denna vegetationstyp har ingen utbredt modern motsvarighet; den gynnas av det kalla, torra klimatet och kunde underhålla stora populationer av mammutar. Simuleringar av en period i mitten av Holocene indikerar att den Arktiska trädgränsen försköts asymmetriskt något mot norr jämfört med dagens förhållanden, med störst utvidgning i de centrala delarna av Sibirien (upp till 300km), och liksom till igen förändring på den Västra Hemisfären. Detta resultat stämmer väl överens med pollen- och megafossildata från samma tidperiod. Skillnader i uppvärmning av kontinenterna, som ett resultat av ökade solinstrålning på höga latituder, antas vara orsaken till denna asymetri. Vegetationsförändringarna i 2100-projektionen, vilken antar att koncentrationen av växthusgaser i atmosfären fortsätter att öka exponentiellt, är mer radikala än de simulierade förändringarna under Holocene. Den årliga globala uppvärmningspotentialen orsakad av GHGs leder till en ökning av både sommartemperaturen och de årliga temperaturerna på höga latituder med upp till den dubbla avvikelsen för Holocene. Den potentiella förskjutningen av trädgränsen och biomförändringarna i vår simulering blir dock troligtvis inte realiserade inom 100 år, på grund av den tid som behövs för migration och etablering av nya vegetationstyper.

Den nutida potentiella arealen av naturliga våtmarker simulerades av BIOME4 till 11.0x10⁶ km². Detta varje är högre än andra uppskattningar, men det inkludrar även små (< 50km²) och säsongberoende våtmarker som inte har inkluderats
i tidigare undersökningar. Västmarkerna simulerades till att vara en källa till methan (CH₄) motsvarande 140 Tgyr⁻¹. Under LGM ökade den simulerade våtmarksarealen med 15%, men CH₄-emissionen var 24% lägre än idag. Denna simulerade reduction av CH₄-källan beror på substratbegränsning orsakad av låg atmosfärskoncentration av CO₂ under LGM. Den i iskärnor uppmätta 100-procentiga ökningen av koncentrationen av CH₄ i atmosfären mellan LGM och det förindustriella Holocene är inte nödvändigvis enbart ett resultat av förändringar i CH₄-källans styrka, eftersom andra spårgaser påverkar den atmosfäriska CH₄-sänkning.

Sammansättningen av stabila isotoper av kol i den terrestra biosfären simulerades av BIOME4 och jämfördes med mätningar på blad- ekosystem- och troposfärnivå. Modellens simuleringar korrelerar inom en standardavvikelse mot uppmätta medelvärden på en skala av vegetationens funktionella grupper (PFT, Plant Functional Type) och på biomnivå, samt även för sex stycken stationer på Norra Hemsfären där koldioxid (CO₂) monterats. Global diskriminering av kolisotoper i den terrestra biosfären var i medeltal 18.6‰ för potentiellt naturlig vegetation och 18.1‰ då hänsyn togs till agrikulturell markanvändning. Dessa simulerade värden är något högre än tidigare uppskattningar, men de är förenliga med uppmätta värden. Denna information är viktig för tolkningen av nutida atmosfäriska observationer av kolkällor och kolsänkor på land och i oceanerna.
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1 Geophysical applications of vegetation modeling

The global vegetation model as a tool for plant ecologists

1.1 Introduction

This thesis centers around a new model of the Earth's vegetation. BIOME4 was developed – as an extension of the BIOME3 global vegetation model [Haxeltine and Prentice, 1996] – to address several problems on the interface between plant ecology/biogeography and the geophysical aspects of climate change. BIOME4 is also more generally applicable to problems in vegetation science, paleoecology, biosphere-atmosphere interaction, and biogeochemistry. BIOME4 uses long-term climatic data and basic information on soil properties to simulate vegetation distribution, productivity, isotopic composition, and other biogeochemical variables.

Here, BIOME4 is used first to simulate the distribution of vegetation in high northern latitudes. Results are tested against a modern botanical vegetation classification and paleoecological information from pollen assemblages (paper I). BIOME4 is also applied to simulate the global distribution of wetlands and their methane emissions; the modeling approach allowed mechanistic simulation of the primary global methane source at the Last Glacial Maximum, when both climate and atmospheric methane concentrations were drastically different from today (paper II). Finally BIOME4 is made to simulate the stable isotopic signature of carbon in the terrestrial biosphere, an exercise critical for the reliable observational partitioning of CO2 sources and sinks between the oceans and land (paper III).

As a sub-discipline of plant ecology, vegetation modeling is central to understanding the role that plants have played in shaping the Earth's atmospheric composition and climate in the past and the potential responses and feedbacks of vegetation to future climates. Vegetation models can be used to assess the relative importance of climate, soil, nutrients and other edaphic features, and plant functional traits on plant distribution, productivity, and resilience to changing conditions and the relationship between plants and other aspects of the climate system and global biogeochemical cycles. Vegetation models synthesize relationships made in field and laboratory studies into a globally applicable framework. A global vegetation model is a valuable tool for the investigation of phenomena that would otherwise be impossible to study because of spatial or temporal constraints. Vegetation models may also help the interdisciplinary scientist explore the interaction between humans and their environment, both past and present.
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1.2 History

Through its origins in plant geography, plant ecology, and plant physiology, vegetation modeling has evolved into an interdisciplinary field with a wide spectrum of applications. Scientific study of global patterns in plant geography began with the expeditions of Alexander von Humboldt and Charles Darwin in the 19th century, who recognized the influence of climate on the form and composition of plant communities [Darwin, 1845; von Humboldt, 1850]. Half a century later, Schimper [1903] made a systematic study of the Earth's vegetation and concluded that climate, through plant physiology, controls the distribution of plant species and overall ecosystem function. These observations led directly to the development of classification schemes, based on functional rather than taxonomic grouping of plants, that linked plant distribution to climate [Holdridge, 1947; Köppen, 1936; Küchler, 1949].

Most recently, computer models with a basis in the physiological mechanisms controlling global plant distribution have appeared [Reu, 1981; Prentice et al., 1992; Woodward and Williams, 1987]. Simultaneously, plant physiologists developed conceptual models of plant growth based on processes at the leaf level [Collatz et al., 1992; Farquhar et al., 1980; Larcher, 1995]. The new field of biogeochemistry developed out of studies on the complete cycles of elements through terrestrial ecosystems both in the field and with models [Cerhan, 1991; Likens et al., 1977].

Syntheses of global vegetation distribution from an ecophysiological perspective provided the foundation for global vegetation modeling [Walter, 1973; Walter et al., 1975; Woodward, 1987]. The concept of the Plant Functional Type (PFT) was developed, wherein plants exhibiting certain fundamental characteristics (i.e. growth form, phenology, rooting depth) can be grouped together into a framework that made vegetation modeling at the global scale possible. Improvements in technology and the compilation of a gridded global climatology [Leemans and Cramer, 1991] culminated in the development of computerized vegetation models. These models could simulate, at a global scale, vegetation distribution (biogeography) or the cycles of carbon and water through plants (biogeochemistry) [e.g. Prentice et al., 1992; Running and Hunt, 1993; VEMAP members, 1995]. Models that coupled both biogeography and biogeochemistry components appeared shortly thereafter [Foley et al., 1996; Haxeltine and Prentice, 1996; Neilson, 1995]. Global vegetation modeling has evolved a latest generation of Dynamic Global Vegetation Models, (DGVM) which incorporate the ecologically dynamic effects of fire, land-use and change, and ecosystem history with biogeography and biogeochemistry with the initial aim of more accurately simulating the fluxes of CO$_2$ through the terrestrial biosphere [Sitch, 2000]. Further development of vegetation models has proceeded at a rapid rate and models have been used in an increasingly broad array of applications, validation exercises and sensitivity tests to answer questions related to the impacts of anthropogenic climate change and the global carbon cycle [e.g. Cramer et al., in press; Schimel et al., 2000; VEMAP, 1995].
1.3 Problems addressed

The Pan Arctic INitiative (PAIN, Paper I) was a first-time effort to fuse the botanical, paleoecological, and modeling branches of vegetation science in order to develop a new paradigm for the description, identification, and simulation of northern high-latitude vegetation. The global significance of the project lies in the sensitivity of high-latitude vegetation to potential future climate changes and the strong feedbacks that are present in the vegetation-atmosphere system at high latitudes. The project has provided the most detailed description and modeling framework of northern high-latitude vegetation developed to date. The PAIN group began by developing a comprehensive description of northern high-latitude vegetation using an approach based on plant functional types (PFTs). Plant ecologists and systematists, working in the field and familiar with the present day vegetation, developed a unified classification and map of modern potential natural vegetation for the region. Pollen analysts and paleoclimatologists contributed to the development of the vegetation classification in light of which vegetation characteristics are identifiable in the paleo-record. Vegetation modelers assembled physiological and biogeochemical data on northern high-latitude plants and ecosystems and built a model that could simulate the vegetation types observed both in the past and present. The model was used to investigate the extent to which "observed" changes in vegetation between the Last Glacial Maximum (LGM), mid-Holocene, and present could be reproduced – and then to assess the implied sensitivity of northern high-latitude vegetation to anthropogenic changes in atmospheric greenhouse-gas concentration and climate.

Methane (CH₄), together with water and CO₂, is one of the three most important radiatively active trace gases in the Earth's atmosphere today. Understanding the natural sources and sinks for methane is critical to an understanding of the controls on atmospheric composition and climate. Wetlands are the single greatest natural source of methane to the atmosphere, accounting for more than half of the total flux (other non-anthropogenic methane sources include grazing animals, termites, wildfire, and the ocean). Atmospheric methane concentrations more closely parallel the higher-frequency component of polar ice-core temperature records of the past 100ka than any other measured trace gas (Fig. 1.1) \cite{Chappellaz et al., 2000}. The sensitivity of methane source area and magnitude to climate and the related feedbacks between methane and climate have been controversial. Changes in the wetland methane source and the atmospheric methane sink (i.e. the concentration of OH radicals in the atmosphere), and catastrophic releases of methane from ocean sediments, have all been proposed as the primary reason for the close relationship between atmospheric methane concentrations and polar temperature records \cite{Brook et al., 2000; Dallenbach et al., 2000; Kennett et al., 2000; Nisbet, 1990}. Using BIOME4, the modeling approach first developed using BIOME3 by Christensen et al. \cite{1996} was extended to simulate changing global wetland areas as well as the associated methane emissions (paper II). This extension allows the prog...
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Diagnostic simulation of global wetland methane emissions under changed climates. Paper II presents such a simulation for natural wetland emissions in the present and for the Last Glacial Maximum, taking into account changes in atmospheric CO$_2$, climate, and sea-level.

To investigate the impact of anthropogenic CO$_2$ emissions on potential future climate change, a thorough understanding of the global carbon cycle is necessary (Schimel et al., 1996). Carbon has seasonally variable sources and sinks in both the terrestrial biosphere and ocean which can in principle be distinguished by measuring the concentration and stable isotopic composition (ratio of $^{13}$C/$^{12}$C) of atmospheric CO$_2$. However, a 10% inaccuracy in the assumed isotopic composition of the terrestrial biosphere will produce a change in the inferred terrestrial C sink equal to the entire magnitude of the sink. Furthermore, the carbon isotopic signature of the terrestrial biosphere may change from year to year as vegetation responds to short-term climatic variability. Here, BIOME4 is used to simulate the isotopic signature of the terrestrial biosphere. The model result is compared to measurements at three scales, from the leaf to the atmospheric level. This modeling

---

Fig. 1.1. Polar temperature and atmospheric CH$_4$ concentrations during the last 110,000 years from the GISP2 [Brook et al. 1996], GRIP [Chappellaz et al. 1993] and Vostok [Chappellaz et al. 1998] ice cores. The time scale for all three CH$_4$ profiles is from Brook et al. [1996] and Chappellaz et al. [2000]. The GRIP and Vostok profiles are reduced by 120 and 250 ppb, for clarity. The GISP2 $^{18}$O profile, which is related to Greenland temperature, is shown for comparison [Grootes et al. 1993]. Numbers 1 to 24 indicate the Dansgaard-Oeschger events. Adapted with permission from Chappellaz et al. [2000].

---
strategy is generally applicable to other investigations of the carbon cycle and will later be used in a full dynamic simulation of the terrestrial carbon cycle. These three applications demonstrate the usefulness of a global vegetation model where other methods leave the investigator lacking information, either spatially, temporally or both. Pollen data can be used to infer vegetation history at a point, but extrapolation is difficult given the sensitivity of vegetation to climatic and edaphic factors beyond the catchment of the pollen source. The source areas for methane emissions from wetlands cannot be constrained at the present-day using available data; for times in the past the problem is even more uncertain. Point measurements of $^{13}$C in different ecosystems have demonstrated the spatial and temporal heterogeneity of the isotopic signature of the terrestrial biosphere source. The global carbon isotopic signature cannot be adequately constrained by current measurement networks. BIOME4 provides a spatially and temporally resolved simulation of the metabolism of the biosphere including $^{13}$C, validated to a dataset of measurements at three scales, and provides a tool required for analysis of the global cycles of carbon, CH$_4$ and $^{13}$C.

1.4 The BIOME4 Global Vegetation Model

BIOME4 is an equilibrium terrestrial biosphere model developed from the BIOME3 model of Haxeltine and Prentice [1996]. BIOME4's main differences from its predecessor include the addition of a module to calculate isotopic discrimination during photosynthesis, the re-parameterization of the original Plant Functional Types (PFTs), and the addition of several new PFTs to reflect poorly represented vegetation types especially in the Arctic and the arid subtropics. BIOME4 simulates the vegetation of the Earth in 27 biomes which represent broad amalgamations of plant communities based on composition, phenology and climate regime (Fig. 1.2). The biomes are defined so as to be downwards compatible with the classification used in the BIOME 6000 dataset of reconstructed past vegetation [Prentice and Webb, 1998; Prentice et al. 2000].

BIOME4 is a coupled carbon and water flux model that predicts global vegetation distribution, structure, and biogeochemistry. The model is driven by monthly averages of temperature, precipitation, cloudiness and absolute minimum temperature. In addition the model uses information on soil texture and soil depth and a recently available global survey of rooting depth [Canadell et al., 1996; FAO, 1995; Haxeltine and Prentice, 1996; Jackson et al., 1996]. The model is run globally at a 0.5° resolution. Model operation is based on 12 PFTs representing physiologically distinct classes, from arctic/alpine cushion forbs to tropical evergreen trees. Each PFT is assigned absolute bioclimatic limits (Table 1.1) which determine whether or not its net primary productivity (NPP) is calculated for a given grid cell. The annual computational core of the model is a coupled carbon and water flux scheme, which determines the leaf area index (LAI) that maximizes NPP for any given PFT.
## Table 1.1. Absolute bioclimatic limits

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Plant Functional Type</th>
<th>$T_{c}$ min (°C)</th>
<th>$T_{c}$ max (°C)</th>
<th>$T_{min}$ min (°C)</th>
<th>$T_{max}$ max (°C)</th>
<th>GDD$_{5}$ min</th>
<th>GDD$_{0}$ min</th>
<th>$T_{w}$ min (°C)</th>
<th>$T_{w}$ max (°C)</th>
<th>Snow min (cm)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Trees</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tropical broadleaf</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>temperate broadleaf evergreen</td>
<td>-10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-10</td>
<td>1200</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>temperate broadleaf summergreen</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-10</td>
<td>1200</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>temperate needleleaf evergreen</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cold evergreen</td>
<td>-32.5</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cold deciduous</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-trees</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>temperate grass</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tropical grass</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>desert woody shrub</td>
<td>-45</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tundra woody shrub</td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cold herbaceous</td>
<td>90</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cushion-fern</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$T_{c}$, mean temperature of the coldest month; $T_{min}$, absolute minimum temperature; GDD$_{5}$, growing-degree-days on a 5°C base; GDD$_{0}$, growing-degree-days on a 0°C base; $T_{w}$, temperature of the warmest month; Snow, minimum survivable winter snowpack.
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based on a daily time-step simulation of soil water balance, canopy conductance, photosynthesis, and respiration. Environmental factors affecting this calculation include variable soil texture with depth and seasonal patterns in precipitation, as well as the ambient concentration of atmospheric CO2. PFT-specific parameters determine the sensitivity of each PFT to changes in environment (Tables 1.3 and 1.4). Photosynthetic pathway is PFT-specific: all trees and cold-climate herbaceous plants are C3, tropical grasses are C4. Temperate grasses and desert woody shrubs may have either pathway; the dominant pathway is selected seasonally on the basis of maximizing seasonal NPP. This convention does not imply that individual plants change pathway (which is rare), but rather that dominance shifts seasonally between taxa with different pathways (which is well documented).

The woody PFT which achieves the maximum annual NPP (at its optimized LAI) is generally considered the dominant PFT except in cases where grass or mixtures of grass and trees would be expected to dominate because of an implied disturbance regime or soil moisture constraints; thus, semi-empirical rules based on inferred fire risk and the balance of NPP between trees and grasses are used to assign the boundaries between forests, savannas, and grasslands (Table 1.2). Biogeochemical fluxes calculated by the model generally represent the dominant PFT for a each grid-cell. However, in the case of tropical savannas and other mixed tree-grass plant communities, certain output variables are assigned an NPP-weighted average of grass and tree types. To choose the biome for a given grid cell, the model orders the tree and non-tree of the PFTs that were calculated in that grid cell in terms of NPP, LAI and mean annual soil moisture and uses the semi-empirical rule base to assign each grid cell to one of 27 biomes.

Table 1.2. Schematic rule base for determining dominant vegetation in BIOME4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dominant PFT</th>
<th>Rules</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All tree PFTs</td>
<td>NPP &lt; 140 g m⁻² yr⁻¹ then tree PFT not sustainable (grass, shrub, and tundra biomes)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tropical and temperate broadleaf trees</td>
<td>LAI &lt; 2.0 or firedays &gt; 190 then non-tree PFT is dominant (grass and shrub biomes) 2.0 &lt; tree LAI &lt; 3.0 then woodland/savanna biomes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temperate and cold needleleaf trees</td>
<td>LAI &lt; 1.0 or firedays &gt; 90 then non-tree PFT is dominant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temperate needleleaf tree only</td>
<td>LAI &lt; 1.2 then woodland biome</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cold deciduous trees</td>
<td>LAI &lt; 1.0 or firedays &gt; 60 then woodland biome</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Herbaceous and shrub PFTs</td>
<td>Ranked in order of NPP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No dominant PFT (all PFTs have 0 NPP)</td>
<td>Barren</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 1.3. PFT-specific physiological parameters

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Plant Functional Type</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>Gmin (mm s⁻¹)</th>
<th>Emax (mm d⁻¹)</th>
<th>Sleafout (%)</th>
<th>Sleafdrop (%)</th>
<th>Rs</th>
<th>GDD5</th>
<th>GDD0</th>
<th>Lm</th>
<th>R30</th>
<th>R5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Druy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tropical broadleaf</td>
<td>rg</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>temperate broadleaf evergreen</td>
<td>eg</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>temperate broadleaf summergreen</td>
<td>sg</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>200</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>temperate needleleaf evergreen</td>
<td>eg</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cold evergreen</td>
<td>eg</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cold deciduous</td>
<td>sg</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>200</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-druy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>temperate grass</td>
<td>rg</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>no</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tropical grass</td>
<td>rg</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>no</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>desert woody shrub</td>
<td>eg</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tundra woody shrub</td>
<td>eg</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cold herbaceous</td>
<td>sg</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cushion forb</td>
<td>eg</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

P: phenological type (rg, raingreen; eg, evergreen; sg, summergreen); $G_{\text{min}}$: minimum canopy conductance; $E_{\text{max}}$: maximum daily transpiration rate; $S_j$: soil moisture threshold for leaf-out and leaf-drop of the raingreen phenology expressed as a percent of field capacity; $R_{30}$: proportion of plant roots in the top layer (<30 cm) of soil; $L_m$: relative leaf longevity; $GDD_5$: number of GDD required to grow a full canopy; $GDD_0$: number of GDD required to grow a full canopy; $R_s$: presence of sapwood respiration.
Table 1.4. PFT-specific physiological parameters II

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Plant Functional Type</th>
<th>C₄</th>
<th>optratio</th>
<th>kk</th>
<th>Tₛ₃°C</th>
<th>Tₛ₄°C</th>
<th>Tᵢₙₙₜ</th>
<th>Rₑₙₑ</th>
<th>Alloc</th>
<th>Fire</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Trees</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tropical broadleaf</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>temperate broadleaf evergreen</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>temperate broadleaf deciduous</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>temperate needleleaf evergreen</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cold evergreen</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cold deciduous</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-tree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>temperate grass</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tropical grass</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>desert woody shrub</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tundra woody shrub</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>-7</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cold herbaceous</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>-7</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cushion forb</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>-12</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

C₄, presence of the C₄ photosynthetic pathway; optratio, the maximum achievable ci/ca ratio; kk, the Beer’s Law extinction coefficient; Tₛ₃°C, minimum monthly temperature for C₃ photosynthesis; Tₛ₄°C, minimum monthly temperature for C₄ photosynthesis; Tᵢₙₙₜ, relative response of photosynthesis to temperature; Rₑₙₑ, relative response of maintenance respiration to temperature; Alloc, relative minimum allocation; Fire, soil moisture percent of field capacity at which a fine day may be counted.
BIOME4 and BIOME3 (or its prototype BIOME2) have been applied to a variety of studies which demonstrate the versatility and usefulness of the modeling approach. BIOME3 has been used in biogeochemical applications to investigate global- and continental-scale carbon cycling [Heimann et al., 1998; Kicklighter et al., 1999; VEMAP, 1995] and methane emissions from northern wetlands [Christensen et al., 1996]. BIOME3 was applied to study the effect of low CO₂ concentrations on ecosystem structure and biome distribution [Cowling, 1999; Jolly and Haxeltine, 1997]. Both models have been used to investigate climate-biosphere interactions in the past, including the problem of glacial inception [de Noblet et al., 1996], Phiocene vegetation on Antarctica [Haywood et al., in press], and sources of atmospheric dust [Mahanwald et al., 1999]. BIOME3 and BIOME4 have been used to assess the impact of future climate change on regional vegetation [Neilson et al., 1998; Rathgeber et al., submitted; Shafer, 2000]. Finally BIOME4 has been recently applied to paleovegetation model-data comparison [Williams et al., 1998] and in inverse modeling of paleoclimate [Guiot et al., 1999].

1.4.1  
**Equilibrium versus dynamic global vegetation models**

Despite the recent focus on developing dynamic global vegetation models (DGVMs) for carbon cycle research [Sitch, 2000; Cox et al., 2000], “snapshot” models like BIOME4 remain important tools in plant ecology, biogeochemistry, and climate modeling. Equilibrium vegetation models are currently far more detailed and precise than DGVMs in their ability to simulate biogeographic patterns. Nor is a DGVM appropriate for addressing every research problem. A DGVM requires 10 to 100 times more overhead in terms of the size of input and output datasets and computing power to run than BIOME4. Equilibrium vegetation models thus provide an efficient method to investigate global ecosystem theory and a required test-bed for developing methods for simulating the behavior of vegetation that may later be applied in a DGVM context. A DGVM is required to study periods of rapidly changing climate where ecosystem “memory” is important, e.g. biogeochemical feedbacks in the anthropogenically modified environment of the present and the near future. Equilibrium models are more suited to analyses of “time slices” where an equilibrium approximation is adequate and interest focuses on regional phenomena that are not as well simulated with current DGVMs.

1.4.2  
**Arctic vegetation types in BIOME4**

BIOME4 was expressly developed with several “new” PFTs to better represent high-latitude and alpine vegetation (Paper I). The three PFTs cold woody shrub, cold herbaceous, and cushion-forbs were defined to represent the most widespread, dominant forms of tundra plants. Values of parameters were assigned based on available physiological information and limits inferred in comparisons of habitat
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### Table 1.5. Tundra biomes simulated by BIOME4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Biome</th>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>Typical taxa</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low- and high-shrub tundra</td>
<td>Continuous shrubland, 50 cm to 2 m tall, deciduous or evergreen, sometimes with tussock-forming graminoids and true mosses and lichens</td>
<td>Betula, Betula, Salix, Pinus pumila (in eastern Siberia), Euphorbus, Sphagnum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erect dwarf-shrub tundra</td>
<td>Continuous shrubland 2 to 50 cm tall, deciduous or evergreen, with graminoids, true mosses, and lichens</td>
<td>Betula, Cassiope, Empetrum, Salix, Vaccinium, Gramineae, Cyperaceae</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prostrate dwarf-shrub tundra</td>
<td>Discontinuous shrubland of prostrate deciduous shrubs 0 to 2 cm tall</td>
<td>Salix, Dryas, Prolesus, Asteraceae, Caryophyllaceae, Gramineae, true mosses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cushion forb, lichen, and moss tundra</td>
<td>Discontinuous cover of rosette plants or cushion forbs with lichens and mosses</td>
<td>Saxifragaceae, Caryophyllaceae, Papaver, Dryas, lichens, true mosses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graminoid and forb tundra</td>
<td>Predominantly herbaceous vegetation dominated by forbs, graminoids, true mosses, and lichens</td>
<td>Artemisia, Koeleria, Brassicaceae, Asteraceae, Caryophyllaceae, Gramineae, true mosses</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Fig. 1.3.** Climate space occupied by the Arctic biomes defined in BIOME4
ranges with climate data (see Tables 1.1, 1.3, and 1.4). Five new biomes represent tundra (Table 1.5, Fig. 1.3). The new biomes allow direct comparison with a new map of potential natural vegetation in northern high-latitudes, developed for the PAIN project, and with paleovegetation data based on pollen and macrofossil counts.

1.4.3 Wetland area and methane emissions in BIOME4

BIOME4 was used to simulate global wetland area and associated methane (CH₄) emissions (Paper II). Simulated soil moisture, vegetation type, productivity, and heterotrophic respiration (Rₜ) are combined with a global digital terrain model to identify areas both wet and flat enough to form wetlands (Fig. 1.4). Vegetation productivity constrains the annual rate of CH₄ evolution through its control of the size of the pool of material available for heterotrophic respiration. The fraction of Rₜ that is released as CH₄ depends on the extents to which the CH₄ is oxidized on its way to the atmosphere through the soil, roots, and aboveground vegetation. The model simply assigns a differential in-situ oxidation rate for CH₄ based on the biome that is simulated in the wetland area. BIOME4 is then combined with the terrestrial dry-soil CH₄ sink model of Ridgwell et al. [1999], applied across all non-wetland areas, to simulate a global terrestrial source-sink balance.

![Schematic diagram of the wetland and methane model](image-url)
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1.4.4 Carbon isotope discrimination in BIOME4

BIOME4 calculates the isotopic discrimination against \(^{13}\text{C}\) in \(\text{CO}_2\) during photosynthesis (\(\Delta_{\text{leaf}}\)), and total ecosystem “discrimination” (\(\Delta_{\text{e}}\)) which is the difference between atmospheric and total terrestrial ecosystem \(\delta_{^{13}\text{C}}\) (Fig. 1.5) (Paper III). Carbon isotope ratios are expressed in \(\delta_{^{13}\text{C}}\) notation with is calculated as:

\[
\delta^{13}\text{C} = \frac{R_{\text{sample}}}{R_{\text{std}}} - 1
\]  

where \(R_{\text{sample}}\) and \(R_{\text{std}}\) are the \(^{13}\text{C}/^{12}\text{C}\) ratios of the sample and the standard, respectively. Conventionally, \(\delta^{13}\text{C}\) and \(\Delta\) are expressed in units of per mil (‰). Isotopic discrimination \(\Delta\) is defined as the difference in \(\delta\) between two pools such that

\[
\Delta = \frac{\delta_a - \delta_b}{\frac{1}{2} \delta_a + \delta_b}
\]  

where \(\delta_a\) and \(\delta_b\) represent the average isotopic composition of pools \(a\) and \(b\) [Buchmann et al. 1998].

The photosynthetic discrimination model is conceptually related to other models of leaf carbon isotope discrimination [Beerling, 1994; Lloyd and Farquhar, 1994]. However, BIOME4 explicitly simulates the concentration of \(\text{CO}_2\) in the chloroplast through the optimization calculations balancing carbon gain with water stress. Only a maximum ratio of \([\text{CO}_2]\) inside the leaf to \([\text{CO}_2]\) outside the leaf \((c_i/c_a)\) is
prescribed for each PFT. The actual $c_i/c_o$ is subsequently calculated through iterative optimization [Haxeltine and Prentice, 1996]. Maximum $c_i/c_o$ ratios were compiled from direct measurements in laboratory studies [Farquhar, 1983; Farquhar et al., 1982] and inferred from maximum measured values of $\delta^{13}C$ in leaf material from samples of all PFTs [see e.g. Brooks et al., 1997; Donovan and Ehleringer, 1994; Ehleringer et al., 1987; Guehl et al., 1998; Kloeppel et al., 1998; Körner et al., 1991; Larcher, 1995; Michelsen et al., 1996; Osmond et al., 1975; Schulze et al., 1996; Schulze et al., 1998].

Total ecosystem discrimination, $\Delta_e$ [Brooks et al., 1997; Buchmann et al., 1998; Buchmann and Kaplan, in press; Flanagan and Ehleringer, 1998] was also modeled (Fig. 1.6). Monthly $\Delta_e$ is estimated as the flux-weighted difference in discrimination against $^{13}C$ from NPP and heterotrophic respiration ($R_h$). Photosynthetic, with a specific $^{13}C$ content determined by the $\Delta_e(\text{leaf})$, is incorporated into the plant on an integrated flux-weighted basis. A simple model for $R_h$ determines the monthly flux of respired CO2 and $^{13}C$CO2 to the atmosphere [Foley, 1994; Lloyd and Taylor, 1994; Stich, 2000]. The source of respired CO2 is the aggregated annual NPP for the dominant vegetation type in a grid cell. This carbon stock is divided into three pools according to the scheme of Foley [1994]. Each pool is subjected to a degree of isotopic fractionation during respiration based upon the assumed decay rate of the pool.
1.5 Three Applications of BIOME4

1.5.1 The Pan-Arctic INitiative

Of all the Earth's vegetation, Arctic tundra is perhaps the most acutely sensitive to climate change and at the same time has a significant potential for feedbacks, both physical and chemical, which could in turn affect the climate [Bonan et al., 1995; Chapin et al., 1995; Christensen et al., 1999; Foody et al., 1994; Kattge et al., 1998; Oechel et al., 1993]. The goals of the Pan-Arctic INitiative (PAIN) included the simulation of northern high-latitude vegetation in a globally consistent manner. The simulated vegetation was systematically reconciled to the modern potential natural vegetation map developed by PAIN. Driven by the output of several general circulation models (GCMs), the vegetation of the mid-Holocene and the Last Glacial Maximum (LGM) was also simulated and compared with spatially extensive paleovegetation data derived from pollen records (which also formed a component of the PAIN project). The impact of a future climate scenario was finally simulated using a GCM simulation of the next 100 years based on the assumption of a continuing exponential increase in atmospheric greenhouse gas concentrations.

Spatially extensive paleovegetation data can be used as a benchmark for coupled climate-vegetation model simulations [Prentice and Webb, 1998]. The time slices of the mid-Holocene (6000 yr BP) and LGM (21000 yr BP; approximately equivalent to 18000 yr BP by 14C-dating) are considered important test-periods in the recent geological past where the Earth's climate was considerably different from the present due to well-known changes in boundary conditions: orbital variations between the mid-Holocene and present, and at the LGM low CO2 and other greenhouse gas concentrations, low sea level, and extensive ice sheets. These time slices have been the main focus of the Paleoclimate Modelling Intercomparison Project (PMIP) [Joussaume, 1999; Pinot et al., 1999]. Paleo-vegetation distribution can be estimated from pollen data using a PFT-based method called biomization [Prentice et al., 1996]. The biomization method has been applied to continuous pollen records to investigate vegetation change [Tarasov et al., 1997]. Biomization is currently being used to generate global paleovegetation maps for the mid-Holocene and LGM using a uniform set of biomes as part of the BIOME 6000 project [Kohfeld and Harrison, 2000; Prentice et al., 2000; Prentice and Webb, 1998]. Mid-Holocene paleo data indicate that, although caused by a longitudinally uniform forcing around the Arctic, warming was not spatially uniform compared to the present [Bigelow et al., submitted; MacDonald et al., 2000; Prentice et al., 2000; TEMPO members, 1996]. LGM paleo data indicate a radical difference from present with a dramatic retreat of the forest limit and widespread occurrence of graminoid-forb tundra, which does not cover large, continuous areas of the high northern latitudes in today's climate.

The Arctic vegetation simulated by BIOME4 has been validated against a map of present potential natural vegetation (Fig. 1.7) and at the mid-Holocene and the
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LGM using biomized pollen data (Figs. 1.8, 1.9) [Bigelow et al., submitted]. Simulated vegetation matches the map of potential natural vegetation well, with a few exceptions. For example, the oceanic tundra landscapes of southwestern Alaska and Iceland are not simulated correctly by BIOME4. The effect of extreme cloudiness combined with low sun angles at high latitudes may be the cause of the mismatch.

To simulate vegetation distribution at the mid-Holocene and the LGM, BIOME4 was run using the climate simulations of a series of AGCMs. PMIP simulations with prescribed sea-surface temperatures, ice sheets and atmospheric CO2 concentration (200 ppm) show a large range of high-latitude cooling on unglaciated land at the LGM. The observed prevalence of dwarf-shrub and graminoid-forb tundra and extreme restriction of low and high shrub tundra were nevertheless reproduced successfully in a qualitative sense (Fig. 1.8). The simulated graminoid-forb tundra
was about twice as productive as its spatially restricted modern equivalents, due to lower latitude and less cloudiness.

Changes in the orbital configuration of the Earth produced a substantial, zonally uniform increase in summer and annual insolation in the Arctic during the early and mid-Holocene relative to the present day. Results obtained with two coupled atmosphere-ocean models (AOGCMs, HadCM2 and IPSL) for 6000yr BP indicate that mid-Holocene tree line extension was modest (0-300km) and longitudinally asymmetrical, with maximal extension in central Siberia and little or no change in Alaska (Table 1.6). This model result is supported by pollen-based vegetation reconstruction and mega-fossil distributions which also indicate a heterogeneous change in the tree line latitude compared to the present [Rigby et al., submitted; MacDonald et al., 2000]. That the tree line was further south than present in Labrador is assumed to be due to local effects of residual ice sheets still present in the mid-Holocene [Clark et al., 2000], which were not represented in the simulations. Models and data also agree in showing a 100-300km northward displacement of shrub tundra types (Fig. 1.9).

Projections of the effect of increasing atmospheric greenhouse gas concentration based on a HadCM2 simulation suggest a potential for larger changes in Arctic ecosystems during the 21st century than have occurred between the mid-Holocene and present. This is because greenhouse gases produce a large, year-round climate forcing with major consequences for the distribution of sea ice, thus removing the steep thermal gradient towards the Arctic coast. Ecosystem effects of the CO2 increase (to >700ppm) were slight compared with the effects of the simulated change in climate (Table 1.6). It should be noted however that this is a hypothetical scenario based on the IS92a projection of an approximately 1% per year exponential increase in CO2 emissions throughout the 21st century; lesser emissions would
lead to a smaller climatic and vegetational impact. In contrast, physical vegetation feedback to climate, which was not included in this study, is likely to compound the effect of warming [Betts et al., 2000].

1.5.2 Wetlands and methane emissions

Before industrialization (including the use of natural gas for fuel) and the great expansion of rice cultivation in recent centuries, natural wetlands exerted the primary control on the global terrestrial CH$_4$ source. CH$_4$ is an important trace gas in the atmosphere, 20.6 times more insulating than CO$_2$, and accounting for about...
17% of the total present-day trace-gas induced atmospheric radiative forcing. Changes in the natural sources and sinks of CH4 may have had a significant impact on global climate. Changes in the atmospheric concentration of CH4 over the last glacial-interglacial cycle measured in ice cores indicate that CH4 concentrations closely paralleled polar temperatures. However, the cause of the changing CH4 concentrations is not well constrained by observations.

Based on present-day knowledge of the CH4 budget, qualitative explanations for the relationship between atmospheric CH4 concentrations and climate have been based on the CH4 emission from natural wetlands and CH4 oxidation by OH radicals in the troposphere. OH, the primary sink for CH4, is produced in the atmosphere by the reaction of O3 with high-energy solar radiation and H2O; OH abundances are strongly controlled by the abundances of other reactive trace gases including CO and NOx [Houweling et al., 2000; Thompson et al., 1993]. Other sources of CH4 (including termites, ruminant animals, wildfires, and ocean sediments), as well as the dry-soil CH4 sink, are a small part of the current global CH4 budget, and would probably not have contributed significantly to changes observed in the past [Chappellaz et al., 2000]. The role of CH4 hydrates in ocean sediments in influencing short-term global climate fluctuations is controversial. Evidence for rapid degassing and corresponding climate fluctuations have been reported from the marine record [Kennett et al., 2000], but high-resolution sampling of ice cores...
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have failed to show the very rapid increases in CH$_4$ concentrations required by this hypothesis [Chappellaz et al., 2000].

BIOME4 has been used to simulate potential natural wetland area and CH$_4$ emissions for the present-day and for the LGM (Fig. 1.10). Simulated potential natural wetland area is nearly 50% greater than earlier estimates largely because BIOME4 simulates seasonal wetlands which, because of the methods used to assess wetland area, could not be detected in other studies (Fig. 1.10). Simulated CH$_4$ emissions for the present-day are however comparable to other estimates. At the LGM, simulated area of wetlands was 15% larger than present but their total CH$_4$ emissions were 24% less. Extensive wetlands were simulated on the wide, flat conti-

Fig. 1.10. Potential natural wetlands and CH$_4$ emission simulated for a the present-day and b the LGM.
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Three Applications of BIOME4

1.1 Continental shelves, a result supported by paleoecological evidence from the tropics and Arctic [Edwards et al., in press; Hanebuth et al., 2000; Webb et al., 1995]. However, peak CH4 emission rates were reduced because of low temperatures and low CO2 concentration, both leading to lower rates of substrate formation for methanogenic organisms. Simulated global wetland CH4 emissions, 140 Tg per year at the present and 107 Tg at the LGM, are within the range of previous estimates. The soil sink for CH4 was simulated as 14 Tg at present and less than 0.5 Tg at the LGM, i.e., ambient atmospheric CH4 concentration at the LGM was too low to sustain methanotrophy in dry soils. A sensitivity test simulating vegetation, wetland area, and CH4 emission with the glacial climate but with mid-20th century CO2 concentration produced a wetland CH4 source of 140 Tg, i.e. similar to present. The simulated increase in natural CH4 emissions since the LGM is therefore largely due to the increase in substrate availability from changes in wetland productivity, which in turn is strongly linked to CO2 concentrations in the model. Field studies disagree in their assessment of the real importance of atmospheric CO2 concentration to CH4 production [Chapman and Thurlow, 1996; Hutchins et al., 1995; Whiting and Chanton, 1993]. However, no experiment on CH4 production has considered explicitly the low CO2 concentrations present at the LGM, despite evidence for a strong non-linear response of vegetation productivity and structure at sub-ambient CO2 [Gowling, 2000].

Changes in the atmospheric OH sink may need to be postulated to explain the full magnitude of the increase in atmospheric CH4 since the LGM. CH4 concentrations increased from 350 to 700 ppb from the LGM to pre-industrial time; this 100% increase in concentration is larger than could likely be accounted for by the simulated increase in source strength of only 24%. This result is in contrast to earlier studies which suggested that the long-term increases in atmospheric CH4 concentration were largely or entirely due to the effect of changing temperature and precipitation patterns on wetlands [Chappellaz et al., 1993; Crutzen and Bruhl, 1993; Martinere et al., 1995; Petit-Maire et al., 1991; Pinto and Khalil, 1991; Thompson et al., 1993]. Atmospheric OH concentrations are strongly regulated by the concentration of CO and NOx as well as by the extent of saturation by CH4 itself. It is expected that source strength and emission patterns of these gases were different at the LGM, as these too are strongly dependent on vegetation processes, including fire, which were evidently very different at the LGM. To better constrain LGM OH concentrations requires further research towards building a comprehensive model of trace gas sources in the biosphere and linking to atmospheric chemistry models.

While the location of wetlands since the Last Glacial Maximum has changed greatly, neither the global total simulated wetland area (15% increase) nor consequent simulated CH4 emissions (24% decrease) changed in proportion with the observed changes in atmospheric CH4 recorded in ice cores. CH4 emissions are strongly controlled by substrate availability, which at the LGM was limited strongly by atmospheric CO2 concentrations, according to these model results. These results place the close co-variance of the ice-core derived polar temperatures and atmo-
geophysical CH₄ concentration into a new light, as it appears that the mechanisms controlling the global CH₄ source are less sensitive to climate change on glacial-interglacial time-scales than previously thought. However, on shorter timescales, CH₄ from boreal wetlands may respond rapidly to climate change, as recent work has suggested [Worthy et al., 2000].

1.5.3 Carbon isotopic composition of the terrestrial biosphere

Because the terrestrial biosphere discriminates strongly against ¹³C during photosynthesis, the ¹³C/¹²C ratio of CO₂ in the atmosphere has been used to partition the sources and sinks of atmospheric CO₂ between oceanic and biospheric components [Bakwin et al., 1998; Battle et al., 2000; Bouquet et al., 1999; Ciais et al., 1995a; Ciais et al., 1995b]. This partitioning of CO₂ sources and sinks is critical for understanding how the global carbon budget is affected by climate, and in turn, how CO₂, the atmosphere's second most important greenhouse gas after water vapor, feeds back to the climate system. However, in order to clearly define the CO₂ sources and sinks using CO₂ and δ¹³C, the isotopic composition of the principal components in the system must be known. Further complicating the problem is that the isotopic signatures of the components, especially the terrestrial biosphere, are not homogenous through space and time. Measurements of the isotopic composition of the biosphere, while they exist at a variety of scales, are limited in spatial and temporal coverage. Thus, a global vegetation model can be used to provide an approximation of the global signature of ¹³C in the biosphere. Measured δ¹³C at the leaf, ecosystem,
and troposphere levels may all be used to make a robust validation of the model results.

Carbon isotope discrimination of the terrestrial biosphere was compared to measurements at the leaf, canopy, and free-atmosphere scales. The simulated leaf-level discrimination ($\Delta_{\text{leaf}}$) was compared to estimates from leaf $\delta_{13}C$ measurements (Fig. 1.11) and simulated total ecosystem discrimination $\Delta_e$ was compared to canopy-level measurements (Figs. 1.12, 1.13). To test the model at the whole atmosphere scale, the seasonal cycle of tropospheric CO$_2$ and $^{13}C$ was simulated by combining BIOME4 with an ocean biogeochemistry model and coupling the resultant flux field to an atmospheric tracer transport matrix. The simulated CO$_2$ concentration and $^{13}C$ were compared to measurements of free troposphere air at various locations around the world (Fig. 1.14).

Measurements of $\Delta_{\text{leaf}}$ were classified into 12 PFTs simulated by BIOME4. In total the dataset of $\Delta_{\text{leaf}}$ represents more than 1000 measurements from samples taken on vegetation growing in natural habitats. Modeled $\Delta_{\text{leaf}}$ was summarized from the present-day potential natural vegetation simulation of BIOME4 (Fig. 1.11).

At the whole ecosystem level BIOME4 simulates $\Delta_e$, incorporating the effects of isotopic discrimination during photosynthesis and in soil decomposition processes. Buchmann and Kaplan [in press] have compiled a dataset of measurements on ecosystem-level validation which uses the "Keeling plot" technique to estimate isotopic signature from samples of canopy air. The Keeling plot is based on the fact that CO$_2$ concentration and $^{13}C$ co-vary in a predictable manner. When $1/[\text{CO}_2]$ is plotted against $\delta^{13}C$, the intercept of a linear regression line through the points indicates the flux-integrated $^{13}C$ signature of the CO$_2$ source [Buchmann et al., 1998; Keeling, 1961]. For the ecosystem level measurements, the diurnal cycle of CO$_2$ was used to
create the Keeling plot. Ecosystem level \( \Delta e \) simulations compared closely to measurements made on canopy flask air both at the biome level and on global latitude bands (Figs. 1.12, 1.13).

Changes in CO\(_2\) concentration over the seasonal cycle can also be used to estimate source \(^{13}\)C signatures. At the troposphere level, a global flux field of CO\(_2\) and \(^{13}\)C was generated by combining BIOME4 outputs with an ocean biogeochemistry model simulation [Six and Maier-Reimer, 1996]. The seasonal cycle of CO\(_2\) and \(^{13}\)C at specific free-troposphere measuring stations were then simulated with the flux field as input to an adjoint tracer transport matrix [Kaminski et al., 1996]. The model-simulated signature of the \(^{13}\)C source was close to the measured value at six
medium- to high-latitude stations in the northern hemisphere and reflected the observed latitudinal gradient.

To test the importance of short-term climatic variability on global isotopic discrimination, I developed a transient version of BIOME4 called BIODYNE [J.O. Kaplan, unpublished results]. BIODYNE simulates the carbon and isotopic fluxes of all of the plant functional types included in BIOME4. The dynamic simulation is driven by the same soils data as BIOME4 and a variable climatology. Results of a fifteen-year simulation (1980-1995) with BIODYNE indicate that the interannual variability of global $\Delta_e$ may be as high as 1‰ (Fig. 1.15). This variability, along with the range of uncertainty in $\Delta_e$ currently predicted by this and other global models of $\Delta_e$, is important because a mis-estimate in global $\Delta_e$ of 3‰ can produce a 20% change in the inferred strength of the terrestrial carbon sink. A global $\Delta_e$ that over-emphasizes the importance of C$_3$ vegetation leads to the too-strong inference of oceanic sink [Fung et al., 1997]. Therefore, the spatial and temporal patterns of vegetation in the tropics and agricultural land use are particularly important to better constrain the carbon budget using $^{13}$C. Future plans include investigating the dynamics of $^{13}$C using the Lund-Pik-Jena (LPJ) DGVM [M. Scholze, J.O. Kaplan, W. Knorr, M. Heimann, and S. Sitch, unpublished results].

Fig. 1.15. Global NPP and $\Delta_{\text{leaf}}$ simulated by BIODYNE
1.6 Conclusions

Vegetation models are powerful tools for the investigation of questions in plant ecology that are impossible to assess directly in the field or laboratory because of spatial or temporal sampling limitations and the impossibility of performing very large-scale experiments. This thesis describes three applications of a global vegetation model to problems that cannot be solved using observations or experiments alone but are nonetheless highly relevant to contemporary global change issues because of the important role vegetation plays in land-atmosphere climate feedbacks; the budget of CH₄, an important greenhouse gas; and the global cycle of carbon, which determines the fate of anthropogenic CO₂.

The BIOME4 global vegetation model has achieved the most detailed and accurate simulation of global potential natural vegetation to date. The model successfully simulates the distribution of Arctic vegetation both in the present day and, when combined with a climate model, in the past, where it is validated against pollen-based vegetation reconstructions. BIOME4 simulates the global distribution of natural wetlands at a higher resolution and with more temporal information than previously accomplished. CH₄ emissions from natural wetlands are simulated for the present day and are within the range of other estimates. At the LGM, CH₄ emissions from wetlands are not simulated as low as previously thought because the model indicates that areas suitable for wetland development were more extensive (especially taking into account the exposure of large, flat continental shelf areas) than previous reconstructions have assumed. A complete explanation of the glacial CH₄ cycle may require a full simulation of reactive trace gases and a new analysis of LGM atmospheric chemistry. Simulations of the isotopic composition of the biosphere indicate that ¹³C is more variable spatially and temporally than has generally been assumed in geophysical analyses of the contemporary carbon cycle. The accuracy of the model was confirmed by validation at the leaf, ecosystem, and whole-atmosphere level.

Further research should integrate the new plant ecological information from field studies, especially those using new micrometerological techniques, into existing model frameworks. A comprehensive sensitivity test by Hallgren and Pitman [2000] showed that the greatest changes in vegetation distribution simulated by BIOME3 could be affected by changing the root distribution of the different model PFTs. These results point to the general sensitivity of the vegetation model, and its successors, to hydrology. Recent studies point to the importance of tropical vegetation to interannual variability in the global carbon cycle [McGuire et al., in press]. Given the known variability of the hydrologic cycle at the interannual to decadal scale, especially in the tropics, further research must also focus on improving hydrology in vegetation models.

As a means of exploring the importance of particular processes in the functioning of ecosystems, vegetation modeling provides plant ecologists with a new perspective. Vegetation models can be used to explore phenomena that are impossible
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to measure directly. The future will bring improvements to BIOME4 and its descendant models that assimilate new advances in plant ecology and at the same time allow the assessment of the importance of plant ecological processes at a variety of spatial and temporal scales. BIOME4 has already proven its usefulness in several applications and will continue to be useful for studying states of the Earth in other periods of geologic time; as a baseline to help in understanding causes and effects of major climate changes observed in the past; and as a tool to help in the assessment of anthropogenic climate changes, now and in the future.

I thank I.C. Prentice, K.E. Kohfeld, and S. Sitch for their comments, which improved this manuscript.
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Abstract. Large variations in the composition and structure of Arctic ecosystems are determined by climatic gradients, especially of growing-season warmth, soil moisture and snow cover. Structural differences influence water, energy and carbon exchange characteristics. A unified circumpolar classification of tundra types was adopted and shown to reflect bioclimatic controls on plant-type dominance and primary production. These controls were incorporated in the biogeochemistry-biogeography model BIOME4. Present-day vegetation patterns (forest types, tundra types, and the location of the forest-tundra boundary) north of 55°N were generally well simulated. Climate model experiments for the last glacial maximum (LGM) and mid-Holocene (6000 yr BP) were used to modify the baseline simulation and thus to simulate past vegetation patterns. Results were compared with paleovegetation data derived from pollen data [Bigelow et al., submitted]. Simulations with prescribed sea-surface temperatures showed a large range of high-latitude cooling on unglaciated land at the LGM. The observed prevalence of dwarf-
shrub and graminoid-forb tundra and the restricted extent of low- and high-shrub tundra were nevertheless reproduced. The simulated graminoid-forb tundra was 1.5 to 2.5 times more productive than its (spatially restricted) modern equivalents, due to lower latitude and reduced cloud cover. Although orbital changes produced a substantial, zonally symmetric increase in summer and annual insolation at 6000 yr BP relative to the present day, results obtained with coupled atmosphere-ocean models for 6000 yr BP correctly show that mid-Holocene treeline extension was modest and zonally asymmetrical, with maximal extension (on the order of 300 km) in central Siberia and little or no change in Alaska. Projection of the effect of a continued exponential increase in atmospheric greenhouse gas concentration based on a transient coupled simulation suggests a potential for larger changes in Arctic ecosystems during the 21st century than have occurred between 6000 yr BP and present. Simulated physiological effects of the CO₂ increase (to > 700 ppm) at high latitudes were slight compared with the effects of the simulated change in climate.

2.1 Introduction

High-latitude ecosystems are an important component of the global energy balance and carbon budget [Bonan, 1995; Chapin et al., 1995a; Chapin et al., 2000; Christensen et al., 1999; Foley et al., 1994; Oechel et al., 1993]. Nevertheless, high-latitude vegetation has been simplistically treated in global modeling and global analyses of paleodata which have commonly lumped these ecosystems as a single biome, “tundra.” Differentiation among high-latitude vegetation types is important because there are in fact large structural differences among vegetation types and these would be expected to have a strong influence on land-surface properties, including surface albedo, roughness, and conductance to water vapor.

The Pan-Arctic Initiative (PAIN) has taken a comprehensive approach to describing and modeling terrestrial ecosystems of the northern high latitudes. The philosophy of PAIN has been to base models not only on modern understanding and observations, but also to test the models at key times in the past where validation against paleodata is possible. A robust, validated model can be applied with some confidence to make projections about the sensitivity of Arctic vegetation to possible future changes. By performing analyses of past and possible future changes in parallel and using paleodata as a check we aim to make statements about the sensitivity of Arctic ecosystems to climate change that are more strongly scientifically justified than statements based solely on contemporary observations and modeling. The selection of key times for model evaluation with paleodata (mid-Holocene, 6000 yr BP; Last Glacial Maximum, 21 000 yr BP) follows the Palaeoclimate Modelling Intercomparison Project (PMIP), because of the major focus on these times both in palaeoclimate modeling and data synthesis in PMIP and in other projects [Harrison, 2000; Joussaume and Taylor, 2000; Kohfeld and Harrison, 2000]. A future projection, used as an illustrative example, used one of the same coupled atmo-
sphere-ocean models used in the mid-Holocene simulations, with a greenhouse gas (GHG) forcing assumed to follow a "business as usual" (IS92a) scenario with continuing exponential increase in GHG concentrations up to the end of the 21st century.

We present a new, standardized classification of Arctic vegetation at the biome level which may be identified floristically in the field and in pollen records, and simulated using a global vegetation model. We apply the model to four times: the present-day, the Last Glacial Maximum (LGM), the mid-Holocene, and 100 years into a hypothetical future with unchecked GHG increase and the climate change that this implies. We compare the modeled vegetation result to a map of present day vegetation distribution based on satellite and field observations, and to paleovegetation distributions inferred from pollen spectra. The future scenario then allows us to assess the sensitivity of Arctic vegetation to anthropogenic change in atmospheric CO2 concentration and climate.

2.2 Methods

2.2.1 Classification of tundra vegetation types

Most previous classifications of tundra vegetation types have been based on species assemblages and tailored to specific regions. Application of these schemes outside the region for which they were designed can be problematic. Furthermore, widely used but loosely-defined terms, such as "high Arctic", "subarctic", and "polar desert" have geographical connotations which cause confusion especially when applied to the radically different environmental conditions of the past. We have therefore adopted a new classification scheme for tundra vegetation types at the biome level [Walker, 2000]. Each biome is defined in terms of physical structure and dominant life forms, with the additional requirement that each biome must be floristically distinguishable, both in modern vegetation and in pollen-based reconstructions of paleovegetation. Given that species-level recognition of pollen is not often possible, the requirement that a biome can be reconstructed from pollen data is a strong constraint but it greatly increases the usefulness of the classification system by allowing modern and paleo-observations to be analyzed in a compatible way. Finally, we required that each biome occupy a unique and definable bioclimate space, so that the classification scheme could be translated into a set of limiting environmental factors for implementation in a model.

Our scheme (Table 2.1) distinguishes five tundra biomes: cushion forb, lichen and moss tundra; graminoid and forb tundra; prostrate dwarf-shrub tundra; erect dwarf-shrub tundra; and low- and high-shrub tundra. Although it is possible to distinguish low-shrub and high-shrub tundra on physical grounds, and it might be important to make such a distinction in the context of land-surface interactions
with the atmosphere, it is not possible to distinguish these two vegetation types floristically and we therefore do not attempt to do so.

Fig. 2.1 was developed initially as a topology, based on field experience; quantitative expressions of the boundaries between biomes were developed empirically through the process of model development. The tundra biomes form a sequence along the gradient of accumulated growing-season temperature (expressed here as the growing degree days above 0°C: GDD0). The various forms of shrub-tundra are replaced by graminoid and forb tundra in dry habitats, especially areas that are regularly denuded of snow. Graminoid and forb tundra occurs with progressively higher levels of soil moisture as the growing season temperature sum decreases. Figure 2.1 also shows the bioclimatic relationship between the tundra biomes and other high- to mid-latitude biomes: specifically boreal and temperate forests, temperate grasslands, and temperate xerophytic shrublands. The limits of temperate grassland and xerophytic shrubland are expressed in terms of soil moisture and GDD criteria. The boundary between tundra and boreal forests is expressed as a function of net primary productivity (NPP). Under modern climate conditions in the Arctic, forest NPP is highly correlated with GDD [Gower et al., 1997; Schulze et al., 1999]. However, the definition of this limit in terms of NPP is somewhat more mechanistic as it reflects the requirement for a minimum carbon balance to sustain the growth of trees. Furthermore, the use of NPP as a limit on tree growth may provide a more realistic way of simulating treeline in the past under lowered atmo-

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Biome</th>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>Typical taxa</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low- and high-shrub tundra</td>
<td>Continuous shrubland, 50cm to 2 m tall, deciduous or evergreen, sometimes with tussock-forming graminoids and true mosses, and lichens</td>
<td>Alnus, Betula, Salix, Pinus pumila (in eastern Siberia), Eriophorum, Sphagnum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erect dwarf-shrub tundra</td>
<td>Continuous shrubland 2 to 50 cm tall, deciduous or evergreen, with graminoids, true mosses, and lichens</td>
<td>Betula, Cassiope, Empetrum, Salix, Vaccinium, Gramineae, Cyperaceae</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prostrate dwarf-shrub tundra</td>
<td>Discontinuous shrubland of prostrate deciduous shrubs 0 to 2 cm tall</td>
<td>Salix, Dryas, Potentilla, Asteraceae, Caryophyllaceae, Gramineae, true mosses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cushion forb, lichen, and moss tundra</td>
<td>Discontinuous cover of moss plants or cushion forbs with lichens and mosses</td>
<td>Saxifragaceae, Caryophyllaceae, Papaver, Dryas, lichens, true mosses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graminoid and forb tundra</td>
<td>Predominantly herbaceous vegetation dominated by forbs, graminoids, true mosses, and lichens</td>
<td>Artemisia, Kobresia, Brassicaceae, Asteraceae, Caryophyllaceae, Gramineae, true mosses</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.2 Methods

2.2.2 The BIOME4 model

BIOME4 is an equilibrium terrestrial biosphere model derived from the BIOME3 model of Haxeltine and Prentice [1996a]. Like its predecessor, BIOME4 is a coupled carbon and water flux model that predicts global vegetation distribution, structure, and biogeochemistry, taking account of interactions among these aspects. The model is driven by long-term averages of monthly mean temperature and cloudiness and monthly total precipitation, and long-term values of absolute minimum temperature. In addition, the model requires information on soil texture and soil depth in order to determine water holding capacity and percolation rates.

The operation of BIOME4 at a global scale is based on 12 Plant Functional Types (PFTs), representing broad, physiologically distinct classes ranging from arctic cushion forbs to tropical rainforest trees [Kaplan, 2001]. Each PFT is assigned a limited set of bioclimatic limits which determine whether it is considered to be present in a given grid cell, and therefore whether its potential net primary productivity (NPP) is calculated; and a set of parameter values which define its carbon and water exchange characteristics. The computational core of the model is a coupled carbon and water flux scheme, which determines the seasonal maximum leaf area
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index (LAI) that maximizes NPP for any given PFT, based on a daily time-step simulation of soil water balance and monthly calculations of canopy conductance, photosynthesis, and respiration [Haxeltine and Prentice, 1996a].

To choose the biome for a given grid cell, the model ranks the tree and non-tree PFTs that were calculated for that grid cell. The ranking is defined according to a rule-base defined from the computed biogeochemical variables, which include NPP, LAI, and mean annual soil moisture. The resulting ranked combinations of PFTs lead to an assignment to one of 27 biomes.

2.2.3 High-latitude PFTs and biomes in BIOME4

High-latitude biomes are represented in BIOME4 by combinations of a limited set of PFTs. Several of these PFTs have been recognized and used in earlier versions of the BIOME model (e.g. temperate grass, temperate needleleaf evergreen tree) [Kaplan, 2001]. Three PFTs (cold shrub, cold graminoid or forb, and cushion forb) used to distinguish the tundra biomes are newly defined here. Each of these tundra PFTs was assigned values of required model parameters (Table 2.2) based on available physiological information [see e.g. Berry and Björkman, 1980; Berry and Downes, 1982; Ehleringer and Björkman, 1977; Fangohr and von Caemmerer, 1982; Körner and Farquhar, 1984; Körscher, 1995; Larcher, 1995] with supplementary limits inferred by comparison of species distributions with climate data. These tundra PFTs use the C3 photosynthetic pathway and are shallow rooting, and susceptible to water stress and fire.

### Table 2.2. Distinctive bioclimatic limits and physiological parameters for tundra PFTs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PFT</th>
<th>Cold shrub</th>
<th>Cold graminoid or forb</th>
<th>Cushion forb</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Bioclimatic limits</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>min GDD0 (°C)</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>min snowdepth (cm)</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Physiological parameters</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phenology</td>
<td>evergreen</td>
<td>summergreen</td>
<td>evergreen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GDD0 (°C)</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rs</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>optratio</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kδ</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TpC3 (°C)</td>
<td>-7</td>
<td>-7</td>
<td>-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tcurve</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alloc</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The non-tundra PFTs used by BIOME4 to simulate high latitude vegetation types include cold and temperate broadleaf and needleleaf trees, xerophytic shrubs, and temperate grasses. These PFTs are also defined by a set of bioclimatic limits and physiological parameters [Kaplan, 2001]. Where tree PFTs satisfy bioclimatic limits and NPP and soil moisture requirements, they always dominate over grass and shrub PFTs. Temperate xerophytic shrub and temperate grass PFTs may use both the $C_3$ and $C_4$ photosynthetic pathways; carbon gain is optimized for the pathway on a seasonal basis for grasses. All tree PFTs use $C_3$ photosynthesis. Other physiological parameters which vary among the tree PFTs are canopy architecture, root depth distribution, transpiration characteristics, phenology, leaf habit, and the response of photosynthesis and respiration to temperature.

Biomes are assigned on the basis of a rule-based scheme using the dominant PFT, in some cases the sub-dominant PFTs, and certain environmental limits (Fig. 2.1). Thus, there is no simple correspondence between the presence/absence of PFTs and the assignment of biomes in the model. This is an important conceptual difference between the modelling approach described here and the approach of reconstructing biomes from pollen using biomisation [e.g. Bigelow et al., submitted], in which the complete set of available floristic information is used to diagnose the biome.

2.2.4 Climate scenarios

2.2.4.1 Baseline climatology

We used a long-term mean climatology for the late 20th century (CLIMATE 2.2) [W. Cramer pers. comm. 1998]. CLIMATE 2.2 is an update of Leemans and Cramer [1991]. This climatology was used for the modern vegetation simulation, and as the baseline for the other modeling experiments. Version 2.2 of CLIMATE includes more station data from sparsely populated regions and an improved estimation of elevational gradients of climate variables over several parts of the Earth compared to earlier versions of the dataset (see http://www.pik-potsdam.de/~cramer/climate.htm). The dataset was generated by interpolating long-term mean values for monthly temperatures and percent of potential sunshine hours, and for monthly total precipitation, from station data. The three-dimensional interpolation of the climate variables uses the method of thin-plate smoothing splines, in which elevation is an independent variable and variations of each variable with elevation are estimated internally from the data [Hutchinson, 1995; Hutchinson and Bischof, 1983]. The method of thin-plate smoothing splines is an appropriate technique for interpolating climate data from a sparse network of stations, and has been shown to minimize errors in areas of complex terrain relative to other methods [Price et al., 2000]. The method yields functions which can be evaluated at any combination of geographic location and elevation. Here, the functions were calculated for each grid
cell of a 0.5° geographic grid at the modal elevation for each grid cell \cite{GETECH, 1996}. The grid includes all land grid cells north of 55° N, including "virtual" land grid cells on the continental shelf areas that were exposed at the LGM. The LGM land mask was derived by tracing the contour of LGM sea level (-125 m) \cite{Fleming et al., 1998} on modern topography \cite{GETECH, 1996}.

An atmospheric CO$_2$ concentration of 324 ppm was used to force BIOME4 for the present-day baseline simulation. This is the mean [CO$_2$] during the period of measurement of the station data upon which the climatology is based.

\subsection*{2.2.4.2 Paleoclimate Simulations}

We have made BIOME4 simulations for two key times in the past: the last glacial maximum (LGM, ca 21000 calendar yr BP) and the mid-Holocene (ca 6000 yr BP). These two periods have been a major focus for paleoclimate simulations \cite[e.g.][]{Joussaume and Taylor, 1995; Joussaume and Taylor, 2000; Kohfeld and Harrison, 2000} because they represent two extremes in climate forcing. At the LGM, the earth’s orbital configuration was fairly similar to today but greenhouse gas concentrations were low \cite{Raynaud et al., 1993}, northern hemisphere ice sheets were expanded \cite{Denton and Hughes, 1981} and sea level was therefore lower \cite{Fairbanks, 1989}. In addition to the large changes in terrestrial geography, the ocean surface was significantly colder and the distribution of sea ice was expanded \cite{CLIMAP, 1981}. The configuration of the earth’s orbit was however substantially different from today (and LGM) during the early to mid-Holocene. The phasing of the precession (23 kyr) and obliquity (41 kyr) cycles has been such that the high latitudes of the northern hemisphere received a maximum in insolation (incoming solar radiation), both during boreal summer and annually, at ca. 11000 calendar yr BP. This anomaly decayed gradually towards the present. As a direct result of the changes in orbital forcing, many regions of the Arctic experienced summer temperatures considerably higher than present already during the early Holocene \cite[see e.g.][]{Bradley, 2000; Elias, 2001; MacDonald et al., 2000; Ritchie et al., 1983}. The Laurentide ice sheet, although substantially reduced from the LGM, was still sufficiently large to have a major downwind cooling effect during the early Holocene \cite{Harrison et al., 1992; Mitchell et al., 1988}. Northern Europe and eastern North America therefore experienced a thermal maximum several thousand years after the insolation maximum \cite{Wright et al., 1993}. For this reason, investigations of the impact of insolation changes on climate have conventionally focused on 6000 yr BP, when the difference in orbital configuration was still large but the impact of the residual Laurentide ice sheet was small and essentially local.

Several atmospheric general circulation models (AGCMs) have performed identically-forced simulations of the LGM within the framework of the Paleoclimate Modelling Intercomparison Project (PMIP) \cite{Joussaume and Taylor, 1995; Joussaume and Taylor, 2000}. In these simulations, orbital parameters were set to those appropriate for 21000 calendar yr BP \cite{Berger, 1978}, the extent and height of the ice
sheets was prescribed from Peltier [1994], land-sea distribution, sea-surface temperatures and the seasonally-varying distribution of sea ice were prescribed from CLIMAP [1981] and CO2 concentrations was set to 280ppm [Raynaud et al., 1993]. Recent compilations of palaeoceanographic data have suggested that the CLIMAP representation of the LGM ocean is incorrect in some respects. Seasonal changes in SSTs and sea-ice extent in the North Atlantic were probably greater than shown by CLIMAP [de Vernal and Hillaire-Marcel, 2000; Sarthein et al., 1995] while the tropical ocean surface was generally cooler than shown by CLIMAP [Hostetler and Mix, 1999; Mix et al., 1986]. Several models within PMIP also ran LGM simulations using coupled atmosphere-mixed-layer ocean models, instead of prescribing SSTs and sea-ice limits from CLIMAP. Although comparisons of the PMIP simulations and palaeoenvironmental data from the tropics suggests that the mixed-layer ocean simulations may be more realistic in some ways than those driven by CLIMAP [Froehn et al., 1999], the mixed-layer ocean simulations differ greatly from one another while none adequately captures the spatial patterning in tropical cooling shown by the data. There has been no systematic analysis of the performance of the mixed-layer ocean models compared to the atmosphere-only simulations in the high latitudes. We have therefore adopted CLIMAP-driven simulations, while recognizing that they may contain certain biases.

We chose four PMIP simulations for the LGM to encompass a range of simulated high-latitude climates (especially simulated summer temperature and precipitation changes). We used simulations performed with two versions of the Laboratoire de Météorologie Dynamique (LMD) model [LMD4, LMDH] [Le Treut et al., 1994; Masson et al., 1998; Ramstein et al., 1998], the Meteorological Research Institute, Japan GCM-IIb model [MR2] [Kim et al., 1995], and the UK Universities’ Global Atmospheric Modelling Programme model (UGAMP) [Dong and Valdes, 1998].

The mid-Holocene was also a focus for PMIP [Joussaume, 1999; Joussaume and Taylor, 2000]. However, the PMIP simulations were made using AGCMs in which ocean conditions were prescribed to be the same as in the control simulation. Ocean feedbacks are now known to have a significant impact on mid-Holocene climates, both in the tropics and at high-latitudes [Kutzbach and Liu, 1997; Taylor et al., 1997] and the use of atmosphere-alone simulations in which no attempt is made to take ocean feedbacks into account is therefore inappropriate. Simulations of the climate of 6000 yr BP have recently been performed by several fully coupled atmosphere-ocean general circulation models (AOGCMs) [Braconnot et al., 2000; Hewitt and Mitchell, 1998; Otto-Bliesner, 1999]. We used output from two such models: version 2 of the United Kingdom Meteorological Office coupled model (HADCM2) [Hewitt and Mitchell, 1998] and the Institut Pierre Simon Laplace coupled model (IPSL-CM1) [Braconnot et al., 2000]. We also used output from HADCM2 for our simulation of the response to possible future climate change (see below). Both of the 6000 yr BP simulations were forced only by changes in orbital configuration. CO2 concentrations, land-sea geography and land-surface parameters were prescribed to be the same at 6000 yr BP as in the control simulation.
None of the paleoclimate simulations used here take into account the changes in physical land-surface conditions that are known to have occurred at the LGM and during the mid-Holocene. Changes in land-surface parameters such as albedo and surface roughness associated with changes in vegetation have been shown to impact both on monsoonal and high-latitude climates [Broström et al., 1998; de Noblet-Ducoudré et al., 1998; Foley et al., 1994; Kutzbach et al., 1996; TEMPO, 1996; Texier et al., 2000; Texier et al., 1997]. Braconnot [1999] investigated the interaction between oceanic and vegetation feedbacks on the mid-Holocene climate using an ocean-atmosphere model coupled asynchronously to a vegetation model (BIOME). Levis [1999] and Doherty [2000] have used an AGCM fully coupled to a dynamic vegetation model (IBIS) to investigate the role of vegetation feedbacks at the LGM and the mid-Holocene respectively. However, none of these models provides a full dynamic linkage between the ocean, atmosphere and vegetation and thus these simulations do not fully capture the synergism between these components. Given this limitation in currently available model results, we have confined our analyses to simulations which adopt standard protocols and thus can be considered comparable to one another.

Paleoclimate scenarios for the LGM and mid-Holocene used for running BIOME4 were derived by an anomaly procedure. The anomaly method consists of was produced by subtracting the control (present-day) simulation of a GCM from the paleo simulation, and adding this anomaly (with suitable interpolation) to the present-day baseline climatology. The anomaly approach compensates for first-order bias in the GCM control simulations. However, we cannot rule out that biases in the GCM also affect the sensitivity of the GCM to boundary condition changes [de Noblet-Ducoudré et al., 2000]. In generating the LGM climatologies, we made a small correction of temperature to account for the topographic difference between the LGM land surface as modeled by Peltier [1994] and the simplified topography used in the GCM, using a standard lapse rate.

The CO2 concentration prescribed in the GCM simulations for their present-day control simulations was 345 ppm. The CO2 concentration prescribed for the present-day control simulation of BIOME4 was 324 ppm. To compensate for the difference in baseline [CO2] between the GCMs and BIOME4 we prescribed [CO2] in the paleo simulations with BIOME4 such that

\[ \begin{align*} P_{B4} = C_{B4} - C_{G4} \left( \frac{P_{G4}}{C_{G4}} \right) \end{align*} \]

(2.1)

where \( P_{B4} \) is the [CO2] used by BIOME4 in the paleo-simulation, \( C_{B4} \) is the BIOME4 control [CO2], and where \( P_{G4} \) and \( C_{G4} \) are the CO2 concentrations defined in the GCM paleo- and control-simulations respectively. This resulted in a nominal BIOME4 [CO2] of 296 ppm for the mid-Holocene simulations and 211 ppm for the LGM simulations. We additionally performed all of the paleoclimate experiments again using BIOME4’s unchanged present-day baseline CO2 concentration (324 ppm), as a sensitivity test to separate the effects of climate and physiological effects of CO2.
2.2 Methods

2.2.4.3 Future projection

To assess the sensitivity of Arctic vegetation to possible future climate changes we used results from the HADCM2-SUL model forced by the IS92a greenhouse gas concentration scenario for the 21st century [Hulme et al., 1999]. The “SUL” suffix indicates that this simulation incorporates an estimate of the effects of anthropogenic sulfate aerosols on the climate. We used the mean climate anomalies given from the final ten years of the simulation (i.e. 2090-2100). This same GCM scenario has been applied in other studies on the sensitivity of vegetation to future climate change [Cramer et al., in press; Malcolm and Markham, 2000; Neilson et al., 1998]. The scenario does not include the potentially significant feedbacks between land-surface and atmosphere. It is used here simply to illustrate a possible course of the climate change and thus to give an impression of the sensitivity of Arctic ecosystems to the climate changes that might be induced by increasing GHGs if GHG forcing continues to increase at its present rate.

2.2.5 Earth surface properties

As input to BIOME4, we used the land area and derived soil properties defined in the FAO digital soil map of the world [FAO, 1995] to create a data set on soil water holding capacity and depth for the present-day and future simulations. For the LGM simulations we used the present-day soils dataset as a baseline and overlaid information on ice sheets [Denton and Hughes, 1981; Dyke and Prest, 1987; Sveinsson et al., 1999], sea level [Fleming et al., 1998], and lakes and inland seas [Dyke and Prest, 1987; Kuson, 1975a; Kuson, 1975b]. For the mid-Holocene simulations we used sea level and ice data from Peltier [1994] (ftp://ftp.ngdc.noaa.gov/paleo/ice_topo/).

2.2.6 Validation Data Sets

A provisional map of present-day potential natural vegetation north of 55°N (Fig. 2.2a) was produced by combining information from two sources. Tundra vegetation distributions are based on the preliminary mapping by Walker [2000]. The distribution of other vegetation types was derived from the potential natural vegetation map of Haselton and Prentice [1996a], with minor modifications of nomenclature.

Maps of vegetation at the LGM (defined as 18 000 ± 1000 14C yr BP, approximately equivalent to 21 000 calendar yr BP) and for the mid-Holocene (defined as 6000 ± 500 14C yr BP) have been produced at individual pollen sites from the region north of 55°N using a standard, objective procedure (biomisation) [Prentice et al., 1996] and the classification scheme for tundra and boreal biomes used in BIOME4.
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(Fig. 2.1, Table 2.1) [Bigelow et al., submitted]. The sampling locations, age models used for the selection of samples, allocation of pollen taxa to PFTs, and the allocation of PFTs to biomes are described in detail by Bigelow et al. [submitted].

Fig. 2.2. Present-day potential natural vegetation of the Arctic from floristic surveys a, and simulated by BIOME4 b with 20th century mean climatology. Sectors used in calculating treeline changes c and legend d for this figure and figures 2.3 and 2.4.
2.3 Results

2.3.1 The present-day

BIOME4, driven by the present-day baseline climatology, is generally successful at reproducing the broad-scale patterns of circumpolar vegetation distribution (Figure 2.2). In particular, the model accurately reproduces the placement of the forest-tundra boundary across most regions and successfully predicts whether treeline is formed by evergreen or deciduous species. The broad patterns of decreasing tundra height with latitude are also well produced. A few discrepancies between the simulated vegetation map (Figure 2.2b) and the modern potential vegetation map (Figure 2.2a) are mentioned here.

In maritime tundra regions where BIOME4 simulates forest (e.g., SW Alaska and Iceland), the influence of heavy cloud cover at high latitudes (i.e., low sun angles) on surface solar radiation may be responsible for the disagreement. Additional sensitivity experiments (not shown) demonstrated that a reduction in incoming short-wave radiation by ~25% would produce low- and high-shrub tundra in these regions where BIOME4 normally simulates cold evergreen forest. Such a reduction, compared with the values simulated by the simple empirical cloud-radiation algorithm in BIOME4 [Linacre, 1968; Prescott, 1940], is plausible based on observations [Henderson-Sellers, 1986], suggesting that this aspect of the model could be improved by coupling to a physically based radiation code (e.g., by direct coupling to an atmospheric GCM). Graminoid-forb tundra, while not recorded at the scale of the potential natural vegetation map, nevertheless occurs locally in suitable habitats throughout drier parts of the Arctic [Edwards and Armbruster, 1989; Lloyd et al., 1994; Young, 1976; Yurtsev, 1982]. Shrub vegetation, with buds above ground, requires the insulating effect of snow cover to survive extremely cold winter conditions. BIOME4 simulates more extensive graminoid-forb tundra in some areas of the Arctic where station data are inadequate and that have very low (and likely too low) precipitation figures in the baseline climatology. Global runs of BIOME4 show that graminoid-forb tundra is also predicted in highly oceanic regimes in the southern hemisphere, e.g., at high elevation in New Zealand, islands of the Southern Ocean, and in some tropical montane environments, where no snowpack forms. This prediction is correct, although the floristic composition of such graminoid-forb tundras is very different from that found in cold-winter environments of the Arctic [Kaplan, 2001]. Some other discrepancies may be less apparent than real. For example, the boundary between erect and prostrate dwarf-shrub tundra in the Canadian Arctic seems to be misplaced, but it is unlikely that this boundary occurs at different GDDs in Canada and Siberia; resolution of this issue may require improved mapping of the vegetation boundaries, especially in the Canadian Arctic [Walker, 2006]. More generally, the sparse distribution of climate observations may
be responsible for local artefacts in the simulation, e.g. in Alaska [Fleming et al. 2000].

Simulated NPP in the tundra biomes ranged from > 200 g m⁻² yr⁻¹ in high- and low-shrub tundra to < 70 g m⁻² yr⁻¹ for cushion-forbs (Table 2.2). Simulated productivity varied especially widely for graminoid-forb tundra, shown in both very cold, dry climates with low productivity and mild maritime climates with higher productivity. The ranges for simulated productivity are similar to those measured in the field, though particularly favorable micro-site conditions may lead to measurements of higher productivity (> 300 g m⁻² yr⁻¹) in small areas [Christensen et al., 2000; Shaver and Chapin, 1991].

### Table 2.3. NPP for tundra biomes in the present-day simulation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Biome</th>
<th>NPP (g m⁻² yr⁻¹)</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low- and high-shrub tundra</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erect dwarf-shrub tundra</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prostrate dwarf-shrub tundra</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cushion forbs, lichen, and moss tundra</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graminoid and forb tundra</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>154</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 2.3.2 Last Glacial Maximum

BIOME4, driven by climatologies derived from four different AGCMs, simulates major changes in vegetation cover at the LGM compared to present (Fig. 2.3). Tundra vegetation was considerably more extensive than today and forests were confined to the southernmost part of the region. These predictions are generally in good agreement with paleoenvironmental observations (Fig. 2.3e), which show a comparably large expansion of tundra vegetation. Indeed, none of the pollen sites north of 55°N shows forest. Reconstructions of the vegetation cover to the south of our study region in southern Europe [Elenga et al., 2000] and Russia [Tarasov et al., 2000] also indicate non-forest (grassland or tundra) vegetation at the LGM. Thus, even the limited presence of forests in the southern part of the region, as shown in these simulations, may be an overestimate. Evaluations of the PMIP LGM simulations, including the four models presented here, suggest that the models do not produce a sufficiently large cooling in the mid- to high-latitudes compared to paleoenvironmental observations [Kageyama et al., 2001]. Nevertheless, the fact that the BIOME4 simulations reproduce a large part of the change in the extent of tundra vegetation shown by paleoenvironmental observations shows that the vegetation model is capable of responding appropriately to very large changes in climate. The four climate models used for LGM simulations were deliberately chosen to yield very different high latitude temperature and precipitation changes. The simu-
Fig. 2.3. LGM vegetation simulated with 4 AGCMs: a MRI2, b LMD4, c LMDH, and d UGAMP. Observed vegetation e based on pollen reconstructions from Bigelow et al. (submitted). Pale yellow areas are simulated desert.
lated changes in the extent of different tundra biomes reflect this range of model results. Thus, the LMDH simulation produces more arid conditions (particularly in eastern Siberia) than any of the other models and this is reflected in the greater simulated extent of graminoid and forb tundra, and a small area of desert, in the BIOME4 simulation based on LMDH. The UGAMP simulation produces colder conditions in the far north than the other simulations, and this is reflected by the much greater extent of cushion forb, lichen and moss tundra in the BIOME4 simulation based on UGAMP. Given the large uncertainties in the climate simulations, which are reflected in the differences in the BIOME4 simulations, these simulations can not be expected to perfectly reproduce the paleoenvironmental data. The simulated climate of eastern Siberia may also tend to have a bias towards being less cold and dry than the real LGM climate because the PMIP boundary conditions include an East Siberian ice sheet, which has since been shown to be non-existent at the LGM and which creates an unrealistic circulation pattern [Felzer, 2001]. Nevertheless, important features of the observed changes in LGM vegetation distributions can be seen in the BIOME4 results.

Paleoenvironmental data show that low- and high-shrub tundra was greatly reduced in extent at the LGM compared to today, being largely confined to the Beringian land bridge, while graminoid and forb tundra was very much more widespread [Bigelow et al., submitted]. Graminoid and forb tundra occupies only restricted areas today, but is correctly simulated as occupying much larger areas at the LGM. Indeed, the extent of graminoid and forb tundra simulated using the anomaly climatology from LMDH approximates the observed distribution, according to the data in Bigelow et al. [submitted]. The extent of graminoid and forb tundra simulated using the LGM climatology from MRI2 also approximates the observed distribution in western and central Siberia, although low temperatures in eastern Siberia in MRI2 result in the simulation of cushion forb, lichen, and moss tundra over too large an area. The existence and nature of a herbaceous vegetation type with floristic affinities to tundra and yet capable of supporting significant populations of large mammals has been a subject of much debate [Brubaker et al., 1983; Guthrie, 1985; Guthrie and Stoker, 1990; Lloyd et al., 1994; Ritchie, 1985; Yurtsey, 2001]. The ability of the BIOME4 model, when forced by a suitable LGM climatology, to simulate an expansion in graminoid and forb tundra enables us to re-examine this problem. According to our simulations, the LGM graminoid and forb tundra in Beringia and Siberia was significantly more productive than this biome is today, despite low temperatures and low \[\text{CO}_2\] \text{(Table 2.4). The increased productivity is explained by greater solar radiation, partly because the biome occurs at lower latitudes than it does today, and partly because these regions (according to the simulations) show significantly reduced cloudiness, allowing more photosynthetically active radiation (PAR) to be absorbed and used in photosynthesis.}

The simulated expansion of cushion forb, lichen and moss tundra, which is most pronounced in the BIOME4 simulation using the UGAMP anomaly climatology but is shown in all of the simulations, is one feature of the LGM results which is hard to evaluate from paleo-observations. A single site (Andøya, in Norway) is
characterized as cushion forb, lichen and moss tundra in the LGM paleovegetation reconstruction (Fig. 2.3e) [Bigelow et al., submitted]. However, the core areas of the simulated expansion of cushion forb, lichen and moss tundra (along the northern Siberian coast and along the eastern margin of the European ice sheet) are not represented in the existing pollen data network. The extreme conditions which give rise to cushion forb, lichen and moss tundra are generally unfavorable for the creation of suitable sedimentary sites for the accumulation of pollen. This tundra-type is therefore always likely to be under-represented in paleoenvironmental data sets.

2.3.3 Mid-Holocene

The changes in high-latitude vegetation cover between now and 6000 yr BP as simulated by BIOME4, driven by climatologies derived from the IPSL-CM1 and HADCM2 models, are relatively small (Fig. 2.3, Table 2.5). Treeline is simulated up to 200 km north of its modern position in central Siberia (Taimyr sector), and in eastern Canada. There is little or no change in the simulated position of treeline in Alaska, the Mackenzie Delta region, eastern Siberia and Chukotka. The simulated northward shifts in tundra vegetation belts are also most pronounced in central Siberia and in Labrador/Keewatin. Very little change in tundra vegetation is simulated in other Arctic regions. Simulated changes in vegetation south of the treeline are more pronounced. In both simulations, the margin of the cool evergreen needleleaf forest in Scandinavia and eastern Europe is 300-500 km north of its position in the modern simulation. The northern margin of cool mixed forest is also displaced northward, though slightly less than the cool evergreen forest, on the order of 50-200 km (west to east). Large northward displacements of cool and temperate forest zones are also observed in North America, mainly south of the area shown in our maps. In the continental interior of Eurasia, the simulations show a significant area of temperate grasslands and xerophytic shrublands consequent on increased aridity. Expansion of less-moisture-demanding vegetation, including temperate grasslands and xerophytic shrublands, is also simulated in mid-continental North America.

Several key aspects of the 6000 yr BP BIOME4 simulations are supported by the paleoenvironmental data (Fig. 2.4c). Pollen-based reconstructions show major dif-

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Simulation</th>
<th>[CO₂] ppm</th>
<th>Mean annual % of full sunshine</th>
<th>Mean summer (JJA) % of full sunshine</th>
<th>Mean NPP g m⁻² yr⁻¹</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Present-day</td>
<td>324</td>
<td>35.8</td>
<td>37.5</td>
<td>17.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LGM LMDM</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>53.6</td>
<td>46.6</td>
<td>24.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LGM UGAMP</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>51.4</td>
<td>44.1</td>
<td>39.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LGM LMDH</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>47.3</td>
<td>45.4</td>
<td>40.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LGM MHI2</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>46.5</td>
<td>41.3</td>
<td>38.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ferences in the magnitude of the shift of treeline in different sectors, suggesting a significant circum-polar asymmetry in summer warming between 6000 yr BP and present. Indeed, in most sectors, the reconstructed changes (or lack of changes) in treeline are similar to those shown in the simulations (Table 2.5). The change in western and central Siberia was at most 300 km, according to both models and data. The data show no change in Alaska and only a slight extension in the Mackenzie Delta region, eastern Siberia and Chukotka. The reconstructions of treeline shifts presented here are consistent with earlier estimates of the changes in these regions summarized by TEMPO [1996] and Prentice et al. [1998] and with independent reconstructions based on megafossil (tree stump) remains in Eurasia [MacDonald et al., 2000]. The most noticeable discrepancy between the reconstructed and simu-
lated changes in treeline occurs in Québec and Labrador, where the pollen data indicate that treeline was ca 500-700 km south of its present position whereas the simulation suggest it lay ca. 300 km north of its present position. The southward displacement of the treeline in Québec and Labrador at that time probably reflects the localized cooling caused by the persistence of small ice sheets in this region until at least 5500 yr BP [Clark et al., 2000; Richard, 1995; Richard et al., 1997]. Relicts of the Laurentide ice sheet have not been included in the climate model simulations for the mid-Holocene; this omission probably explains the marked discrepancy between the observations and the model results for eastern Canada at 6000 yr BP.

The paleovegetation maps also confirm the results of the 6000 yr BP simulations in showing that the northward shift of cool and temperate forests was significantly larger than changes in the northern treeline in any sector. Indeed, the pollen data suggest that the simulated northward shifts (e.g. of temperate deciduous broadleaf forest in the European sector) may have been smaller than actually occurred. There are at least two possible explanations for why changes further south appear to be larger than those further north. There is a steep gradient in summer temperature near the Arctic coast, due to the presence of sea ice. As a result, large changes in summer temperature are required to produce a significant poleward shift in the northern vegetation zones, and particularly in northern treeline. Further south, smaller changes in temperature would be required to produce a given geographical change in the northern limits of the cool and temperate forest zones. In addition,
many of the observed changes in temperate forest distribution in the mid-Holocene imply that winters were substantially warmer at 6000 yr BP than today in some temperate mid-latitude regions [Cheddadi et al., 1997; Prentice et al., 2000; Yu et al., 1998]. Thus, there is no reason why the magnitude of the northward shift in cool and temperate forests should be similar to the magnitude of the changes in northern treeline, which are controlled primarily by changes in growing-season temperatures and their effect on NPP and tree growth.

The pollen-based reconstructions of mid-Holocene vegetation (Fig. 2.4c) do not show any expansion of less moisture-demanding vegetation in the continental interior of Eurasia. This result is consistent with earlier reconstructions based on pollen data [e.g. Tarasov et al., 1998], and with independent evidence based on geomorphic and biostratigraphic records of changes in lake status that show little or no change in the regional water balance of central Eurasia in the mid-Holocene [Harrison et al., 1996]. The reason for this discrepancy between the observations and the simulations is not known.

2.3.4 Future sensitivity

In the illustrative simulation of a “greenhouse climate”, the potentially forested area of the Arctic increases substantially compared to the present day; tundra is correspondingly reduced (Fig. 2.4). The simulated treeline is farther north than in any of the mid-Holocene simulations, and treeline is shown to advance relative to the present in all sectors of the Arctic. Trees are shown potentially invading coastal Greenland and Chukotka, where only fragments of forest exist today. The area of potential cold deciduous forest is also strongly reduced in Siberia, opposite to the mid-Holocene simulations, because of a simulated strong warming in winter in the greenhouse climate. During the mid-Holocene, low insolation in the boreal winter has little effect at high latitudes (where midwinter insolation is always very low) and acts counter to the summertime forcing further south, producing colder than present winters e.g. in Siberia, according to the model results. In the future simulation, in contrast GHG forcing (by trapping outgoing long wave radiation) results in winter temperatures higher than present throughout the region, reaching anomalies as great as +14° C in eastern Siberia (Fig. 2.5).
2.3 Results

Fig. 2.5. Mean surface air temperature anomaly in winter (DJF, left) and summer (JJA, right). IPSL-CM1 a,b; HADCM3 (6kya) c,d; HADCM3-SUL (2100) e,f.
2.4 Discussion and conclusion

BIOME4 has proved successful in capturing the important features of Arctic vegetation distribution: the position of the northern treeline, and the variety of tundra vegetation types present on the modern landscape. Simulated estimates of tundra productivity are within the range of those measured in the field. In highly oceanic areas where the model fails to reproduce the observed position of the treeline, the main cause is hypothesized to lie in the effects of low sun angle in extremely cloudy climates. All of the BIOME models have used the empirical linear relationship between cloudiness and short-wave irradiance of Ångström, [1924] as modified by Prescott [1940] to predict short-wave irradiance at the earth's surface $\phi_s$:

$$\phi_s = \phi_\infty \left( a + \frac{b n}{N} \right)$$

(2.2)

where $\phi_\infty$ is the solar radiation at the top of the atmosphere, $n/N$ is the ratio of actual to potential sunshine hours, and $a$ and $b$ are empirical constants: $a$ relates to the opacity of clouds and $(a + b)$ represents the transmissivity of clear air. The values for $a$ and $b$ are determined through measurements and have typically been assigned global values of about 0.23 and 0.5 respectively [Haxeltine and Prentice, 1996a; Landsberg and Gower, 1997; Linacre, 1968; Prentice et al., 1992; Roderick, 1998; Stigter, 1980]. Analyses of station data for solar radiation however indicate a considerable range in $a$, e.g. 0.19 measured on Macquarie Island in the Southern Ocean [Roderick, 1998] and values as low as 0.05 in Canada [Davies and Hay, 1980; Henderson-Sellers, 1986]. Alternative empirical formulations include models that explicitly make $a$ a function of latitude [e.g. Glover and McCulloch, 1958], though this formulation was not intended to be applied at latitudes > 60° [Lin et al., 1999]. At lower latitudes the Prescott [1940] formulation with $a = 0.23$ and $b = 0.48$ appears to work best [Lin et al., 1999], but this formulation cannot capture the low values of $\phi_s$ (< 0.23) measured at high latitudes. Biosphere models should in the future include more explicit physical treatments of radiation; this could be achieved most straightforwardly by direct coupling to an atmospheric model.

We have assessed the performance of BIOME4 in reproducing the vegetation of LGM paleoenvironments drastically different from those of today, including a vegetation type (graminoid and forb tundra) that has no large-scale analog on the modern landscape. Given several caveats about the paleoclimate scenarios, the BIOME4 simulations satisfactorily reproduce many of the major features observed in paleo-records of the LGM. The widespread occurrence of graminoid and forb tundra is a prominent and well-known feature of the LGM. This biome is of interest for several reasons. Herbaceous tundra has markedly different biophysical properties from woody tundra; the implications of this difference for the LGM climate has not yet been explored in global climate models. Furthermore, this biome was the primary habitat and source of nutrition for the large mammoth populations that existed at
2.4 Discussion and conclusion

The driest areas may have also been significant sources of aeolian dust [Mahowald et al., 1999]. According to our model results, the LGM graminoid-forb tundra was generally more productive than the graminoid-forb tundra that is found locally in the present-day Arctic, because it grew at lower latitude and under less cloudy conditions than it does at present, resulting in increased absorption of PAR. These factors may also have contributed to the floristic diversity of the graminoid-forb tundra at the LGM [Vartanyan et al., 1993; Yurtsev, 1982].

The xerophyte and cryoxerophyte grass, sedge, and forb taxa found in common association in the graminoid-forb tundra are not all found together on the modern landscape. The phenomenon of a plant association with no modern analog is widespread at the LGM and has been explained in various ways. One interpretation points to the interplay between climate and low CO₂ concentrations [Jackson et al., 2000; Solomon and Shugart, 1984], but in this case [CO₂] is less of an issue; it is the combination of climate and radiation conditions that is distinctive in our model results. It has also been suggested that the floristic diversity of this vegetation was promoted by continual inputs of calcareous aeolian dust [Goetchies and Birks, 2001; Walker et al., 2001].

Our model results do not invoke vegetation feedbacks, nor any direct influence of large grazing animals on the vegetation [Zimov et al., 1995], to explain the widespread distribution of graminoid and forb tundra at LGM. Nevertheless, it seems likely that more complete understanding of the high-latitude vegetation on climate at the LGM will include vegetation feedbacks [Levis et al., 1999; Chapin et al., 2000]

Climate changes in the early Holocene drastically restricted the geographic range of graminoid-forb tundra. Wrangel Island, off the coast of northeastern Siberia, has retained the largest contiguous community of graminoid-form tundra anywhere in the Arctic [Yurtsev, 1982]. While floristically depauperate, the vegetation of Wrangel Island has a higher diversity of herbaceous tundra species than anywhere else in the Arctic and is considered to have survived throughout the Holocene as relic of the Pleistocene graminoid-forb tundra [Leikin et al., 2001]. It was on Wrangel Island where mammoth populations survived longest, with dwarf species persisting until at least 3700 years ago, nearly 6000 years longer than on the Eurasian mainland [Vartanyan et al., 1993].

During the early and mid-Holocene the northern high latitudes were subject to greater summertime and total annual insolation than present, allowing warmer than present summer temperatures to develop, particularly in continental areas (Fig. 2.5). Eurasia, because of its greater size, warmed more than North America during summer, and therefore the northern vegetation changes were greater in Eurasia. Simulated treeline was further north than the present in central Siberia, where the summertime warming was maximal according to the models. Thus a simple explanation for the circumpolar asymmetry of the treeline shift, as seen both in the data and the simulations, invokes the differential heating of the continents. However other factors may be involved, including a shift of the sea ice limit specifically
in the European sector [Vavrus, 1999], assisted by increased northward penetration of warm water from the North Atlantic, contrasting with persistent, perennial sea ice in the other regions of the Arctic [C. Hewitt, pers. comm., 2001].

Feedback between the land-surface and atmosphere related to forest extent at the mid-Holocene may have been overestimated in earlier work [Foley et al., 1994] in light of the new data on vegetation distribution [Bigelow et al., submitted; MacDonald et al., 2000] which indicate a more modest treeline extension than was assumed previously. However, vegetation-atmosphere feedbacks may be more important in the future. For example, Levis [2000] showed that vegetation feedbacks under a doubled CO2 climate could produce an additional 3°C warming during spring (April-May) in the region north of 60° N. Such findings suggest that our estimate of Arctic treeline sensitivity to possible future climate changes represents a minimum estimate, as it is based on a model without vegetation feedback.

Comparison of the mid-Holocene simulations and the future projection suggests that the vulnerability of Arctic ecosystems to climate change depends on the seasonality of the climatic forcing and, possibly, the resulting response of sea-ice distribution. Mid-Holocene climate was influenced by a positive radiative forcing with maximum effect in summer and at high latitudes essentially no effect in winter; lower latitudes experienced negative radiative forcing in winter. Forcing from increased GHGs may have a larger effect because it is positive everywhere, and effective year-round even in high latitudes. The simulated direct physiological effect of CO2 on these cold-climate vegetation types is small compared to the climate effect. The response of leaf level photosynthesis to CO2 concentrations is strongly dependent on temperature, with significant competition between CO2 and O2 for beginning only at ambient temperatures over ~15°C [Farquhar et al., 1980]. Therefore, these results are not contrary to modeling studies on tropical vegetation which show a much greater sensitivity to low CO2 concentration [Cowling, 2000] or to paleodata suggesting a response of tropical treeline to low [CO2] at LGM [Street-Perrott et al., 1997].

Recent studies have proposed that high-latitude vegetation will gain in productivity due to increased nutrient availability as a result of warming in the Arctic [Chapin et al., 1995b; Melillo et al., 1993; Oechel et al., 1994; Oechel et al., 2000]. In our simulations with BIOME4 we assume that the ecosystem optimizes its nutrient demand relative to supply [Haxeltine and Prentice, 1996b]. Therefore, possible short-term gains in productivity that may be observed in field experiments cannot be discounted by our analysis.

Several studies [e.g. Cavalieri et al., 1997; Chapman and Walsh, 1993; Johannessen et al., 1995; Johannessen et al., 1999; Maslanski et al., 1996; Parkinson et al., 1999; Vinnikov et al., 1999] have shown a significant decrease in the extent of northern-hemisphere sea ice during recent decades. The most recent analysis suggests that summer sea ice extent has declined monotonically 4 to 6% during the last four decades [Deser, 2000] due to changes in late spring temperatures, amplified by the ice-albedo feedback. In our GHG scenario, as in other simulations of the impact of potential changes in future climate, the area of perennial sea ice is dramatically
reduced as is the extent of seasonal sea ice, and simulated temperatures are increased year-round.

In conclusion, the vegetation and ecosystems of the high latitudes of the northern hemisphere appear to be especially sensitive to increased radiative forcing of climate due to increases in GHG concentrations. In a modeling study with the same future scenario as we used here, Malcolm and Markham [2000] projected that global ecosystem habitat loss would be greatest in Canada, Russia, and the Nordic countries. Local species loss under doubled CO₂ climates could be as much as 20% in the cold forests and tundra areas of the circumpolar Arctic [Malcolm and Markham, 2000]. The time scale of our future scenario is such that we would not expect the changes to be fully realized during the century; tree line expansion depends on the establishment and growth of trees, which is expected to take several centuries [Cramer et al., in press], as has been shown in a simulation using the LPJ dynamic global vegetation model [Kittel et al., 2000]. These results illustrate what could happen if GHG concentrations continue to increase at the present rate for the next 100 years. The simulations indicate that the mid-Holocene situation, with modest Arctic treeline extension, is in no sense an analog for the effect of GHGs; however, the data-model comparisons give us confidence in the ability of the modeling procedure to simulate the potential consequences of GHG forcing for climate and vegetation in the Arctic.
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Abstract. The global distribution of potential wetlands and their methane (CH\textsubscript{4}) emissions at the present-day and the Last Glacial Maximum (LGM) are estimated using a bottom-up modeling approach. LGM climate was derived from the coupled atmosphere-vegetation simulation of Levis [1999]. The biological model combines the climate and soils driven global vegetation model BIOME4 with simple but effective algorithms for determining wetland area based on topography and soil moisture, and CH\textsubscript{4} emission based on ecosystem carbon turnover in seasonally or perennially wet soils. The global CH\textsubscript{4} sink is also estimated, following Ridgwell [1999]. Simulated LGM wetland area was 15\% larger than present, but simulated global CH\textsubscript{4} emissions were 24\% less. Extensive wetlands were simulated on the continental shelves. Simulated emissions of 140Tg per year at the present and 107Tg at the LGM are within the range of previous estimates. The soil sink for CH\textsubscript{4} was simulated as 14Tg at present but < 0.5Tg at the LGM due to substrate limitation. The simulated increase in natural CH\textsubscript{4} emissions since the LGM is largely due to the increase in substrate availability caused by increased wetland productivity. While rapid climate changes may have had an immediate effect on CH\textsubscript{4} emissions from wetlands, other physical changes at the Earth’s surface may have modulated the long-term wetland CH\textsubscript{4} source. The 100\% increase in atmospheric CH\textsubscript{4} concentration measured in ice cores between the LGM and the pre-industrial period may have been caused in part by changes in the atmospheric OH sink due to altered emissions of other reactive trace gases.

3.1 Introduction

Natural sources of methane (CH\textsubscript{4}) may have contributed to the increase in atmospheric CH\textsubscript{4} since pre-industrial time. CH\textsubscript{4} is an important greenhouse gas, accounting for about 17\% of total trace-gas induced atmospheric radiative forcing [Schimel et al., 1996]. During the last 250 years atmospheric CH\textsubscript{4} concentrations have increased on average nearly 2.5\% per year [Aselmann and Crutzen, 1989]. However, the increase has not been continuous. In particular, the atmospheric rate of increase in CH\textsubscript{4} decreased from the 1970’s through the 1990’s; the effect of climate variability on wetland area and productivity has been proposed as one of the causes [Bartlett and Harris, 1993; Schimel et al., 1996].
Atmospheric CH$_4$ concentrations fluctuated between approximately 350 and 700 ppb over the last 400,000 years [Petit et al., 1999]. Between the Last Glacial Maximum (LGM, 18,000 yr BP) and pre-industrial Holocene (to ~1850), CH$_4$ concentrations in the atmosphere increased nearly 100% and more closely parallel the higher-frequency component of polar temperature records than any other measured trace gas [Chappellaz et al., 1990; Chappellaz et al., 1993a; Raynaud et al., 1988]. Recent studies agree that CH$_4$ emissions from wetlands are the driving component to prehistoric changes in ice-core CH$_4$, but conflict as to the location of the wetlands and the primary environmental factors controlling CH$_4$ emission [Chappellaz et al., 1996; Dallenbach et al., 2000; Worthy et al., 2000]. In addition, given the potency of CH$_4$ as a greenhouse gas (20.6 times more effective than CO$_2$), it seems likely that there are strong feedbacks between temperature and wetland CH$_4$ emissions [Schimel et al., 1996]. I present here a new estimate of wetland area and CH$_4$ emissions for the present-day and the LGM, using a "bottom-up" ecosystem modeling technique.
Several estimates of present-day wetland area and corresponding CH$_4$ emission have been presented in the past decade [Aselmann and Crutzen, 1989; Bartlett and Harris, 1993; Chappellaz et al., 1993b; Matthews and Fung, 1987]. Recently, modeling studies have attempted to assimilate new information on methanogenesis and oxidation (methanotrophy) to give more process-based estimates of global and regional CH$_4$ production [Cao et al., 1996; Christensen et al., 1996; Walter, 1998]. Recent studies have used inverse modeling to assimilate a global budget of CH$_4$ produced by wetlands [Dlugokencky et al., 1994; Hein et al., 1997; Houweling, 1999; Houweling et al., 2000]. These models have not been used to predict wetland area, and were therefore limited in their ability to estimate CH$_4$ production for time periods other than the present. Continental hydrology models exist that can simulate horizontal flow of water across landscapes, river flow, and lake and wetland area, but because of their complexity and requirement for detailed information on topography and soil physical properties, their use has so far been limited to regional studies [Coe, 1995; Coe, 1998].

Because of the geographically sparse nature of ice-core data, the inverse problem of determining sources and sinks of CH$_4$ through time is highly unconstrained [McElroy, 1989]. Nevertheless, several recent studies used the interhemispheric difference in CH$_4$ concentrations measured in Greenland and Antarctic ice-cores to determine CH$_4$ sources from the tropics and northern and southern hemisphere extra-tropics [Brook et al., 2000; Chappellaz et al., 1997; Dallenbach et al., 2000].

Chappellaz et al. [1993b] have made the only other process-based estimate on global wetland area and CH$_4$ emissions at the LGM to date. Their methods combined information on topography and paleo-vegetation to determine wetland area and the CH$_4$ source. This study also used a photochemical model to establish the atmosphere OH sink for CH$_4$, which, because of the closely linked CH$_4$-OH feedback, was assumed to vary in phase with CH$_4$ concentrations [Lu and Khalil, 1991; Pinto and Khalil, 1991; Thompson et al., 1993; Valentin, 1990]. Chappellaz et al. [1993b] estimated the wetland CH$_4$ source at 180 Tg for the pre-industrial Holocene and 120 Tg at LGM. Since then, inverse modeling studies based on widespread flask sampling and isotopic data have made estimates of the wetland CH$_4$ source from 135 to 232 Tg per year for the present-day (Table 3.2).

Chappellaz et al. [1993b] made several key simplifications. First, they used a LGM vegetation map based on a subjective analysis of paleo-data [Adams et al., 1990]. The reliability of the Adams et al. [1990] vegetation map has since been challenged [e.g. Prentice et al., 1993]. Second, the grid model used to constrain wetlands to appropriate slopes was aggregated to a 1 degree (nearly 100 km) grid. Recent studies have shown that small-scale topography and hydrology can have a strong relationship to CH$_4$ emission [Christensen et al., 1995; Christensen et al., 1999]. Widespread wetlands less than 10 km in size may contribute significantly to the global CH$_4$ source. Third, estimates of wetland area were not constrained by climate or plant physiology. However several studies have indicated that low atmospheric CO$_2$ concentration may have increased plant sensitivity to drought [e.g. Cowling and Sykes, 1999; Jolly and Haxeltine, 1997]. Therefore, vegetation type data
alone may not be a reliable proxy for moisture conditions at the LGM. Finally, Chappellaz et al. [1993b] did not take into account changes in substrate availability due to changes in climate and CO₂ concentration; these factors have a major effect on CH₄ production [Christensen et al., 1996; Walter, 1998; Whiting and Chanton, 1993].

In this study I used a high-resolution digital elevation model to determine suitable low-relief areas for extensive wetland formation. I ran the global biogeography and biogeochemistry model BIOME4, forced only by climate and atmospheric CO₂ concentration, to determine the wetland area (soil moisture), substrate availability (NPP), and potential CH₄ production rate as a fraction of heterotrophic respiration. I combined the topographic and biogeochemical information to simulate the CH₄ emissions. Here I present simulated wetland area and CH₄ emissions for both the pre-industrial period, forced by modern observed climate, and the LGM, driven by a fully-coupled atmosphere-vegetation-general circulation model (AVGCM) climatology [Levis et al., 1999].

3.2 Methods

3.2.1 General methodology

Model simulation of wetland areas and their corresponding CH₄ emissions had four parts. First a driver climatology and soils dataset were developed for the pre-industrial and LGM. I used these data to drive the BIOME4 global vegetation model in order to define biomes and to generate spatially and temporally explicit fields of soil moisture, NPP and heterotrophic respiration. I estimated wetland area and extent based on these outputs plus topographic information. Finally I combined the vegetation model output with the information on wetland area to simulate CH₄ emission.

I used a long-term mean climatology for the late 20th century (CLIMATE v2.2) [W. Cramer, pers. comm. 1998] as the baseline for the experiments. The climatology includes more station data from sparsely populated regions and an improved estimation of lapse rate over several parts of the Earth compared to the earlier versions of the dataset [Leemans and Cramer, 1991] (http://www.pik-potsdam.de/~cramer/climate.htm). The climatology was also extrapolated over continental shelf areas that were exposed at the LGM to provide a baseline for the LGM climatology. I used the derived soil properties from the FAO digital soil map of the world [FAO, 1995] for information on soil texture and depth.

I used the BIOME4 global biosphere model to simulate monthly soil wetness, NPP, and potential CH₄ production. A 5-minute global digital terrain model [GETECH, 1996] was used to identify areas flat enough to support wetlands. Potential CH₄ emissions were calculated where wetland areas were identified.
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The BIOME4 global biosphere model is a coupled biogeography and biogeochemistry model developed from the BIOME3 model [Haxeltine and Prentice, 1996]. The model uses a plant-functional-type approach to simulate the distribution and behavior of global vegetation. Major differences between BIOME3 and BIOME4 include the addition of three new PFTs to better represent tundra vegetation [Kaplan et al., this volume], PFT-specific parameterization of the physiological information used by the model, and an improved competition scheme which uses biogeochemical outputs more directly to determine the dominant PFT and biome. Inputs to the model are monthly fields of mean temperature and percent sunshine, monthly total precipitation, and two vertical layers of soil physical parameters related to the water holding capacity and percolation rate of water in the soil column. BIOME3 has been used in to simulate LGM vegetation and soil moisture conditions in a variety of simulations [Harrison et al., in prep.; Jolly and Haxeltine, 1997; Mahowald et al., 1999].

3.2.2 Climate and CO2 scenarios

For the potential natural present-day simulation I ran BIOME4 with the baseline climatology described above and a CO2 concentration of 324ppm (the mean ambient atmospheric [CO2] during the period on which the climatology is based). For the LGM experiment I used a climatology derived from the GENESIS/IBIS atmosphere-vegetation general circulation model (AVGCM) and a atmospheric CO2 concentrations of both 211ppm (glacial minimum) and 324ppm (control).

I used the GENESIS/IBIS AVGCM output to drive the BIOME4 model for the LGM climate scenario described by Levis [1999]. This simulation is unique because it represents the only available dynamically-linked 3D atmosphere-vegetation simulation of LGM climate conditions. Sensitivity tests with GENESIS/IBIS demonstrated the importance of feedbacks between atmosphere and vegetation, and the effect of low [CO2] on vegetation, in reaching an equilibrium climate at the LGM [Levis et al., 1999]. Vegetation-atmosphere feedbacks are particularly important in controlling the moisture balance of the continental interiors and therefore are key to controlling wetland and CH4 formation.

The boundary conditions used in the GENESIS/IBIS simulations were prescribed sea surface temperatures (SST) in both control and LGM simulations, calculated orbital forcing, individual greenhouse gas forcing, and a simple parameterization of tropospheric aerosols. SSTs for the present were prescribed according to Shea et al. [1992] for the present and CLIMAP [1981] for the LGM. GENESIS/IBIS ran at a R15 spectral resolution (about 4.3° latitude by 7.3° longitude).

I used the GENESIS/IBIS LGM-RPV model simulation, which included the full dynamic vegetation-atmosphere coupling and the direct effect of low CO2 on the vegetation. To generate a climatology for BIOME4, I subtracted the LGM-RPV simulation results from the present-day control simulation to generate anomalies for
mean monthly temperature, mean percent sunshine, and total precipitation. These climate anomalies were interpolated from the native GCM resolution to a 0.5-degree resolution grid and added to the baseline modern climatology, with corrections for differences between real paleotopography and the GCM’s representation of the Earth’s surface.

3.2.3 Locating wetland areas

BIOME4 simulates global vegetation distribution in the form of 28 biomes, plus monthly fields of NPP, soil moisture, heterotrophic respiration, and other biogeochemical variables. I combined these data with topographical information to determine the extent of wetlands. The algorithm selects gridcells which are sufficiently flat and with a high enough soil moisture, calculated on a monthly basis. On low-relief terrain under wet conditions, water will not flow horizontally across the landscape sufficiently to prevent the soil from becoming waterlogged. If water inputs are great enough wetlands will form on moderately flat terrain. To determine if a gridcell was flat enough to be a candidate for wetland formation I calculated the slope of every gridcell in a global five-minute digital terrain model [GETECH, 1996]. I ran BIOME4 for modern climate conditions and simulated wetland areas by combining monthly soil moisture with the global slope dataset. By comparing the slope-wetness result to maps of well-known wetland areas, I defined threshold values for slope (0.3%) and mean soil moisture (65% of field capacity).

3.2.4 Methane emission model

CH₄ is produced by methanogens during the anaerobic decomposition of organic matter. The primary controls on CH₄ production in wetlands are: position of the water table, soil temperature, and availability of substrate [Walter, 1998]. CH₄ is released to the atmosphere through diffusion, plant-mediated transport, and ebullition. Methanotrophs living in aerated conditions in the soil and on plants consume a significant amount of total CH₄ production before it reaches the free troposphere [Ridgwell et al., 1999; Walter, 1998].

Several modeling studies have attempted to simulate CH₄ emissions on a regional or global scale. The modeling approaches differ in their complexity and specific focus on ecosystem processes. Cao et al. [1996], Christensen et al. [1996], and Potter [1997] used relatively simple parameterizations of the main factors influencing CH₄ production and transport. Walter [1998] developed a more explicit process-based model for CH₄. No previous modeling study has attempted to simulate wetland area concurrently with CH₄ emission.

To simulate CH₄ emissions I used an approach based on Christensen et al. [1996] where total CH₄ emission in wetlands is a fraction of simulated total heterotrophic respiration, which in turn at equilibrium is a function of NPP, soil tem-
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I considered water table depth implicitly in simulating soil moisture on a monthly time step. I further extended the Christensen et al. [1996] method by explicitly considering vegetation type and structure to account for differences in the CH$_4$ oxidizing capacity of ecosystems. Wetland ecosystems dominated by grasses and other herbaceous plants were considered to have a lower oxidizing capacity and a greater propensity for direct transport of CH$_4$. In mixed forest and grass ecosystems which were classified as wetlands, I varied the CH$_4$ oxidizing capacity as a function of the ratio of grasses to trees. Forested wetlands had the highest CH$_4$ oxidation potential. I also adopted the model of Ridgwell [1999] to estimate the sink for CH$_4$ in non-wetland soils. The model uses information on soil texture, moisture, and atmospheric CH$_4$ concentration to determine the potential soil sink. Soil texture was derived from the soil texture information used to drive BIOME4 and the soil moisture fields were provided from BIOME4.

Fig. 3.2. Schematic diagram of the wetland and methane model
3.3 Results

3.3.1 Present-day wetlands

Table 3.1. Wetland areas for present-day, Pre-industrial Holocene (PHI), and LGM in 10^6 km^2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study</th>
<th>Present-day</th>
<th>PHI</th>
<th>LGM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>This study (potential natural)</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chappellaz et al. 1993</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aselmann and Crutzen 1989</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cogley 1994</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Darras et al. 1999</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathews and Fung 1987</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Global potential natural wetland area was simulated as 11 10^6 km^2, which is considerably larger than previous estimates, but plausible based on comparison to observed wetland datasets and reduction in wetland area by anthropogenic activity. Present-day wetland area estimates from maps, satellite remote sensing, field observation, or a combination of these range from 4.6 to 9.5 10^6 km^2 (Table 3.1). However, comparison among these wetland datasets shows a great deal of disagreement as to the location of wetland areas [Darras et al., 1999; Hagemann and Dümenil, 1997]. In a comparison of four wetland distribution datasets, Darras et al. [1999] found that only 28 1° grid cells classified as wetland were common to all datasets. Seasonal wetland area may be underestimated even in the highest total estimates [Darras et al., 1999]. About half of the total global wetland area simulated by BIOME4 exists only seasonally (Fig. 3.3). Additionally, wetland area is generally considered to have decreased during the last 4000 years, and especially in the last 200, as a result of anthropogenic activities [Aselmann and Crutzen, 1989; Chappellaz et al., 1993]. Wetland area may have been 1-2x10^6 km^2 greater in the preindustrial compared to the present. Thus, a global estimate of 11.0x10^6 km^2 is reasonable, however, it is difficult to assess the performance of the model precisely. Future developments in remotely sensing wetland area using passive microwave techniques (SMMR and SMM/I) [Hamilton et al., 1996; Sippel et al., 1998] and synthetic aperture radar (SAR) [Kaufman and BourgeoisChevez, 1997; Kushwaha et al., 2000] may provide a robust dataset to validate the wetland model. However, no global compilation of wetland area based on these techniques is available at the present [Matthews, 2000].

The major, permanent boreal wetlands of the Western Siberian Lowlands and Hudson Bay Lowlands are easily identifiable. In addition, smaller boreal wetlands are simulated, including the wetlands of southwest Alaska, European Arctic Russia,
3.3 Results

Finland, the Amur River lowland, and the Red Lake wetland complex of northern Minnesota. Among temperate wetlands large, potential wetlands in the Waddensee-Maas-Waal estuaries of The Netherlands, the Priep Marshes of Belarus and Poland, and the Yellow River plain in central China are simulated. The subtropical wetlands of the Florida Everglades and many small natural wetlands of South China are also simulated realistically.

In the tropics and Southern Hemisphere, major, permanent wetlands appear in the Amazon and Congo basins, along the lowlands of Sumatra, Borneo, and New Guinea, and in the delta of the Niger River. Only seasonal wetlands are found at the Mouths of the Ganges, presumably because of the extreme seasonality of precipitation related to the Monsoon. Extensive wetlands appear in the lowlands along the Rio Plata in middle South America, and in the Argentine and Uruguayan Pampas. Short-lived seasonal wetlands that have been described in semi-arid eastern Australia and on the Ganges plain were also simulated [Boon and Lee, 1997; Boon and Sorrell, 1995; Muller et al., 1994].

3.3.2 LGM wetlands

At the LGM, global wetland area increased nearly 15% compared to the potential natural present-day simulation (Table 3.1). In addition there are large shifts in the geographic distribution of wetlands. The low relief of the continental shelves promote wetland formation, especially in the tropics and in Beringia. While the wetlands of Europe, northern Siberia, and Hudson Bay are covered by ice sheets, large wetland areas appear in Beringia, on the Sunda and New Guinea Shelves, and the Atlantic coastal shelves of North and South America. The wetlands of the Yellow-Yangtze River delta expand out to the China Sea shelf and greatly increase in extent compared to the present potential simulation. Wetlands in the Amazon and Congo basins remain roughly the same size. Our prediction of wetland areas are supported by evidence from shallow marine cores shows that extensive river and wetland sys-
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Hanebuth et al., 2000]. Pollen and other paleovegetation data indicate the existence of wetland vegetation on Beringia and southeastern North America [Edwards et al., in press; Webb et al., 1993].

3.3.3 CH₄ emissions

Simulated CH₄ emissions for the present-day are 140 Tg per year, which is within the range of several other studies, despite the wide discrepancy in wetland area (Table 3.2) [Matthews, 2000]. The greater wetland area simulated by BIOME4 com-
3.3 Results

pared to other studies may be largely comprised of low productivity or short-lived wetlands which do not have a strong effect on the global CH$_4$ source. The soil sink for CH$_4$ is calculated as 14 Tg, similar to other results [Chappellaz et al., 1993b; Fung et al., 1991; Ridgwell et al., 1999]. The majority of global CH$_4$ emissions come from tropical wetlands in the Amazon basin and Indonesia, where in many areas net flux is simulated over 250 mg CH$_4$ m$^{-2}$ yr$^{-1}$ (Fig. 3.4). Temperate wetlands have lower annual emissions ranging between 50 and 100 mg m$^{-2}$ yr$^{-1}$. Boreal and tundra wetlands have annual emissions between 5 and 75 mg m$^{-2}$ yr$^{-1}$. These values for net CH$_4$ emissions are comparable to measurements that integrate over wide areas, though higher peak emissions may be measured at point locations [for a review see Matthews, 2000]. Sharp contrasts in CH$_4$ emission rates, and even source/sink transitions, are common over short distances within wetland complexes due to strong vegetation and topographic control [Christensen et al., 2000]. Integration over larger scales tends to reduce average net emissions per unit area, which has been observed in comparison of concurrent chamber and eddy-flux measurements [Christensen et al., 2000; Fröberg et al., 2000]. Thus, the very high net CH$_4$ fluxes (>10000 mg m$^{-2}$ yr$^{-1}$) which have been

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study</th>
<th>Present-day</th>
<th>PIH</th>
<th>LGM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>This study</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>107</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aselman and Crutzen 1989</td>
<td>80</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bartlett and Harris 1993</td>
<td>109</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cao et al. 1996</td>
<td>92</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chappellaz et al. 1993</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matthews and Fung 1987</td>
<td>110</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walter 1998</td>
<td>263</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hein et al. 1997</td>
<td>227</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Houweling 1999</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>163</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brook et al. 2000</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>111</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crutzen and Brühl 1993</td>
<td>570</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dallenbach et al. 2000</td>
<td>106</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martinerie et al. 1995</td>
<td>496</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McElroy 1989</td>
<td>180</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pinto and Khalil 1991</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>95</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valentin and Crutzen 1990</td>
<td>252</td>
<td>173</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.2. Estimated global natural CH$_4$ source in Tg per year, net of the soil CH$_4$ sink. Bottom-up methods refer to process-based estimates of the CH$_4$ source, top-down studies use measured tropospheric or ice-core CH$_4$ concentrations, and may also use isotopic composition, to infer source strengths.
reported in tropical wetlands (Smith et al., 2000), are unlikely to appear when integrated over the 5° (~85 km² in the tropics) grid cell used by the model.

At the LGM CH₄ emission rates were typically lower than emissions in the present-day simulation, with tropical wetlands reaching peak emissions of only 250 mg m⁻² yr⁻¹ (Fig. 3.4). Temperate emissions ranged between 10 and 75 mg m⁻² yr⁻¹. The global simulated net flux of CH₄ was 107 Tg yr⁻¹. Though total wetland area was 15% greater than present, the global CH₄ emissions of were 25% lower compared to the present-day potential. Mean CH₄ emissions per unit area were also lower compared to the present due to lower temperatures and substrate limitation due to low atmospheric CO₂ content. The soil sink for CH₄ is estimated at 0.6 Tg per year because the low ambient atmospheric CH₄ concentration limits the availability of CH₄ for methanotrophs.

3.4 Discussion

The distribution of global wetlands has changed significantly since the LGM. Sea level rise since the end of the glacial period has caused major shifts in global wetland area. Wetlands that once covered large parts of the continental shelves were flooded while new wetlands developed in the wake of retreating ice sheets, especially in boreal Europe and North America. However, the 15% reduction in wetland area was concurrent with a 25% increase in CH₄ production.

Low atmospheric CO₂ concentrations at the LGM limited wetland vegetation productivity that in turn caused a substrate limitation to the formation of CH₄. In a sensitivity test, I used the vegetation-wetland-CH₄ emissions model with the simulated LGM climate scenario but mid-20th century CO₂ concentrations. The result produced a global wetland CH₄ source of 140 Tg per year, identical to the pre-industrial simulated source.

The LGM CH₄ source and wetland area may be slightly overestimated because of the GCM climatology. Recent data suggest that the tropical CLIMAP SSTs used by the GCM were too warm (Farrera et al., 1999) and may therefore produce an overestimate of precipitation in the LGM tropics, leading to excess simulated wetland area and CH₄ emissions.

The terrestrial sink for CH₄ increased twentyfold from less than one Tg CH₄ per year at the LGM to nearly 15 Tg CH₄ per year in the present-day, largely due to the increase in atmospheric CH₄ concentrations. At the low CH₄ concentrations of the LGM, the model suggests that methanotrophs were unable to metabolize CH₄ from the atmosphere, limiting the potential sink. Changes in the atmospheric OH sink may therefore be needed to explain the increase in atmospheric CH₄ since the LGM. This result is in contrast to earlier studies which suggested that the long-term increases in atmospheric CH₄ concentration were the effect of changing temperature and precipitation patterns on wetlands (Table 3.2) (Chappellaz et al., 1993b; Crutzen and Bruhl, 1993; Martinerie et al., 1995; Petit-Maire et al., 1991; Pinto and
3.5 Conclusions

While the location of wetlands since the Last Glacial Maximum has changed greatly, neither the global total wetland area nor consequent CH₄ emissions changed in proportion with the observed changes in atmospheric CH₄ recorded in ice cores. CH₄ emissions are strongly controlled by substrate availability, which at the LGM was strongly limited by low atmospheric CO₂ concentrations. These results place the close co-variance of the ice-core derived polar temperatures and atmospheric CH₄ concentration into a new light, as it appears that the mechanisms controlling the global CH₄ source over glacial-interglacial time scales are less sensitive to climate change than previously thought. On shorter timescales, CH₄ from boreal wetlands may respond rapidly to climate change, as recent work has suggested [Worthy et al., 2000].

CH₄ concentrations increased simultaneously with polar temperature at the end of the LGM [Blunier et al., 1995; Brook et al., 2000]. It has been proposed that sudden releases of methane hydrates from unstable continental shelves could be the cause of the change in ice core CH₄ and a trigger for increased polar temperatures [Nisbet, 1990; Nisbet, 1992]. However, subsequent, high-resolution ice-core analyses have failed to find the extreme CH₄ “spike” that would be expected under this hypothesis [Brook et al., 2000; Chappellaz et al., 2000; Dallenbach et al., 2000].

Other abiotic factors may have triggered the increase of atmospheric CH₄. This study shows that the large wetland areas in western Siberia and Beringia were relatively small CH₄ sources at the LGM. The wetlands of present-day northern Siberia were not glaciated at the LGM; CH₄ emissions there were limited at the LGM by low temperatures. Recent field studies have emphasized the importance of frozen peat as a potential CO₂ and CH₄ source [Christensen, 1999]. Short-term warming events in the high northern latitudes may have led to formation of CH₄ from wetlands in the thawing tundra. Ice-core analyses have suggested that the rapid increase in CH₄ seen at the beginning of the Bølling-Allerød interstadial, were due in large part to northern hemisphere extra-tropical wetlands [Brook et al., 2000; Dallenbach et al., 2000].

Later as sea level rose, tropical wetlands were inundated, reducing total wetland area, which may have counteracted the short-term effect of increased northern CH₄ production. Tropical wetlands have CH₄ emission rates typically five times greater...
per unit area than boreal wetlands; even a small decrease in tropical wetland area could have a large impact on the total global CH$_4$ source. These hypotheses rest largely on our knowledge of the processes controlling CH$_4$ formation on land and destruction in the atmosphere. While much good data exist on CH$_4$ production from boreal and Arctic wetlands, better process-based understanding of CH$_4$ emission in tropical wetlands is critical. Tropical wetlands account for more than half of present-day wetland CH$_4$ emissions. Some data exist for paddy rice and subtropical wet-grasslands but the wide range of oxidation potential and net CH$_4$ emission measured in temperate and boreal ecosystems leads us to expect the same wide range in tropical systems. Furthermore, while there is a good understanding of their chemistry, the natural sources of other reactive trace gases at the Earth’s surface are even less well quantified. Better unified models of biogenic trace gas sources and chemistry, are needed to properly assess the natural role of CH$_4$ and its feedbacks on the global climate system.
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4 The stable carbon isotope composition of the terrestrial biosphere

Modeling at scales from the leaf to the globe
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Abstract. Global datasets of the stable carbon isotope composition of plant leaves, of CO₂ in canopy air, and of CO₂ in the free troposphere were compiled and compared to results of a global vegetation model (BIOME4) that simulated, at these three scales, the magnitude, direction, and timing of fluxes of CO₂ and Δ13C between the biosphere and the atmosphere. Carbon isotope data on leaves were classified into 12 Plant Functional Types (PFTs), and measurements from canopy flasks were assigned to 16 biomes, for direct comparison to model results. BIOME4 simulated the observed leaf δ13C values to within one standard deviation of the measured mean for most PFTs. Modeled δ13C for C₃ grasses, tundra shrubs, and herbaceous plants of cold climates deviated only slightly more from measurements, perhaps as a result of the wide geographic range and a limited set of measurements of these PFTs. Modeled ecosystem isotopic discrimination against 13C (Δe) averaged 18.6‰ globally when simulating potential natural vegetation and 18.1‰ when an agricultural crop mask was superimposed. The difference was mainly due to the influence of C₄ agriculture in areas that are naturally dominated by C₃ vegetation. Model results show a gradient in Δe among C₃-dominated biomes as a result of stomatal responses to aridity; this model result is supported by canopy air measurements. At the troposphere scale, BIOME4 was coupled to an adjacent atmospheric tracer transport matrix to simulate seasonally varying concentrations of CO₂ and Δ13C at remote northern-hemisphere measuring stations. Ocean CO₂ and Δ13C flux fields were included, using the HAMOCC3 ocean biogeochemistry model [Six and Maier-Reimer, 1996]. Model results and observations show similar seasonal cycles, and the model reproduces the inferred latitudinal trend towards smaller isotopic discrimination by the biosphere at lower latitudes. These results indicate that biologically mediated variations in Δ13C discrimination by terrestrial ecosystems may be significant for atmospheric inverse modeling of carbon sources and sinks, and that such variations can be simulated using a process-based model.

4.1 Introduction

Sources and sinks of carbon (C) in the terrestrial biosphere and the ocean can in principle be separated using measurements of the concentration and stable isotope
The stable carbon isotope composition of the terrestrial biosphere has been used to partition the sources and sinks of atmospheric CO₂ between oceanic and terrestrial components. Because the terrestrial biosphere discriminates strongly against 13C during photosynthesis, the 13C/12C ratio of CO₂ in the atmosphere (δ¹³C) has been used to partition the sources and sinks of atmospheric CO₂ between terrestrial and oceanic components. However, the partitioning calculation is sensitive to various quantitative assumptions. A 10% inaccuracy in the assumed carbon isotopic composition of the terrestrial biosphere will produce a change in the inferred terrestrial C sink equal to the entire magnitude of the sink. Furthermore, the carbon isotope signature of the terrestrial biosphere may change from year to year as vegetation composition and carbon-exchange characteristics respond to interannual climatic variability. Optimal use of atmospheric CO₂ observations for studying the global carbon cycle therefore requires both extensive, precise observations of δ¹³C of CO₂ in the atmosphere, and the development of models that can reliably simulate spatial and temporal variability in terrestrial C isotope discrimination.

Here, a global terrestrial vegetation model (BIOME4) is used to simulate the isotopic signature of the terrestrial biosphere. The model results are compared to measurements at three scales: leaf, canopy, and free atmosphere. The simulated δ¹³C of plant leaves is compared to estimates of δ¹³C based on leaf δ¹³C measurements. Simulated total ecosystem discrimination Δₑ is compared to canopy-level measurements. The seasonal cycle of tropospheric CO₂ and δ¹³C is simulated by combining BIOME4 with an ocean biogeochemistry model and coupling the resultant flux field to an atmospheric tracer transport matrix. The simulated CO₂ concentrations and δ¹³C of atmospheric CO₂ are compared to measurements of free tropospheric air at several stations in the NOAA/CMDL global sampling network.

4.2 Methods

4.2.1 δ¹³C of plant leaves

We compiled a global dataset of over 1000 measurements of δ¹³C in plant leaves from a wide range of terrestrial ecosystems. Each plant measurement was classified into one of 12 plant functional types (PFTs). The PFTs represent the major bioclimatic types and growth forms of terrestrial plants and were defined so as to be directly comparable to those used by the vegetation model. Each PFT was represented by at least 50 samples from different individuals. δ¹³C measurements on agricultural crops were not included in the
dataset. When $\Delta_{\text{leaf}}$ was not directly reported, it was calculated from $\delta^{13}$C measurements using

$$
\Delta_{\text{leaf}} = \frac{\delta_{\text{atm}} - \delta_{\text{leaf}}}{1 + \delta_{\text{leaf}}} \quad (4.1)
$$

where $\delta_{\text{atm}}$ was assigned the late 20th century mean atmospheric background value of -8‰ [Ehleringer et al., 1987; Körner et al., 1988; Körner et al., 1991].

4.2.2 Ecosystem $\delta^{13}$C

We compiled a global dataset of $\Delta_{\text{e}}$ at the ecosystem level from air flask samples taken at 46 field sites spanning 42° S to 63° N latitude. For a detailed description of the flask sampling strategy and $\Delta_{\text{e}}$ calculation see Buchmann and Kaplan [in press]. The $\delta^{13}$C of respired CO$_2$ during ecosystem respiration ($\delta^{13}$C$_{\text{ER}}$) represents a weighted average of all respiration processes within the ecosystem. The “Keeling plot” method was used to infer $\Delta_{\text{e}}$ [Buchmann et al., 1998; Keeling, 1958; Keeling, 1961]. This method has several advantages over scaling results from small-scale enclosure studies (i.e. on foliage, stem and soil respiration) to an ecosystem level to estimate ecosystem respiration [Lavigne et al., 1997]. The Keeling plot method integrates spatially over all autotrophic and heterotrophic respiration fluxes within the ecosystem. Furthermore, it results in a flux-weighted estimate of $\delta^{13}$C$_{\text{ER}}$ that includes both plant respiration as well as fast and slowly decomposing carbon pools and their carbon isotope signatures.

The Keeling plot [Keeling, 1958; Keeling, 1961] is based on the principle that the measured, time-varying atmospheric concentration of a tracer can be expressed as a combination of a background amount already present in the atmosphere and an amount that is added or removed by sources or sinks:

$$
C_{\text{ER}} = C_{\text{atm}} \cdot G_{\text{atm}} + C_{\text{source}} \cdot G_{\text{source}} \quad (4.2)
$$

where $C_{\text{ER}}$, $C_{\text{atm}}$ and $C_{\text{source}}$ are the concentrations of the tracer in the respired air, the free atmosphere, and in the contributing source respectively. The isotope ratios of these components conform to the mass balance equation:

$$
C_{\text{ER}} \delta_{\text{ER}} = C_{\text{atm}} \delta_{\text{atm}} \cdot G_{\text{atm}} + C_{\text{source}} \delta_{\text{source}} \cdot G_{\text{source}} \quad (4.3)
$$

where $\delta_{\text{atm}}$, $\delta_{\text{ER}}$ and $\delta_{\text{source}}$ represent the isotopic composition of the tracer in the respired air, in the atmosphere and the source, respectively.
Combining Eqs. 4.2 and 4.3 and rearranging results in:

$$\delta_{ER} = \left[ \frac{\delta_{atm} - \delta_{source}}{C_{atm}} \right] \times \frac{1}{C_{ER}} \times \delta_{source}.$$  (4.4)

Thus, when $\delta_{ER}$ is plotted versus $1/C_{ER}$, the slope of a line fit through the data estimates $C_{atm}$ ($\delta_{atm} - \delta_{source}$) and the intercept of the line estimates $\delta_{source}$.

The isotopic composition of respired CO$_2$ is used to determine ecosystem discrimination ($\Delta_e$) using:

$$\Delta_e = \frac{\delta_{trop} - \delta_{resp}}{\delta_{resp}}$$  (4.5)

where $\delta_{trop}$ and $\delta_{resp}$ represent the $\delta^{13}C$ values of tropospheric and respired CO$_2$ [Buchmann et al., 1998; Buchmann and Kaplan, in press].

The Keeling plot is subject to error from the extrapolated intercept of the linear regression. Because the intercept is many units away from the actual measurements, small errors in measuring either the isotope ratios or concentration of the tracer can lead to large errors in the extrapolation. Recycling of respired CO$_2$ may also contribute to errors in estimating the $\delta$ values of respired CO$_2$ [Buchmann et al., 1998; Sternberg, 1989]. Nevertheless, the Keeling plot is generally considered a reliable method for estimating ecosystem discrimination and is widely used in studies at scales from canopy measurements integrating 10-100 m$^2$ to aircraft measurements covering hundreds of km$^2$ [Buchmann et al., 1998; Lloyd et al., in press].

Results for 46 sites in natural ecosystems were used in this analysis [Buchmann and Kaplan, in press] (original data are available as part of the BASIN initiative: http://gcte-focus1.org/basin.html). When more than one estimate of the $\delta^{13}C$ signature of ecosystem respiration was published, we calculated a growing-season mean [Buchmann et al., 1998].

### 4.2.3 Tropospheric $\delta^{13}C$

Changes in CO$_2$ concentration and $\delta^{13}C$ over the seasonal cycle can be used to estimate the $\delta^{13}C$ signature of the CO$_2$ source, also using the Keeling plot method. We calculated the isotopic signature of the CO$_2$ source at six Northern Hemisphere measuring stations in the NOAA/GMDL Cooperative Flask Sampling Network (Table 4.1) [Conway et al., 1994]. Within this network, tropospheric air samples are collected in remote areas and analyzed for CO$_2$ and $\delta^{13}C$ at regular intervals; we used the monthly mean concentrations and isotope ratios in our source calculations [Trolier et al., 1996] (see also http://www.cmdl.noaa.gov/ccgg/index.html). We chose stations with a wide distribution in latitude, elevation, and position relative to the continents. The measuring stations are located on oceanic islands (Cape Kumakahi, Mauna Loa, Ragged Point), continental margins (Barrow, Alert) and in a high-elevation, mid-continental location (Niwot Ridge). Stations with less than
two years of record available in the public domain were not considered. Monthly mean data were normalized to remove the long-term trend, then averaged for each month over the number of years in the record \cite{Bakwin1998}. Only months of data where both CO2 and δ13C were simultaneously available were used in computing the monthly values.

Table 4.1. Troposphere measuring stations used in calculations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Station name</th>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Longitude</th>
<th>Latitude</th>
<th>Elevation m.a.s.l.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alert</td>
<td>ALT</td>
<td>Ellesmere Island, Canada</td>
<td>62° 31' W</td>
<td>82° 27' N</td>
<td>210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Point Barrow</td>
<td>BRW</td>
<td>Alaska, USA</td>
<td>156° 36' W</td>
<td>71° 19' N</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Niwot Ridge</td>
<td>NWR</td>
<td>Colorado, USA</td>
<td>105° 35' W</td>
<td>40° 03' N</td>
<td>3475</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mauna Loa</td>
<td>MLO</td>
<td>Hawaii, USA</td>
<td>153° 35' W</td>
<td>19° 32' N</td>
<td>1997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cape Kumukahi</td>
<td>KUM</td>
<td>Hawaii, USA</td>
<td>153° 49' W</td>
<td>19° 51' N</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ragged Point</td>
<td>RPB</td>
<td>Barbados</td>
<td>59° 26' W</td>
<td>13° 10' N</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.2.4 The BIOME4 vegetation model

BIOME4 is an equilibrium terrestrial biosphere model based on the BIOME3 model of \cite{Haxeltine1996}. BIOME4’s differences from its predecessor include the addition of a module to calculate isotopic discrimination during photosynthesis ($\Delta_{leaf}$), re-parameterization of the original PFTs with the aim of reproducing vegetation distribution and biogeochemistry more realistically, and the addition of several new PFTs to reflect poorly represented vegetation types in cold environments and the arid subtropics. Like BIOME3, BIOME4 is a coupled carbon and water flux model that predicts global vegetation distribution, structure, and biogeochemistry taking into account interactions between these aspects. The model requires as input: latitude; long-term mean monthly values of temperature, precipitation, and relative cloudiness; absolute minimum temperature ($T_{min}$); ambient CO2 concentration; and soil water holding capacity and percolation rate (usually based on soil textural data).

In BIOME4, 12 PFTs represent broad physiologically distinct classes of vegetation ranging from cushion forbs, characteristic of extremely cold environments, to desert shrubs and tropical rainforest trees. Each PFT is assigned absolute bioclimatic tolerance limits that determine whether or not its net primary productivity (NPP) is calculated. Such limits are only defined in those cases where a known mechanism exists that restricts the possible range of the PFT (e.g. frost tolerance) \cite{Kaplan1938,Buchmann1998}. The core of the model is a coupled carbon and water flux scheme, which determines the value of leaf area index (LAI) that maximizes NPP for each allowable PFT. Given a certain soil water
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Table 4.2. Biomes simulated by BIOME4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Biome</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Tropical evergreen broadleaf forest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Tropical semi-evergreen forest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Tropical deciduous broadleaf forest and woodland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Temperate deciduous broadleaf forest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Temperate evergreen needleleaf forest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Warm-temperate evergreen broadleaf and mixed forest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Cool mixed forest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Cool evergreen needleleaf forest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Cool-temperate evergreen needleleaf and mixed forest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Cold evergreen forest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Cold deciduous forest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Tropical savanna</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Tropical xerophilic shrubland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Temperate xerophilic shrubland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Temperate sclerophyll woodland and shrubland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Temperate deciduous broadleaf savanna</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Temperate evergreen needleleaf open woodland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Cold parkland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Tropical grassland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Temperate grassland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Desert</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Graminoid and forb tundra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Low- and high-shrub tundra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Erect dwarf-shrub tundra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Prostrate dwarf-shrub tundra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Cushion-forb, lichen, and moss tundra</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

balance, calculated on a daily timestep for numerical stability (interpolated from the monthly input data), the model iteratively calculates the LAI that yields the maximum gross photosynthetic uptake and canopy conductance [Haxeltine et al., 1996]. NPP is then calculated as the difference between gross photosynthetic uptake and growth and maintenance respiration. Environmental factors, including seasonal patterns in precipitation as well as the ambient concentration of atmospheric CO₂, affect transpiration and carbon gain. PFT-specific parameters determine the sensitivity of each PFT to environmental variations. Photosynthetic pathway is PFT-specific: woody plants are generally C₃, while C₄ types represent tropical and subtropical grasses and C₃ desert shrubs (such as some Atriplex and Euphorbia species). The C₃ subtypes, NADP-ME, NAD-ME and PCK, are not separated. CAM photosynthesis is not considered.

Monthly mean NPP is summed on an annual basis for each PFT. The woody PFT with maximum NPP is considered the dominant PFT, except in special cases where grass or mixtures of grass and trees would be expected to dominate because of an
implied disturbance regime or soil moisture constraints. The combination of dominant and sub-dominant PFTs are classified into 26 biomes representing the major types of terrestrial vegetation (Table 4.2). Biogeochemical output from the model represents the dominant PFT for a grid-cell, as there is no explicit accommodation for mixed-PFT grid-cells. However, in the case of tropical savannas and other mixed tree-grass biomes, the output variables (including $\Delta_{\text{leaf}}$) are given as an NPP-weighted average of the grass and tree types.

BIOME4 simulates isotopic discrimination against $^{13}\text{C}$ during photosynthesis at the leaf level ($\Delta_{\text{leaf}}$) and total ecosystem discrimination ($\Delta_{e}$) (Fig. 4.1) [Buchmann et al., 1998; Flanagan and Ehleringer, 1998]. The discrimination model for $\Delta_{\text{leaf}}$ is similar in principle to that of Lloyd and Farquhar [1994]. The main difference is that BIOME4 explicitly simulates the concentration of CO$_2$ inside the leaf using a process-based representation of canopy conductance. The maximum potential intercellular-to-atmospheric CO$_2$ concentration ($c_i/c_a$) ratio is prescribed for each PFT, but the actual $c_i/c_a$ is subsequently modeled as the water-limited $c_i/c_a$, less than or equal to the defined maximum, which can yield a reduced evapotranspiration rate consistent with water limitation. Maximum $c_i/c_a$ ratios were compiled from a literature survey on laboratory studies and from minimum $\delta^{13}C$ values measured for leaf material of all PFTs.

Monthly $\Delta_e$ values are estimated as the flux-weighted difference in discrimination against $^{13}\text{C}$ from NPP and heterotrophic respiration ($R_h$). Photosynthate, with a specific $^{13}\text{C}$ content determined by the $\Delta_{\text{leaf}}$ value, is incorporated into the plant on a seasonally integrated flux-weighted basis. A simple model for $R_h$ determines the monthly flux of respired CO$_2$ and $^{13}\text{CO}_2$ to the atmosphere [Foley, 1995; Lloyd and Taylor, 1994]. The source of respired CO$_2$ is the aggregated annual NPP for the dominant vegetation type in a grid-cell. This carbon stock is divided into three pools which represent different turnover times [Foley, 1995; Sitch, 2000]. Each pool is subjected to a small isotopic fractionation ($\Delta_{\text{decomp}}$) during respiration based upon the assumed decay rate of the pool (0.1-1‰). Because the processes underlying carbon isotope fractionation during respiration are poorly understood, fractionation in each pool is assigned a constant value which increases with pool age [Buchmann et al., 1998; Buchmann and Kaplan, in press; Ehleringer et al., 2000].

We ran BIOME4 at a global spatial resolution of 0.5° x 0.5°, driven by the CLIMATE 2.2 global gridded climatology [W. Cramer, pers. comm. 1998] (http://www.pik-potsdam.de/~cramer/climate.htm), which is an updated version of [Lee-mans and Cramer, 1991]. Ambient CO$_2$ concentration was set at the mean pCO$_2$ during the period on which the climatology is based. Soil physical parameters were derived from a global soils dataset using the IGBP/FAO soil properties scheme, which associates soil name, texture and phase, and drainage classes with water holding capacity and percolation rate [FAO, 1995]. Global $T_{\text{act}}$ data were provided by P.J. Bartlein [pers. comm. 1998].

We generated an agricultural land-use mask for the BIOME4 simulations. The base mask represents the fractional area of agricultural crop land use in a 0.5° grid cell identified in satellite imagery for the early 1990’s [Ramankutty and Foley, 1999].
We identified areas traditionally dominated by C₄ crops using an economic atlas [Jones, 1972]. All agricultural grid cells were simulated with the C₃ and C₄ grass PFTs to obtain alternative C fluxes and δ¹³C values. The resulting output was merged with the standard potential natural vegetation simulation of BIOME4. Outside of the climatological limits of C₄ crops, agricultural fluxes were considered to be 100% C₃. Elsewhere, agricultural fluxes were considered 80% C₃ and 20% C₄, except in certain defined places with a concentration of C₄ agriculture (e.g. North American corn belt, sugar cane areas of the Caribbean and Australia) where fluxes were assumed to be 80% C₄ and 20% C₃.

To simulate δ¹³C and [CO₂] at the troposphere level, a global flux field of CO₂ and δ¹³C was generated by combining BIOME4 with output from the HAMOCC3 ocean biogeochemistry model [Six and Maier-Reimer, 1996]. The seasonal cycle of CO₂ and δ¹³C at specific free-troposphere measuring stations were then simulated with the flux field as input to an adjoint tracer transport matrix derived from the TM2 atmospheric tracer transport model [Kaminski et al., 1996].
3 Results and discussion

4.3 Results and discussion

4.3.1 13C at the leaf scale

Modeled and measured $\Delta_{leaf}$ varied from $< 6\%$ in C4 grasses to $> 23\%$ in tropical broadleaf trees (Fig. 4.2). At the PFT level, the strong bi-modal distribution of $\Delta_{leaf}$ between C3 and C4 photosynthesis is apparent. Agreement between measured and simulated $\Delta_{leaf}$ is good: values correspond within $< 2\%$ for most PFTs; well within 1 standard deviation around the measured mean ($~4\%$ for most PFTs). Among C3 PFTs, $\Delta_{leaf}$ varies $~4\%$ in the simulation and slightly less in measurements. This variability among C3 PFTs demonstrates the sensitivity of $\Delta_{leaf}$ to increasingly arid eco-climates, caused by the stomatal response to decreasing soil moisture and increasing vapor pressure deficit. It is a feature visible in the data and successfully simulated by the model. The model also captures the difference in $\Delta_{leaf}$ between C4 grasses and C4 desert shrubs. These results show that the model can simulate the diversity in carbon isotope discrimination measured among plants with different ranges and adaptations to climate.

Among C4 plants, tropical broadleaf trees (1 in Fig. 4.2) have both the greatest measured and modeled $\Delta_{leaf}$. High ratios of carbon assimilation to stomatal conductance found in tropical trees result in high $c_i/c_a$ ratios, and therefore in low leaf carbon isotope discrimination [Farquhar et al., 1989]. Minimum $\Delta_{leaf}$ for C4 plants is measured in cushion forbs (12) but simulated in C3 grasses (7). Simulated $\Delta_{leaf}$
values for the C3 grass (7) and cold herbaceous (11) PFTs are lower than their measured values. Measured values of $\Delta_{\text{leaf}}$ in these PFTs may be biased towards samples from mesic habitats, while the simulated $\Delta_{\text{leaf}}$ represents mainly the arid environments where the PFTs dominate. However, arid grasslands and dry tundra do not contribute greatly to global terrestrial carbon exchange; inaccuracy in model prediction is unlikely to influence the global terrestrial carbon isotope signature. Cold deciduous trees (6) (e.g. *Larix*, *Betula*, *Sorbus*) have higher $\Delta_{\text{leaf}}$ values than cold evergreen trees (5) with which they sometimes co-exist, presumably because of their physiological ability to transpire more water and hence achieve a higher $c_i/c_a$ ratio. These model results are corroborated by field studies on leaf $\delta^{13}C$ ratios [Klöppel et al., 1998; Lloyd and Farquhar, 1994]. C4 grasses (8) have lower $\Delta_{\text{leaf}}$ compared to C4 shrubs (9) because of differences in both leaf anatomy and photosynthetic pathway (i.e. the NAD, NADP, and PCK subtypes). These differences observed in the data are implicit in the model parameterizations and captured successfully by the simulation.

4.3.2 $^{13}C$ at the ecosystem scale

Biome-averaged measured $\Delta_e$ varied globally between 13.5‰ and 21.0‰. Temperate grassland, comprised of a mix of C3 and C4 vegetation, had the lowest $\Delta_e$ (Fig. 4.3, Table 4.3). Physiological constraints on C3 photosynthesis, as well as the expression of the C4 photosynthetic pathway, are responsible for this large global variability in $\Delta_e$.

Model results for $\Delta_e$ display several features reflecting global trends in vegetation composition and water status. Generally, ecosystems in superhumid environments...
show the highest simulated \( \Delta_e \) values (21-22‰), whereas C\(_4\) dominated tropical grasslands have the lowest \( \Delta_e \) values (<5‰). Measured and modeled mean \( \Delta_e \) agree within 1‰ for most biomes (Fig. 4.3), which is considerably less than the measured or modeled variability within biomes (Table 4.3). Within the area of C\(_3\) dominated vegetation, there is a wide range of \( \Delta_e \) values, representing changing water status of the vegetation and plant adaptations to more or less arid environments (Fig. 4). Deserts have characteristically low \( \Delta_e \) values due to the common occurrence of C\(_4\) species and restricted transpiration by C\(_3\) plants. Latitudinal averages of flux-weighted \( \Delta_e \) estimates display a tri-modal distribution, with maximum \( \Delta_e \) values in the boreal zones of both hemispheres and in the humid tropics (Fig. 4.4). Tropical rain forests (between 10° N and S) mask the signal from C\(_4\)-dominated equatorial grasslands, such as those in East Africa. In the boreal zone (between 55° and 80° N), \( \Delta_e \) is generally high because of low ratios of assimilation to stomatal conductance in boreal plants. In addition, waterlogged soils due to permafrost and low evaporative demand in cool-climate regions tend to increase \( \Delta_e \). Mean values for modeled \( \Delta_e \) estimates are lowest in subtropical C\(_4\) dominated grasslands, especially in Africa and Australia. In the temperate prairies of central North America and Eurasia, C\(_4\) grasslands are only seasonally dominant and share latitude bands with both forests and deserts. In these regions, \( \Delta_e \) values are intermediate.

Discrepancies between measured and modeled \( \Delta_e \) may be due to both model and measurements. Limitations to the modeled values may come from generalization inherent in the model and inadequate parameterization of the PFTs. However, the main sources of disagreement between model and measurements stem from the limited number of measurements of \( \Delta_e \) available for a particular biome (one to five point measurements) compared to the wide bioclimatic space integrated by the model, even for a single biome (10°-10° km\(^2\)). Two other sources of error should be
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4.3.3 Scaling \( \Delta \) from leaf to ecosystem

Because canopy \( \Delta \) measurements are time-consuming and require special apparatus, it has been recently proposed that leaf \( \delta^{13}C \) measurements be used to approximate ecosystem discrimination [Bonal et al., 2000; Ehleringer, 1997]. As BIOME4 scales from the leaf to the ecosystem level, we can test the premise that leaf carbon isotope composition should be related to \( \Delta \). We plotted PFT-average \( \Delta_{\text{leaf}} \) against associated biome-average \( \Delta \) for the 12 basic PFTs, and the single combination tree-grass PFT, in BIOME4 (Fig. 4.5). Reflecting the strong control of \( \Delta_{\text{leaf}} \) on the carbon isotope composition of an ecosystem, \( \Delta_{\text{leaf}} \) and \( \Delta \) are highly correlated. A fit-line through the C3 plant types has the equation \( \Delta = 0.62 \Delta_{\text{leaf}} + 2.16 \) (n=24, \( r^2=0.67 \)).

Table 4.3. Measured and modeled mean ecosystem discrimination for 16 biomes where canopy flask measurements were available. Where no standard deviation is given, the measurement consisted of only one sample.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Biome</th>
<th>measured ( \Delta )</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>modeled ( \Delta )</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tropical evergreen broadleaf forest</td>
<td>18.5</td>
<td>2.34</td>
<td>21.8</td>
<td>0.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tropical semi-evergreen broadleaf forest</td>
<td>19.6</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td>21.8</td>
<td>0.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tropical deciduous broadleaf forest and woodland</td>
<td>21.0</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>21.8</td>
<td>0.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temperate deciduous forest</td>
<td>16.6</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>18.8</td>
<td>1.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temperate evergreen needleleaf forest</td>
<td>17.8</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>15.7</td>
<td>2.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warm-temperate evergreen broadleaf and mixed forest</td>
<td>16.6</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>17.0</td>
<td>1.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cool mixed forest</td>
<td>16.9</td>
<td>4.14</td>
<td>17.3</td>
<td>2.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cool evergreen needleleaf forest</td>
<td>16.8</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>17.6</td>
<td>2.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cool-temperate evergreen needleleaf and mixed forest</td>
<td>17.1</td>
<td>1.26</td>
<td>16.9</td>
<td>3.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cold evergreen needleleaf forest</td>
<td>18.4</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>19.1</td>
<td>1.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cold deciduous forest</td>
<td>19.2</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>20.1</td>
<td>2.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tropical xerophytic shrubland</td>
<td>14.9</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td>8.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temperate deciduous broadleaf savanna</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td>1.51</td>
<td>15.1</td>
<td>0.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temperate grassland</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>0.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High and low shrub tundra</td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>17.3</td>
<td>2.28</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erect dwarf-shrub tundra</td>
<td>15.6</td>
<td>16.1</td>
<td>2.01</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.3 Results and discussion

Where modeled $\Delta_{\text{leaf}}$ is significantly greater than $\Delta_e$, $\Delta_e$ is reduced by the long turnover time of C in the ecosystem. Cool mixed forests (7 and 9 in Fig. 4.5), and graminoid-forb tundra (22), have long residence times for ecosystem C because their ranges include cold, dry climates. BIOME4 integrates both climate and the structural resistance of the dominant PFT to decay (e.g. woody vs. herbaceous life-form) to approximate ecosystem turnover time. A single PFT may be dominant in several biomes, which also contributes to the differences between the means of $\Delta_{\text{leaf}}$ and $\Delta_e$. In field studies where leaf and canopy measurements have been compared, $\Delta_e$ is typically 0-2‰ less than $\Delta_{\text{leaf}}$; differential decomposition of isotopically distinct compounds in organic matter probably accounts for most of the variation [Ehleringer et al., 2000; Schmidt and Gleixner, 1998]. Thus, scaling $\Delta$ from leaf to ecosystem is possible in most cases, except for those ecosystems with very long residence time for C, where additional isotopic fractionation is most likely to occur.

4.3.4 Agricultural land-use and global $\Delta_e$

$\Delta_e$ simulated by BIOME4 with the agricultural land-use mask emphasizes the importance of $C_4$ crops in the temperate latitudes, especially in regions where the natural vegetation is forest (Fig. 4.6). The corn-growing regions of the central United States, northeastern China and the Western Mediterranean stand out. $C_4$ agriculture in sub-Saharan Africa also reduces the mean $\Delta_e$ relative to the natural vegetation. In high latitudes, the agricultural $\Delta_e$ is slightly higher than natural vegetation due to the influence of water-efficient and short-lived $C_3$ crops (Fig. 4.6). In the rest of the world, the agriculture-influenced $\Delta_e$ is lower than the value for natural vegetation from the widespread prevalence of $C_4$ crops. In all cases the agricul-
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Natural $\Delta e$ is within 1 standard deviation around the mean value for $\Delta e$ strictly from natural vegetation. Globally flux-weighted $\Delta e$ decreased slightly with the addition of the agricultural land use mask, from 18.6‰ to 18.1‰.

Global (Fig. 4.6) and latitudinal (Fig. 4.7) patterns in $\Delta e$ show that carbon isotope discrimination is heterogeneous and affected by agricultural land use. Other forms of land use, for example where forest has been converted to pasture in the tropics, may have a stronger effect on global $\Delta e$. Improved data sets on the nature and timing of land use and change are required before a more detailed assessment of land-use effects on $\Delta e$ can be made.

Fig. 4.6. Ecosystem discrimination simulated by BIOME4: a for potential natural vegetation, b including an agricultural land-use mask.
Bakwin et al. [1998], in their survey of mainly continental sampling locations, estimated a mean $\Delta_e$ for terrestrial ecosystems of 16.8‰. This value is smaller than the value of 18.1‰ we compute globally. The differences might be due to the influence of long-distance transport of CO$_2$ to the oceanic stations and to the omission of fossil fuel from our analysis. The modeled latitudinal gradient of $\delta^{13}$C is somewhat steeper than that presented by Bakwin et al. [1998], but it is within the range both of canopy measurements and of the entire CMDL dataset. Our global flux-weighted model estimate of $\Delta_e$ is also 2-4‰ greater than values inferred from previous modeling studies by Fung et al. [1997] and Lloyd and Farquhar [1994]. Bakwin et al. [1998] suggested that these earlier modeling studies may not be supported by atmospheric observations. The Lloyd and Farquhar [1994] discrimination probably overemphasizes the importance of C$_4$ photosynthesis at mid-latitudes of the northern hemisphere, while the simulation of Fung et al. [1997] has a stronger latitudinal gradient than either this study or tropospheric measurements [Bakwin et al., 1998].

### 4.3.5 $^{13}$C at the troposphere scale

Keeling plots for the six selected northern-hemisphere measuring stations show generally good agreement between modeled and measured CO$_2$ concentrations and $^{13}$C ratios (Fig. 4.8). The y-intercept of the line fit to the Keeling plot data indicates the isotopic signature of the source CO$_2$; modeled and measured values compare reasonably well (Table 4.4). With decreasing latitude, the slope of the Keeling plot decreases and the inferred source $^{13}$C becomes slightly more positive. The influence of C$_4$ vegetation and increasing water stress cause the general enrichment with
Fig. 4.8. Keeling plots of the measured left column and modeled right column CO₂ concentration and δ13C at Northern Hemisphere free-troposphere measuring stations. See Table 4.1 for legend.
latitude. The seasonal cycle of CO₂ and δ¹³C is less pronounced in lower latitudes, but for these stations (MLO, KUM, RPB) the fit of the trend line is still good as the stations integrate sources of CO₂ from wide regions [Kaminski et al., 1996]. Niwot Ridge and Ragged Point have lower inferred δ¹³C source signals compared to the other stations because their fetches integrate significant areas of C₄ vegetation from the interior plains of North America and the tropics, respectively. The seasonal trend is similar in the measured and modeled results for all stations. At the highest latitudes (stations ALT and BRW), the intercepts of the Keeling plots are 2-3‰ more negative in the measurements than the model simulation indicates. At mid-latitudes the simulation fits the measured data more closely. Disagreement between the measured and modeled δ¹³C may be caused by inaccuracies in the timing and magnitude of the modeled biosphere fluxes of both CO₂ and ¹³C. However, the tracer transport and ocean models both add uncertainty to the final prediction of source δ¹³C. A sensitivity test suggests that the ocean δ¹³C, which is included in the modeled δ¹³C and CO₂ of the troposphere, does not affect simulated y-intercept δ¹³C at troposphere stations by more than ±0.5‰. Finally, in modeling δ¹³C the impact of fossil fuel combustion was not included. Fossil fuel does not make a large contribution to the seasonal cycle of either CO₂ or δ¹³C [Heimann et al., 1998; Heimann et al., 1989] but ignoring its seasonality could give rise to a small discrepancy between model and observations.

4.4 Conclusions

This study has provided a robust initial modeling platform for simulating the carbon isotopic composition of the biosphere. The model reproduces estimates of carbon isotope discrimination in a generally successful manner at three scales.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Station</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Slope</th>
<th>SE of slope</th>
<th>Intercept</th>
<th>SE of intercept</th>
<th>r²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ALT</td>
<td>measured</td>
<td>6713</td>
<td>75.5</td>
<td>-26.70</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>0.999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>modeled</td>
<td>7170</td>
<td>123.6</td>
<td>-28.08</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>0.997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRW</td>
<td>measured</td>
<td>6410</td>
<td>79.6</td>
<td>-23.87</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>0.998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>modeled</td>
<td>7275</td>
<td>107.5</td>
<td>-28.37</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>0.998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NWR</td>
<td>measured</td>
<td>6064</td>
<td>237.4</td>
<td>-26.23</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>0.987</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>modeled</td>
<td>6536</td>
<td>190.4</td>
<td>-26.29</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>0.992</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MLO</td>
<td>measured</td>
<td>6593</td>
<td>184.2</td>
<td>-26.32</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>0.992</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>modeled</td>
<td>6779</td>
<td>112.5</td>
<td>-26.98</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>0.997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KUM</td>
<td>measured</td>
<td>7251</td>
<td>185.4</td>
<td>-28.19</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>0.993</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>modeled</td>
<td>6834</td>
<td>108.3</td>
<td>-27.13</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>0.997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RPB</td>
<td>measured</td>
<td>6064</td>
<td>282.3</td>
<td>-24.82</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>0.979</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>modeled</td>
<td>5283</td>
<td>363.1</td>
<td>-22.67</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>0.955</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The stable carbon isotope composition of the terrestrial biosphere represents processes from the leaf to the globe. More extensive information on the distribution and type of land use should add further power to such data-model comparisons. Future work will also incorporate the modeling framework into a dynamic global vegetation model (DGVM) [Sitch, 2000], capable of capturing the interannual variability in CO$_2$ and $^{13}$C fluxes, which is central to current observationally-based analyses of the global C budget [Bakwin et al., 1998; Battle et al., 2000].
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Fig. 1.2. Present-day potential natural vegetation simulated by BIOME4 using a late 20th century mean climatology [W. Cramer, pers. comm.] and appropriate CO2 concentration (324 ppm).