



## **Assessing the seasonal cycle of simulated photosynthesis using carbonyl sulfide (COS) at a continental mixed forest site**

**S. Conner Gausepohl**(1), A.S. Denning(1), J. Berry(2), S. Montzka(3), I. Baker(1), J. Kleist(1)

(1) Colorado State University, USA

(2) Carnegie Institution of Washington, Stanford, California, USA

(3) NOAA Climate Monitoring and Diagnostics Laboratory, USA (sheri@atmos.colostate.edu)

Simulated hourly global atmospheric CO<sub>2</sub> for the years 2000, 2001 and 2003 exhibit a systematic error in the seasonal cycle of simulated Net Ecosystem Exchange (NEE) in the Northern Hemisphere mid-latitudes, characterized by early spring drawdown of CO<sub>2</sub> relative to the observations. We have evaluated the simulation of carbonyl sulfide (COS) in SiB3, a land-surface model, at a continental mixed-forest site to separately assess seasonal variations in simulated photosynthesis and ecosystem respiration. Preliminary results of our simulation at the WLEF tall tower in Wisconsin, US show that the calculation of photosynthesis (rather than ecosystem respiration) is the primary cause of the systematic error in the simulated seasonal cycle of atmospheric CO<sub>2</sub>.

The seasonal cycle of NEE, as simulated by Colorado State University's Simple Biosphere Model v. 3.0 (SiB3) [Sellers *et al.*, 1996, Baker *et al.*, 2003], a land-surface parameterization using satellite vegetation, with improved treatment of soil hydrology and soil and snow-pack thermal properties, as well as prognostic canopy temperature, moisture, CO<sub>2</sub> and isotopes, is shifted by several weeks compared with the observed seasonal cycle at many Northern Hemisphere mid-latitude sites. Identifying the mechanisms causing this shift is difficult as sources of CO<sub>2</sub> in the biosphere (autotrophic (plant) and heterotrophic (microbial) respiration) are convolved with sinks (photosynthesis) due to their similar dependencies on temperature and moisture.

COS is consumed in plant tissues by a reaction catalyzed by carbonic anhydrase, an

enzyme that catalyzes the decomposition of COS into CO<sub>2</sub> and H<sub>2</sub>S in leaf mesophyll cells. Kesselmeier [*Sandoval-Soto et al.*, 2005] has shown that COS uptake by vegetation follows a pathway through the stomata of leaves similar to that of CO<sub>2</sub> in photosynthesizing plants; however, there appears to be no corresponding source of COS in leaves. Thus, COS behaves as a tracer of stomatal conductance and gross photosynthesis over land surfaces. In addition, recent work by Montzka and Tans [2004] has shown that the amplitude of the seasonal cycles of COS and CO<sub>2</sub> are strongly correlated in the Northern Hemisphere mid- and high-latitudes. Thus, the ratio of COS uptake to CO<sub>2</sub> uptake should provide a sensitive indicator of the ratio of photosynthesis to respiration.

Also, studies by Montzka and others indicate that the background concentration of COS in the atmosphere is fairly stable (circa 500 parts per trillion) and that it should be possible to integrate a model of the biogeochemical cycle of COS with that of CO<sub>2</sub>.

Based on this research, we have performed a case study simulating COS at a well-observed temperate continental site (the WLEF tall tower in Wisconsin, US) using SiB3 to evaluate the simulated timing of spring (i.e., the seasonal change in the difference between the [COS] in the free troposphere and the mixed layer) versus the observed, using flask data for 2000 - 2005. In this pilot study, we are simulating the primary sink of COS (i.e., plant uptake) in a location far removed from its primary source (i.e., oxidation of marine biomass) [*Andreae and Crutzen, 1997*].

Simulated surface exchanges of COS systematically led those derived from observations by several weeks in the spring, indicating that the simulated initiation of photosynthesis, rather than the timing of ecosystem respiration, is the primary cause of the systematic error in the simulated seasonal cycle of the flux of CO<sub>2</sub>. The results of this work indicate that measurement and modeling of COS could provide a new window on the carbon cycle by providing insight into the terrestrial biosphere sinks of CO<sub>2</sub> and an additional constraint on the mechanisms that control these sinks.

## References

Andreae, M.O. and P.J. Crutzen (1997), Atmospheric Aerosols: Biogeochemical Sources and Role in Atmospheric Chemistry, *Science*, 276, 1052 - 1058.

Baker, I., A.S. Denning, N.P. Hanan, L. Prihodko, M. Uliasz, P.-L. Vidale, K.J. Davis, P.S. Bakwin (2003). Simulated and observed fluxes of sensible and latent heat and CO<sub>2</sub> at the WLEF-TV tower using SiB2.5. *Global Change Biology*, 9, 1262-1277.

Montzka, S. and P. Tans (2004), Can Carbonyl Sulfide Help Constrain Gross Vegetative Fluxes of Carbon Dioxide?, American Geophysical Union, Fall Meeting 2004, abstract #B21E-04, 2004AGUFM.B21E..04M.

Sandoval-Soto, L., M. Stanimirov, M. von Hobe, V. Schmitt, J. Valdes, A. Wild and J. Kesselmeier (2005) Global uptake of carbonyl sulfide (COS) by terrestrial vegetation : Estimates corrected by deposition velocities normalized to the uptake of carbon dioxide (CO<sub>2</sub>). *Biogeosciences*, 2, 125-132.

Sellers, P. J., D. A. Randall, G. J. Collatz, J.A. Berry, C.B. Field, D. A. Dazlich, C. Zhang, G. D. Colello, L. Bounoua (1996). A revised land surface parameterization (SiB2) for atmospheric GCMs.1. Model formulation. *Journal of Climate*, 9(4), 706-737.