

Monitoring and analysis on blue carbon fluxes in coastal mangrove restoration area in Southern Zhejiang Province, China

> Xianglan Li Beijing Normal University July 27th, 2019 Email: xlli@bnu.edu.cn

The 16th China-US Carbon Consortium Annual Workshop



- Research background
- Observation platform
 - EC-LGR-SIF automatic system
 - Aerial photography
 - Monitoring items
- Results and discussion
 - Impact of tide on CH₄/CO₂ fluxes in mangrove ecosystem
 - Impact of vegetation types on CH₄ and CO₂ fluxes
 - Soil organic carbon stock across soil salinity gradient
- Conclusions and implications





Coastal blue carbon plays great role in carbon sink.

- Mangrove forests
- Saltmarsh
- Seaweed bed



(Webb et al., 2013, NCC; Mcleod et al., 2011)

Due to sea level rising, 20% global wetland will disappear by 2080.

- Carbon emission
- Ecological function loss
- Extreme climate
- Relocation and migration







(1) Impact of tide on CH_4/CO_2 fluxes in mangrove ecosystem





Impact of tide on CH4/CO2 fluxes in mangrove ecosystem



















Impact of tide on CH₄/CO₂ fluxes in cordgrass ecosystem













CH₄ fluxes in mangrove from different time scales









- Spring tide: CH₄ decreasing
- Neap tide: CH₄ increasing
- Mean Flux: 16.6 mg C m⁻² d⁻¹

Neap > Spring

CH₄ fluxes in cordgrass from different time scales

Diurnal variation





07/01/2018 07/02/2018 07/03/2018 07/04/2018 07/05/2018 07/06/2018 07/07/2018 07/08/2018

Seasonal variation



- Spring tide: CH₄ decreasing
- Neap tide: CH₄ increasing
- Mean Flux: 11.2 mg C m⁻² d⁻¹
 Neap > Spring
 Cordgrass<Mangrove

CO₂ fluxes in mangrove from different time scales

Monthly variation

Diurnal variation





07/01/2018 07/02/2018 07/03/2018 07/04/2018 07/05/2018 07/06/2018 07/07/2018 07/08/2018

-4.0

Seasonal variation



- Spring tide: CO₂ decreasing
- Neap tide: CO₂ increasing
- Mean NEE: -1888 mg C m⁻² d⁻¹
 - Sink: Neap > Spring

CO₂ fluxes in cordgrass from different time scales

Monthly variation

Diurnal variation



1.5 4月互花米草CO2通量(umol/(m²·s)) 1.0 溯期 0.5 0.0 - CO2 -0.5 -1.0 -1.5 -2.0 -2.5 -3.0 -3.5 -4.0 04/10/2018 04/13/2018 04/16/2018 04/19/2018 04/22/2018 04/25/2018 04/28/2018 0.5 5月互花米草CO2通量(umol/(m²·s)) -0.5 -1.5 -2.5 -3.5 -4.5 -5.5 -6.5 05/01/2018 05/06/2018 05/11/2018 05/16/2018 05/21/2018 05/26/2018 05/31/2018 0.0 -1.0 6月互花米草CO2通量(umol/(m²·s)) -2.0 -3.0 -4.0 -5.0 -6.0 -7.0 -8.0 -9.0 -10.0 -11.0 -12.0 -13.0 06/01/2018 06/06/2018 06/11/2018 06/16/2018 06/21/2018 06/26/2018 0.0 ol/(m²·s)) -1.0 -2.0 -3.0 7月互花米草co2通量(ui -4.0 -5.0 -6.0

07/01/2018 07/02/2018 07/03/2018 07/04/2018 07/05/2018 07/06/2018 07/07/2018 07/08/2018

-7.0

Seasonal variation



- Spring: CO₂ decreasing
- Neap: CO₂ increasing
- Mean NEE: -3818 mg C m⁻² d⁻¹

Sink: Neap > Spring

Cordgrass > Mangrove

GCESS

EC based NEE variations and the response to par



- At night, spring tide, Rsoil relatively high.
- During day time, spring tide>neap tide.

$$\mathsf{NEE} = -\frac{A_{\mathsf{max}} \alpha \mathsf{PAR}}{A_{\mathsf{max}} + \alpha \mathsf{PAR}} + R_{\mathsf{eco}}$$

Amax: light-saturated net CO₂ exchange; a: apparent quantum yield

- Amax: Spring tide (14.17) >neap tide (12.77).
- a: Spring tide (0.03) < neap tide (0.04).

NEE variation and the impact factors



NEE, GPP, and Reco during 2016-2018



- During 2016-2018, GPP, Reco, and NEE showed similar tendency with the annual carbon sink of 441.65 g C m⁻².
- NEE fluxes fluctuated at -16-4 umol m⁻² s⁻¹, in agreement with LGR results.



(2) Impact of mangrove and cordgrass on CH_4 and CO_2 fluxes





CH₄ and CO₂ fluxes from soil sources



- Both mangrove and cordgrass were the sources of CH₄ and CO₂ emissions.
- Soil CH_4 emissions: Cordgrass (0.88-13.6 mg C/(m² d)) > Mangrove (0.66-11.6 mg C/(m² d)).
- Soil CO₂ emissions: Cordgrass (86-497 mg C/(m² d)) < Mangrove (761-1049 mg C/(m² d)).
- GWP: Mangrove CO2-eq 529 g m^{-2} > Cordgrass 407 g CO2-eq m^{-2} .
- Much higher carbon sink potential would be found when the mangrove forests ages was old.

Impact factors of CH₄ and CO₂ fluxes from soil sources







- Compared with CH₄ fluxes in mangrove soil (0.66-13.6mg C m⁻² d⁻¹), mangrove forests significantly promoted CH₄ fluxes (9.9-22.4mg C m⁻² d⁻¹) by 3-18 times.
- About 60% CH₄ emitted via mangrove vegetation.





- Both mangrove and cordgrass were the sources of CH_4 (16.6-22.4; 8.0-16.5 mg C/(m² d)) and the sinks of CO_2 (1866-3117; 3202-6227 mg C/(m² d)).
- 红树林和互花米草覆被区均为大气和,互花米草土壤CH4的释放量低于红树林土壤、CO2吸收量高于 红树林。
- 互花米草覆被区CH₄排放量较低、CO₂碳汇功能较大,可能由于红树林的树龄较小(4-5年)而互花米 草长热识狂。具造成植被覆盖区复体排放通量差异的主要因素



(3) Soil organic carbon stock across soil moisture and salinity gradient





Soil properties across soil moisture and salinity gradient



Soil organic carbon stock



 Soil organic carbon stock increased across soil moisture and salinity gradient with the mean values of 40-80 Mg/ha.

Conclusions and implications

- EC-LGR-SIF automatic monitoring system supplies an important platform to analyze the carbon sink potential of mangrove forests in coastal zone.
- Spring and neap tides play great role in controlling CH₄ and CO₂ emissions from blue carbon ecosystems. From large scale, the carbon sink potential was high during the spring tide period since the response of NEE to PAR was significant. From point scale, high carbon sink potential occurred during neap tide period. The soil moisture and properties cause the difference in this study.
- Both mangrove and cordgrass were the sources of CH₄ and the sinks of CO₂. The mangrove promoted CH₄ emissions, while the cordgrass increased the carbon sink potential. As the increasing of mangrove forests age, high carbon sink potential might be found with long-term observation in this study area. Lateral carbon cycling is necessary to calculate the carbon budget of mangrove restoration regions.



Acknowledgement

- Houcai Cai, Wandong Chen, Xiaopin Ni, Nanji islands national Marine nature reserve administration.
- Jianwu Tang, Ying Huang, East China Normal University.
- Xiao Cheng, Baogang Zhang, Sen Li, Xinchen Lv, Huimin Zou, Xintong Chen, Beijing Normal University.

