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1. Introduction

As the second and third primary greenhouse gases, methane (CH\textsubscript{4}) and nitrous oxide (N\textsubscript{2}O) have been researched extensively for their global budgets. However, large uncertainties still exist in estimating the strength of the sources and sinks related to agricultural activities. For example, estimates of N\textsubscript{2}O emission from agricultural activities, accounting for about a quarter of the total anthropogenic emission, vary in a wide range of 0.6 to 14.8 Tg N yr\textsuperscript{-1} (Mosier et al., 1998).

Each of flux measurement methods for CH\textsubscript{4} and N\textsubscript{2}O has its own advantages and drawbacks. The chamber method can be used to quantify the component fluxes from the soil and the plant in an ecosystem, but has difficulty to tackle the heterogeneous nature of the flux on the landscape scale. The eddy covariance method, used for CO\textsubscript{2} flux measurement, has larger footprint than the chamber method, but its application in the measurement of CH\textsubscript{4} and N\textsubscript{2}O fluxes is still limited by the detection technique for CH\textsubscript{4} and N\textsubscript{2}O concentration. Instrument problems such as signal drift and high frequency loss can lead to bias up to 300% (Kroon et al., 2010a; Kroon et al., 2010b).

The flux-gradient method has similar footprint as the eddy covariance and has less stringent requirement for CH\textsubscript{4} and N\textsubscript{2}O analyzer in terms of response time and measurement frequency, (Wolf et al., 2008), but requires the assumption that all the scalar quantities are transferred indiscriminately by turbulent eddies.

The objective of this study was to quantify the CH\textsubscript{4} and N\textsubscript{2}O flux in a landscape dominated by soybean and corn cultivation. We used a modified Bowen ratio (MBR) method with the gradient measurement of CH\textsubscript{4} and N\textsubscript{2}O on a tall tower. In addition, the fluxes were tested by using Stochastic Time-Inverted Lagrangian Transport Model (STILT) and the concentration observation on 200 m.

2. Methods

The experiment took place at a tall tower site at the University of Minnesota Outreach, Research and Education Park from August to September, 2009. A tunable diode laser (TDL) and an infrared gas analyzer (IRGA) were used to measure the concentrations of CH\textsubscript{4}, N\textsubscript{2}O, CO\textsubscript{2} and H\textsubscript{2}O at the height of 3 m and 200 m above the ground (Griffis et al., 2008). The CH\textsubscript{4} and N\textsubscript{2}O concentrations measured by the TDL analyzer were calibrated against pure nitrogen, and a span gas of known CH\textsubscript{4} and N\textsubscript{2}O concentrations in every 30 s site cycle. The IRGA was calibrated with a standard CO\textsubscript{2} gas and a dew point generator at the beginning of the experiment.

The CH\textsubscript{4} and N\textsubscript{2}O fluxes were calculated with the MBR method (Meyers et al., 1996; Werner et al., 2003). This method assumes that all scalar quantities in air are transferred indiscriminately by turbulent eddies. Under this assumption, the CH\textsubscript{4} or N\textsubscript{2}O flux was calculated by

\[ F_2 = F_1 \frac{\partial c_2}{\partial z} / \frac{\partial z}{\partial z} \]

In the equation, \( F_2 \) is the flux of CH\textsubscript{4} or N\textsubscript{2}O, \( F_1 \) is the flux of CO\textsubscript{2}, \( \partial c_2 / \partial z \) is the gradient of CH\textsubscript{4} or N\textsubscript{2}O, and \( \partial c_2 / \partial z \) is the gradient of CO\textsubscript{2}. Here, the CO\textsubscript{2} flux was the average of the eddy covariance.
flux measured simultaneously in a soybean and a corn field near the tall tower (Griffis et al., 2008). The calculated CH$_4$ and N$_2$O fluxes were the mean biogenic fluxes of the cultivated cropland, assuming that soybean and corn each accounted for 50% of land area in the tall tower footprint.

We deployed the STILT to obtain the influence function of surface flux on the concentration variation on 200 m of the tower (Lin et al., 2003). The influence function (footprint) was coupled to four types of surface flux data to simulate the concentration variation: 1) constant and homogeneous emission rate; 2) biogenic flux calculated from above method, assuming the region is fully covered by cropland; 3) anthropogenic flux derived from Emissions Database for Global Atmospheric Research (EDGAR) inventory, assuming emission rate constant in time; 4) biogenic flux and anthropogenic flux. The simulated gas concentration variation was noted by $\Delta C_{\text{con}}$, $\Delta C_{\text{bio}}$, $\Delta C_{\text{ant}}$, $\Delta C_{\text{all}}$.

3. Results and Discussion

The MBR results are given in Fig. 1. The results suggest that the landscape emitted both CH$_4$ and N$_2$O at night (18:00-06:00 LST) at an average rate of 0.02 µmol m$^{-2}$ s$^{-1}$ and $5 \times 10^{-4}$µmol m$^{-2}$ s$^{-1}$ and appeared to take up these two gases during the day (07:00-17:00 LST).

The nighttime CH$_4$ and N$_2$O fluxes calculated by the MBR method might be questionable, as the MBR assumption usually does not work at night. But several lines of evidence have been found to support the calculated fluxes: 1) The diffusivities for CO$_2$ and H$_2$O, calculated from their concentration gradients measured on the tall tower and the fluxes measured in the soybean and corn fields, were linearly correlated, with the correlation coefficient of 0.42 (number of observations 694). That the slope of the regression was close to unity suggests that the assumption that scalars are transported indiscriminately was a good approximation. 2) Midnight (23:00-04:00 LST) block average of the CH$_4$ and N$_2$O concentration was positively and linearly correlated with the midnight block average of the CO$_2$ concentration (Fig. 2). This correlation suggests that the CH$_4$ and N$_2$O accumulated similarly near the ground as CO$_2$.

The negative daytime fluxes for both CH$_4$ and N$_2$O were supported by the modeling result. We first tested the model on CO$_2$. Driven by a diurnally varying biogenic surface flux that matches the observed diurnal composite flux of the soybean and corn fields, the STILT model reproduced the diurnal phase of the CO$_2$ concentration observed at the 200 m height on the tall tower, but the magnitude of modeled variation is larger than the observation. The overestimation of the CO$_2$ concentration variation may be caused by the arbitrary assumption that the landscape is all covered by soybean and corn cultivation. We found that by reducing the diurnal amplitude of the surface flux to 35% of the observed value (optimization coefficient LC = 0.35), the modeled CO$_2$ concentration produced the best fit with the observation (Fig. 3).

The same method was applied to CH$_4$ and N$_2$O (Fig. 4, Fig. 5). The correlation coefficients between the observed concentration variation ($\Delta C_{\text{obs}}$) and modeled concentration variation ($\Delta C_{\text{con}}$, $\Delta C_{\text{bio}}$, $\Delta C_{\text{ant}}$, $\Delta C_{\text{all}}$) are summarized in Table 1.

Forced with a constant emission value according to the observed nighttime flux, the modeled CH$_4$ and N$_2$O concentration variation ($\Delta C_{\text{con}}$) at 200 m has poor agreement with the observation.,. In comparison, the simulation with the biogenic flux ($\Delta C_{\text{bio}}$) agrees reasonably well with the observation; here the surface flux was prescribed according to the observed diurnal pattern shown in Fig. 1. The result suggests that the diurnal pattern of the biogenic flux for CH$_4$ and N$_2$O, especially the daytime uptake, exists and dominates the atmospheric concentration variation of CH$_4$ and N$_2$O over the agricultural landscape. In the third simulation, the model was forced by the gridded inventory data from EDGAR without any diurnal variation. The original 1° by 1° data were interpolated to 0.2° by 0.2° resolution. The poor correlation between this simulation ($\Delta C_{\text{inv}}$) and $\Delta C_{\text{obs}}$ indicates that either the spatial heterogeneity of the anthropogenic emissions is not well defined in the EDGAR Inventory, or the influence of the anthropogenic emission on the atmospheric CH$_4$ and N$_2$O concentrations is not important in the agricultural landscape.

With the optimization coefficient of LC (LC$_{\text{CO}_2}$=0.35; LC$_{\text{CH}_4}$=1; LC$_{\text{N}_2\text{O}}$=0.35), the final set of simulation ($\Delta C_{\text{eq}}$) has the diurnal variation patterns and the magnitude of variations that are comparable with $\Delta C_{\text{obs}}$. In this simulation, the surface flux was the sum of the gridded EDGAR inventory flux and the observed biological flux according to Fig. 1 but adjusted by LC. The LC value of 0.35 seems reasonable because the
cultivated cropland, which has much higher productivity than other vegetation types, accounts for only 50% of the footprint of the observation point at the 200 m height. The bigger optimization coefficient LC for CH$_4$ than CO$_2$ and N$_2$O indicates that some important natural sources, such as wetland and lakes, have not been included in the simulation. With the support of the National Land Cover Database (NLCD 2001), we will further improve the inventory in order to obtain a better fit of the modeled concentration and the observation.
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Table 1: A summary of correlation coefficient for modeled and observed concentration variation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>CO₂</th>
<th>CH₄</th>
<th>N₂O</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$\Delta C_{\text{con}}$ and $\Delta C_{\text{obs}}$</td>
<td>-0.17</td>
<td>-0.40</td>
<td>-0.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\Delta C_{\text{bio}}$ and $\Delta C_{\text{obs}}$</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>0.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\Delta C_{\text{ant}}$ and $\Delta C_{\text{obs}}$</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
<td>-0.41</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\Delta C_{\text{all}}$ and $\Delta C_{\text{obs}}$</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0.14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*LC$_{\text{CO₂}}$=0.35; LC$_{\text{CH₄}}$=1.20; LC$_{\text{N₂O}}$=0.35

Figure 1: Ensemble diurnal variation of CH₄ (a) and N₂O (b) fluxes calculated from the tall tower gradient measurement, August ~September 2009: blue dot – hourly flux value; red circle – median value for each hour of the day

Figure 2: Linear relationship between the night CH₄(a), N₂O(b), and CO₂ gradients, August ~September 2009: blue dot – the block average between 23:00-04:00 LST; red line– linear regression

$y = 3 \times 10^{-3}x + 9.6 \times 10^{-3}$
$r = 0.53$

$y = 2.7 \times 10^{-4}x - 6.4 \times 10^{-3}$
$r = 0.7$
Figure 3: Time series of observed and modeled CO₂ concentration variation. Black line- CO₂ concentration variation from observation; green line- CO₂ concentration variation modeled from biogenic flux; red line- CO₂ concentration variation modeled from EDGAR anthropogenic inventory; magenta line- CO₂ concentration variation modeled from biogenic flux and EDGAR anthropogenic inventory.

Figure 4: Time series of observed and modeled CH₄ concentration variation. Black line- CH₄ concentration variation from observation; green line- CH₄ concentration variation modeled from biogenic flux; red line- CH₄ concentration variation modeled from EDGAR anthropogenic inventory; magenta line- CH₄ concentration variation modeled from biogenic flux and EDGAR anthropogenic inventory.

Figure 5: Time series of observed and modeled N₂O concentration variation. Black line- N₂O concentration variation from observation; green line- N₂O concentration variation modeled from biogenic flux; red line- N₂O concentration variation modeled from EDGAR anthropogenic inventory; magenta line- N₂O concentration variation modeled from biogenic flux and EDGAR anthropogenic inventory.