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by
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Doctor of Philosophy in Earth and Planetary Science
University of California, Berkeley
Professor Ronald C. Cohen, Chair

Oxidative forms of reactive nitrogen (NO_y) impact air quality, nutrient dynamics, and climate. Our understanding of the sources and sinks of atmospheric NO_y that result from exchange between the atmosphere and biosphere is poorly constrained due to the lack of adequate instrumentation.

In this dissertation, I apply novel technologies to the question of NO_y exchange and describe observations of fluxes at the atmosphere-forest interface. I use thermal-dissociation laser-induced fluorescence, chemiluminescence, and the micrometeorological eddy-covariance method. Simultaneous observations of the rate and magnitude of exchanges and vertically resolved concentration measurements of the NO_y species (NO, NO_2, RO_2NO_2, RONO_2 and HNO_3) were measured in addition to a wide suite of relevant parameters including canopy structures, meteorological parameters, and associated chemical species as part of the Biosphere Effects on AeRosols and Photochemistry EXperiment (BEARPEX), which took place June 15 – July 31, 2009 at a Ponderosa pine plantation on the western slope of Sierra Nevada Mountains in California.

I present observational evidence for active within canopy chemistry resulting in simultaneous production and removal of NO_X within a forest canopy. My observations provide direct evidence for a NO_X canopy reduction factor and for an NO_2 compensation point. I also establish that an unusual peroxynitrate is formed within the canopy and then emitted to the atmosphere above underscoring the importance of coupling between biogenic volatile organic compounds and NO_X to the fluxes of NO_X, NO_y and BVOC.
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Chapter 1

Nitrogen oxides exchanges in atmosphere-biosphere interactions

1.1 Summary of previous work

Nitrogen (N) is one of the basic elements of living creatures. Reactive nitrogen (Nr) is an activated form of N (as opposed to the unreactive dinitrogen molecule, N\textsubscript{2}, that makes up 80% of Earth’s atmosphere) and is produced via fixation processes including biological (microbial activities), electrical (lightning), and industrial (fertilization production via Haber–Bosch reaction) pathways. Even though Nr comprises a trivial amount, 3 Tg, of the total nitrogen on Earth—compare to the 4,000,000,000 Tg of N\textsubscript{2} (Jacob, 1999)—Nr is the main form of nitrogen directly involved in N cycling processes. Accordingly, much research has focused on global-scale N cycling of the reduced (e.g. ammonia) and oxidized (e.g. HNO\textsubscript{3}) forms of Nr in order to understand ecosystem nutrient cycling.

In this dissertation, I focus on the role of nitrogen oxides in Nr cycling between the atmosphere and biosphere. Nitrogen oxides (NO\textsubscript{y} \equiv NO + NO\textsubscript{2} + RO\textsubscript{2}NO\textsubscript{2} + RONO\textsubscript{2} + HNO\textsubscript{3} + HONO + NO\textsubscript{3} + N\textsubscript{2}O\textsubscript{5} \ldots) are important to the chemistry of Earth’s atmosphere because of their role in controlling the oxidative capacity of atmosphere and their effects on the composition of aerosol. They also influence carbon uptake by vegetation. In addition to the fertilizing effects of NO\textsubscript{y} on vegetation (Hungate et al., 2003; Galloway et al., 2004; Morikawa et al., 2004a; Morikawa et al., 2004b; Takahashi et al., 2004; Teklemariam and Sparks, 2004; Takahashi et al., 2005a; Takahashi et al., 2005b; Lockwood et al., 2008; Sparks, 2009; Norby et al., 2010, Hietz et al., 2011) deleterious effects of nitrogen oxides are also well known; i.e. dehydration, chlorosis, and membrane damage (Hessen et al., 1997; Herman et al., 2001; Oka et al., 2004) and the acidification of soils and eutrophication of water (Makarov and Kiseleva, 1995; Pawlowski, 1997; Gbondo-Tugbawa and Driscoll, 2002; Zapletal et al., 2003; Chen et al., 2004). Recent studies also point out the climate impact via the fertilization effect of NO\textsubscript{y} deposition. (Townsend et al., 1996; Vitousek and Farrington, 1997; Vitousek et al., 1997; Holland and Lamarque, 1997; Holland et al., 1997; Ollinger et al., 2002a; Ollinger et al., 2002b; Hietz et al., 2011). (Hungate et al., 2003; Galloway et al., 2004; Hietz et al., 2011).

NO\textsubscript{y} exchange across the biosphere-atmosphere interface remains poorly understood. Figure 1.1 describes the understanding of NO\textsubscript{y} exchange that has emerged as a result of prior studies. The goal of this thesis is to test the understanding represented by this figure with direct observations of exchange rates for nitrogen oxides.
Analyses of previous experiments indicate that the dominant processes in the exchange of \(\text{NO}_y\) between the atmosphere and biosphere is \(\text{NO}\) emission resulting from soil microbial activities (biosphere to atmosphere) and \(\text{HNO}_3\) deposition (atmosphere to biosphere). Freshly emitted \(\text{NO}\) is converted to \(\text{NO}_2\) by reaction with ozone \((\text{O}_3)\) within and above the canopy and \(\text{NO}_2\) recycles back to \(\text{NO}\) via its photolysis reaction or oxidized further to form \(\text{HNO}_3\) above the canopy (Figure 1.1). Subsequent chemistry eventually converts \(\text{NO}_2\) to \(\text{HNO}_3\). The deposition of \(\text{HNO}_3\) is taken to be a permanent loss of \(\text{NO}_x\) from the atmosphere. The \(\text{NO}\) to \(\text{NO}_2\) conversion and \(\text{NO}_2\) photolysis, typically on a time scale of \(\sim 100\) seconds in daytime, is comparable to the turbulent mixing time between the within and above canopy air masses. As a result, the magnitude and rate of vertical transport (the flux) of \(\text{NO}\) or \(\text{NO}_2\) competes with the chemistry and thus the measureable flux for both species is expected to deviate from the flux that would be observed for a non reactive trace gas (e.g. water, or carbon dioxide). This flux divergence has been evaluated theoretically (Vila-Guerau de Arellano et al., 1993). Because the chemistry of \(\text{NO}\) and \(\text{NO}_2\) is largely the inter conversion from one species to the other, the flux of their sum, \(\text{NO}_x\) \((\text{NO}_x = \text{NO} + \text{NO}_2)\), is expected to behave as quasi-conserved tracer. There are a few observational studies of \(\text{NO}_x\) exchange that qualitatively support this idea. For example, higher \(\text{NO}\) concentrations have been seen near the forest floor (Rummel et al., 2002) and enhanced ratios of \(\text{NO}_2\) to \(\text{NO}_x\) (Horii 2002) have been reported within canopy owing to slower photolysis rates in a shaded canopy. However a detailed comparison of experiment and theory has yet to be reported.

In addition to the chemistry described above, large-scale chemical transport models invoke an ad hoc parameter, the so-called canopy reduction factor, to reconcile the observed \(\text{O}_3\) with high soil \(\text{NO}\) emission rates in remote regions (Jacob and Wofsy, 1990; Yienger and Levy, 1995; Wang and Leuning, 1998). Canopy reduction factors are estimated to be 25-80\% of soil \(\text{NO}\) emission. Several observational studies also support the idea of a “shielding effect of canopy”; with some observers reporting smaller amounts of \(\text{NO}_x\) well above the soil surface (Lovett and Lindberg, 1993; Hereid and Monson, 2001; Fang and Mu, 2006; Pang et al., 2009).

However, there is also considerable evidence that canopies should add to the atmospheric \(\text{NO}_x\) burden, not subtract from it. Leaf scale observations indicate that exchange of \(\text{NO}_x\) is bi-directional, that is plants can act either a source or sink of \(\text{NO}\) and/or \(\text{NO}_2\) depending on conditions of the surroundings. The ambient concentration of \(\text{NO}_2\) (or \(\text{NO}\)) where a plant changes from a source to a sink of \(\text{NO}_2\) (or \(\text{NO}\)) is defined as the compensation point, \(C_{\text{PT}}\) (Conrad, 1996). If the ambient concentration is higher than the \(C_{\text{PT}}\), vegetation consumes \(\text{NO}_2\) (or \(\text{NO}\)). If the ambient concentration is lower than the \(C_{\text{PT}}\), emissions occur. Reported \(C_{\text{PT}}\)s from branch enclosure studies of \(\text{NO}_2\) range from 0.1-3ppb (Sparks et al., 2001; Raivonen et al., 2009; Breuninger et al., 2011; Chaparro-Suarez et al., 2011) implying most of remote regions of the globe act as \(\text{NO}_x\) sources. Previous reports about plant \(\text{NO}\) emission below 1ppb are also consist with that (Wildt et al., 1997). This is in direct conflict with the idea of a canopy reduction factor (Lerdau et al., 2000).

Although \(\text{HNO}_3\), is represented in Figure 1.1, atmosphere-biosphere interactions of other higher oxides of nitrogen are completely absent. Recently, leaf level measurements (Okano et al., 1990; Sparks et al., 2003) and canopy-scale estimates (Doskey et al., 2004) of exchange for peroxy acyl nitrate (PAN: \(\text{CH}_3\text{C(O)OONO}_2\)), have led to suggestions that the PAN uptake rate is
significant – comparable to HNO$_3$ deposition in some locations. The laboratory measurements suggest PAN uptake is controlled by stomata. There is also one leaf-level study of alkynitrates (ANs: RONO$_2$) showing that direct uptake of ANs and incorporation into amino acids within the leaves occurs (Lockwood et al., 2008).

One of the main obstacles to advancing our understanding of atmosphere-biosphere exchange of NO$_y$ is the lack of technologies for sensitive high frequency measurements needed for eddy-covariance flux measurements. In the last few years, new technologies have made possible canopy scale measurements of the exchange of NO, NO$_2$ and the higher oxides. These studies provide evidence for new processes that are not represented in Figure 1.1. For example, upward exchange of ΣPNs and HNO$_3$ was reported by Farmer et al., (2006) and fluxes of speciated PNs were observed by Turnipseed et al., (2006); and by Wolfe et al., (2009). Both Farmer et al. and Wolfe et al. interpret the observations as evidence for rapid within canopy chemistry affecting the fluxes. The concept of rapid within canopy oxidation processes is also supported by several observational studies of biogenic volatile organic compounds (BVOCs) and their oxidation products (Holzinger et al., 2005; Karl et al., 2005; Bouvier-Brown et al., 2009a; Bouvier-Brown et al., 2009b; Park et al., 2012) and ozone deposition (Kurpius and Goldstein, 2003). In addition to the field observations, multi-layered canopy modeling studies also emphasize the importance of within canopy chemistry on NO$_y$, O$_3$, and BVOC exchange (Wolfe et al., 2011a; Wolfe et al., 2011b).

1.2 Overview of this work

In this thesis, I make use of these new techniques to obtain observations of nitrogen oxide fluxes using eddy covariance (EC). By coupling the highly specific and fast-time resolution thermal-dissociation laser-induced fluorescence (TD-LIF) for NO$_2$, PNs, ANs, and HNO$_3$ and a 2-channel chemiluminescence (2ch-CL) measurement for NO with well established micrometeorological knowledge, I was able to directly observe the fluxes and height resolved concentration, vertical gradients, simultaneously. A major advantage of this experiment was that it included a complete suite of simultaneous measurements of nitrogen oxides.

Using these new observations in this dissertation, I present evidence of active within canopy chemistry affecting the fluxes of nitrogen oxides. The new picture I propose is summarized in Figure 1.2. Instead of the simple canopy reduction process affecting NO and NO$_2$, shown as uptake by plants in Figure 1.1, I propose multiple mechanisms of higher nitrogen oxide formation within the canopy as shown in red arrows in Figure 1.2.

The detailed chemical cycling between NO$_X$ and higher oxides and the connection to the biosphere plant involved processes is described in Figure 1.3. The red arrows are emission, representing a source of NO$_X$, and the blue and black arrows indicate the loss of NO$_X$ via plant involved or chemical pathways, respectively. The processes outlined in this figure are the subject of Chapters 2-4 of this thesis.
In Chapter 2, I focus on the flux and gradient measurements of NO and NO$_2$ and infer the existence of NO$_X$ loss processes within the canopy by analyzing the discrepancies between the flux and gradient relationships of both molecules as well as their sum. My finding from this chapter is consistent with the concept of a canopy reduction factor as suggested from large-scale chemical transport modeling studies. The observed fluxes of NO and NO$_2$ are generally upward. I compare the magnitude of fluxes with their vertical gradients and find the fluxes to be smaller than predicted from the gradients of NO$_2$ and NO$_X$ alone. I argue this is evidence for NO$_X$ loss processes within the canopy and investigate multiple chemical loss mechanisms associated with the formation of higher oxides. I suggest that the loss of NO$_X$ is primarily due to the conversion of NO$_X$ to peroxo and alkyl nitrates.

In Chapter 3, I present evidence for bidirectional fluxes of NO$_2$ at the canopy scale. The fluxes are shown to depend on ambient NO$_2$ in a manner consistent with the idea of a compensation point affecting NO$_2$ fluxes. The calculated exchange velocity of NO$_2$ is shown to be inversely correlated with the NO$_2$ concentration. Analysis of the NO$_X$ cospectrum provides evidence for flux carrying eddies that have systematically different behavior at high and low NO$_2$.

In Chapter 4, I describe fluxes of total and speciated peroxynitrates. I find that the sum of specific peroxynitrate fluxes does not add to the total and use the difference to infer the production of an unidentified PN, denoted XPN, within the canopy. An upward flux of this molecule acts to counter the downward flux of the identified PNs with the net result that the deposition rate of total PNs is lower than the sum of the fluxes of individual molecules. Interestingly, this process is likely one of the loss processes contributing to within canopy NO$_X$ removal and thus acting as a canopy reduction factor.

In Chapter 5, I briefly conclude with some ideas for future research on the atmosphere biosphere exchange of N and with a discussion of the broader implications of the results presented in CH’s 2-4.
Figure 1.1. Schematic of the various interactions involved in the exchange of nitrogen oxides between the atmosphere and a forest canopy. Bold arrows in blue (downward) and red (upward) represent the direction of the flux of each species across the canopy surface.
Figure 1.2. Updated schematic of the various interactions involved in the exchange of nitrogen oxides between the atmosphere and forest canopy. Bold arrows in blue (downward) and red (upward) represent the direction of the flux of each species across the canopy surface.
Nitrogen oxide cycling. Red arrows are NO\textsubscript{X} sources and blue arrows are NO\textsubscript{y} losses through direct plant uptake. The black arrows indicate the chemical processes.
Chapter 2

Eddy covariance measurements of NO and NO\textsubscript{2} fluxes over a ponderosa pine ecosystem: an observational evidence of canopy reduction processes

Abstract

Exchange of NO\textsubscript{X} (NO+NO\textsubscript{2}) between the atmosphere and biosphere is important for air quality, climate change, and ecosystem nutrient dynamics. There are few direct ecosystem scale measurements of the direction and rate of atmosphere-biosphere exchange of NO\textsubscript{X}. As a result a complete description of the path of NO\textsubscript{X} following emission from soils and/or plants to the free atmosphere remains poorly constrained and therefore debated. Here, we describe measurements of NO and NO\textsubscript{2} fluxes and vertical concentration gradients made during the Biosphere Effects on AeRosols and Photochemistry EXperiment 2009. In general, during daytime we observe upward fluxes of NO and NO\textsubscript{2} with counter-gradient fluxes of NO. We find that NO\textsubscript{X} fluxes from the forest canopy are smaller than calculated using observed flux-gradient relationships for conserved tracers and also smaller than measured soil NO emissions. We interpret these differences as evidence for the existence of a “canopy reduction factor”. We discuss the mechanisms that might explain the reduction factor and suggest it is primarily due to chemistry converting NO\textsubscript{X} to its higher nitrogen oxides.

2.1. Introduction

The chemistry of reactive nitrogen oxides is one major factor determining the oxidation capacity and global ozone burden of troposphere. Reactive nitrogen oxides are also a nutrient (Sparks, 2009; Takahashi et al., 2005a; Takahashi et al., 2004; Teklemariam and Sparks, 2004; Lockwood et al., 2008) and interactions between available nitrogen in ecosystems and atmospheric N are many and complex, with exchange processes altering the patterns of N availability in the biosphere (Townsend et al., 1996; Vitousek and Farrington, 1997; Vitousek et al., 1997; Holland and Lamarque, 1997; Holland et al., 1997; Ollinger et al., 2002a; Ollinger et al., 2002b; Hietz et al., 2011). Nitrogen is the limiting nutrient for plant growth in most regions outside the tropics (Hungate et al., 2003; Galloway et al., 2004; Hietz et al., 2011), thus nitrogen deposited to the surface after atmospheric transport can act as fertilizer contributing to enhanced
carbon uptake (Morikawa et al., 2004a; Morikawa et al., 2004b; Takahashi et al., 2004; Takahashi et al., 2005a; Takahashi et al., 2005b; Sparks, 2009; Norby et al., 2010). For example, Norby et al. (2010) found that the availability of nitrogen was a major limiting factor for the CO₂ fertilization effect in the FACE (Free-Air CO₂ Enrichment) experiment. However, too much nitrogen deposition may impair ecosystem health (Hessen et al., 1997; Herman et al., 2001) by causing dehydration, chlorosis, membrane damage from peroxy acetal nitrate (PAN) (Oka et al., 2004) and/or ozone (O₃) (Moldau et al., 1991; Kasana, 1992; Ewert and Porter, 2000), or by inducing soil acidification and eutrophication (Makarov and Kiseleva, 1995; Pawlowski, 1997; Gbondo-Tugbawa and Driscoll, 2002; Zapletal et al., 2003; Chen et al., 2004).

A comprehensive understanding of NOₓ exchange between the atmosphere and biosphere does not yet exist. Experimental studies have primarily focused on NO emissions from soils to the atmosphere (e.g. Butterbach-Bahl et al., 2002; Gasche and Papen, 2002; Gut et al., 2002a; Gut et al., 2002b; Rummel et al., 2002; van Dijk et al., 2002) or on the leaf-level transfer of NO and NO₂ using branch enclosures (Hereid and Monson, 2001; Chaparro-Suarez et al., 2011; and references therein). Studies at the canopy-scale often assume simple flux-gradient similarity relationships—meaning molecular movement is always along the gradient from high to low concentration—to infer the rate of exchange from vertically resolved observations (Mayer et al., 2011 and reference therein). Direct measurements of the direction and rate of exchange, the flux, at the canopy scale are few (Wesely et al., 1982; Wildt et al., 1997; Horii, 2002; Horii et al., 2004; Farmer et al., 2006).

Prior studies have constructed a picture of biosphere-atmosphere NOₓ exchange as shown in Figure 2.1. In this model, NO is mainly emitted by soil microbial activity, is converted to NO₂ by reaction with O₃, and is then ultimately oxidized to nitric acid (HNO₃), which returns back to the biosphere via wet and dry deposition. The timescale of NO to NO₂ conversion by O₃ and the photolysis of NO₂ back to NO is typically ~100s in the daytime—comparable to that of the turbulent mixing time (τ_{turb}) within and out of a forest canopy. As a result, although the flux of either NO or NO₂ is expected to deviate from the flux of a conserved tracer, such as water, heat, or carbon dioxide (Vila-Guerau de Arellano et al., 1993), the flux of NOₓ, their sum, is expected to behave as a quasi-conserved tracer.

This model of NOₓ exchange is qualitatively supported by observational studies. For example, NO is observed to decrease as air is transported up through a canopy from the forest floor (e.g. Rummel et al., 2002) and the low light levels within a shaded canopy reduce NO₂ photolysis and enhance the NO₂ to NOₓ ratio. For these reasons, downward NO fluxes and upward NO₂ fluxes have been observed as expected (e.g. Horii, 2002).

In contrast, calculations of ozone by large-scale chemical transport models parameterized with NO soil fluxes measured by chambers over-predict O₃ concentrations in comparison to aircraft and tower observations (e.g. Lerdau et al., 2000). To match observations, these models invoke a canopy reduction factor of 25-80% (Jacob and Wofsy, 1990; Yienger and Levy, 1995; Wang and Leuning, 1998). This parameter functions non-mechanistically to remove soil NOₓ before it escapes the canopy, thus preventing its contribution to atmospheric ozone formation.
At the same time, laboratory observations at the leaf scale indicate bi-directional exchanges of NO\textsubscript{X} by plant biota, where the direction and rate of exchange is controlled by a so-called “compensation point”—a concentration above which vegetation takes up NO\textsubscript{2} and/or NO but below which emissions occur. Direct observations of the NO\textsubscript{2} compensation point present real measurement challenges (Raivonen et al., 2003) and evidence suggests that compensation behavior is not fixed but rather varies by plant species, plant lifecycle, and environmental conditions (Raivonen et al., 2009). That said, compensation points are measured in the range of ambient NO\textsubscript{2} abundances and have been reported from 0.1 to 3 ppb (Sparks et al., 2001; Raivonen et al., 2009; Breuninger et al., 2011; Chaparro-Suarez et al., 2011) implying that most of the forests on Earth are a source of NO\textsubscript{X}. This is in direct contradiction to the idea of a canopy reduction factor (Lerdau et al., 2000).

Recent field studies demonstrate very active within-canopy chemistry that is not included in Figure 1. With respect to nitrogen oxides, Farmer et al. (2006) observed upward exchanges of total peroxynitrate, $\Sigma$RO\textsubscript{2}NO\textsubscript{2}, and HNO\textsubscript{3} and interpreted this as the formation of these molecules within a forest canopy. In addition, Wolfe et al. (2009) described the importance of chemical processes in speciated peroxynitrate exchange also finding observational evidence for within-canopy chemistry affecting observed fluxes. Several other experimenters have reported the occurrence of within-canopy chemistry affecting fluxes of biogenic volatile organic compounds (BVOCs) (Holzinger et al., 2005; Karl et al., 2005; Bouvier-Brown et al., 2009a; Bouvier-Brown et al., 2009b; Park et al., 2012) and ozone (Kurpius and Goldstein, 2003). A recent study from our group (Min et al., 2012a) further supports this idea, providing experimental evidence for upward fluxes of unidentified peroxynitrates formed within the forest canopy. Taken together these studies emphasize the importance of active chemistry not only for determining the magnitude but also for the direction of N exchange at the biosphere-atmosphere interface.

The Biosphere Effects on AeRosols and Photochemistry EXperiment (BEARPEX) included a component designed to provide comprehensive measurements of concentrations, vertical gradients, and fluxes of a wide suite of nitrogen oxides—NO, NO\textsubscript{2}, total and speciated peroxynitrates, total and speciated alkynitrates, HNO\textsubscript{3}, and nitrous acid (HONO)—and therefore presents a direct opportunity to test our ideas about canopy-scale NO\textsubscript{X} exchange. Analyses of peroxynitrate (Wolfe et al., 2009; Min et al., 2012a) and HONO (Ren et al., 2011) fluxes have been reported elsewhere. Here we present observations of vertical concentration gradients and fluxes of NO\textsubscript{2} and NO measured with laser induced fluorescence (LIF) and chemiluminescence, respectively, coupled to the eddy covariance flux method. We describe relationships between gradients and fluxes, present and interpret evidence for a canopy reduction factor, and explore the significance of chemistry within the canopy to the import/export of NO\textsubscript{X} from the canopy.
2.2. Research site and instrumentation

The data used in this work were obtained as a part of BEARPEX 2009 (June 15 – July 31, 2009). The experiment was conducted over a managed Ponderosa pine plantation on the western slope of the Sierra Nevada Mountain range 75 km downwind of Sacramento, California and near to the University of California Berkeley Blodgett Forest Research Station (UC-BFRS, 38°53’42.9”N, 120°3757.9”W, 1315m). An overview of and results from BEARPEX can be found elsewhere (Cohen et al., 2012) and in the other articles in this special issue of ACP. A brief description of the field site and of instrumentation relevant to this paper follows.

Descriptions of the local meteorology by Choi et al. (2011) and Dillon et al. (2002) indicate that in the summer (May–September), winds at the BEARPEX site are characterized by daytime southwesterlies (210–240°) and nighttime northeasterlies (30°) with remarkably little variability in winds and transport patterns. As a result, this site samples air that has low concentrations of trace gases with anthropogenic sources early in the morning and higher concentrations in air transported from the west later in day. The westerlies bring air that has been exposed to a band of oak trees that are intense isoprene emitters (after 12:00). After 17:00 the westerlies bring isoprene and its oxidation products mixed with the urban plume from Sacramento.

There were two sampling towers at the site; a 15m walk-up tower on the south side of the site (hereafter south tower), and 18m scaffolding tower located 10m north of the south tower (hereafter north tower). On south tower, temperature, relative humidity, wind speed, net radiation, photosynthetically active radiation (PAR), water vapor, carbon dioxide (CO2), and O3 were monitored at 5 heights (1.2, 3.0, 4.9, 8.75, and 12.5m above the forest floor). At 12.5m, fluxes of water vapor, CO2, and O3 were measured. Vertical gradients of temperature, relative humidity, and wind speed were also measured on the north tower at 5 heights (1.2, 5.4, 9.2, 13.3, and 17.5m above the forest floor). Measurements from the north tower or an adjacent adjustable lift included NO, NO2, HONO, total peroxy nitrates (ΣPNs, RO2NO2), total alkyl nitrates (ΣAN, RONO2), HNO3, hydroxyl radical (OH), hydroxy peroxy radical (HO2), the OH reactivity, O3, several individual PNs, several individual ANs, numerous volatile organic compounds (VOCs) including many biogenic VOCs (BVOCs), formaldehyde (HCHO), glyoxal, methylglyoxal, organic peroxides, and aerosol chemical and physical properties. Needle temperature, soil moisture, soil temperature, and soil heat flux were also monitored. In addition, soil NO emissions were measured using dynamic chamber set-up on July 2, 12 and 30th. All measurements were made at the 17.5m level and many were additionally recorded at one or more of the following heights: 1.2, 5.4, 9.2, and 13.3m. The upper canopy at this site is mainly Pinus ponderosa L., with a few scattered Douglas fir, white fir, and incense cedar. The understory is primarily mountain whitethorn (Ceanothus cordulatus) and manzanita (Arcostaphylos species) shrubs (see Misson et al., 2005, for a more detailed site description and history). The mean tree height was 8.8m and the leaf area index (LAI) was 3.7m²/m² based on a tree survey conducted on July 17, 2009.

NO was measured using a custom built two-channel chemiluminescence NO detection system (2ch-CL) and NO2 with two thermal-dissociation LIF systems (TD-LIF). The sampling
inlets for NO and NO\textsubscript{2} were collocated at 0.5, 5 (4.5), 9 (8.8) and 18 m (17.5) on the north tower and represent the forest floor, mid canopy, top canopy, and above canopy, respectively. At 18m, fluxes of NO and NO\textsubscript{2} were monitored along with 3-d wind and temperature from a sonic anemometer (Campbell Scientific CSAT3 3-D Sonic Anemometer). The measurements were combined to infer fluxes using eddy covariance (EC) (see Section 3). The sonic anemometer was pointing into the mean daytime wind stream with 0.02m vertical displacement and 0.2m horizontal displacement from the NO and NO\textsubscript{2} inlets.

The 2ch-CL system for the NO flux and vertical gradient measurements was based on the standard O\textsubscript{3} chemiluminescence method. A detailed description of the operating principle can be found elsewhere (Drummond et al., 1985 and references therein). Briefly, ambient NO is combined with an excess of O\textsubscript{3} (generated by electric discharge of O\textsubscript{2}). The reaction of NO and O\textsubscript{3} produces exited state NO\textsubscript{2} molecules, which then fluoresces. One of the gold-plated detection cells was used for the flux measurement and the other one cell for the vertical concentration gradient measurement. The signals from photocathodes (flux channel: EMI 9658B, gradient channel: Hamamatsu H7421-50) were acquired at 5Hz. The cell pressures were maintained at 8-8.5 torr with pressure restricted at the inlet and with a fluorinated oil-sealed rotary vane pump. We operated the 2ch-CL system in free background checking mode, whereby during the sampling mode, 100\% of the ozone flow was added directly into the detection cell to monitor the ambient NO concentration (for 24 seconds). The background signal was monitored by adding 50\% of the O\textsubscript{3} to the sampling air prior to the detection cell to titrate ~90\% NO (for 6 seconds). Incomplete titration of NO was employed to limit possible interferences from vibrationally excited OH molecules produced in the reaction of ozone with alkenes (Drummond et al., 1985). The other 50\% of the ozone was added directly to the cell to minimize flow changes within the reaction cell between the sampling and the background mode.

Two TD-LIF systems were used for simultaneous flux and vertical gradient measurements of NO\textsubscript{2} and the higher nitrogen oxide species ΣPNs, ΣANs, and HNO\textsubscript{3}. Details of LIF detection of NO\textsubscript{2} (Thornton et al., 2000) and application to EC flux measurement (Farmer et al., 2006) are described elsewhere. Briefly, thermal dissociation of each class of higher oxide generated NO\textsubscript{2} and a companion radical at the characteristic temperatures 180°C for ΣPNs, 350°C for ΣANs, and 600°C for HNO\textsubscript{3}, (Day et al., 2002) followed by detection of NO\textsubscript{2} by LIF. In both TD-LIF systems, excitation at 585nm was provided by Nd:YAG (Spectra Physics, average power of 2W at 532 nm, 30 ns pulse length) pumping a custom-built tunable dye laser operating at 8kHz. The wavelength of the dye laser beam was tuned to a specific, narrow rovibronic feature of NO\textsubscript{2} by rotating an etalon within the dye cavity. We alternated the laser frequency between a strong NO\textsubscript{2} resonance (8 sec) and the weak continuum adsorption (4 sec) to maintain a frequency lock on the spectral feature of interest. By adapting a supersonic expansion technique, we acquired ~10-fold higher sensitivity to NO\textsubscript{2} (Cleary et al., 2002). The fluorescence signal long of 700nm was collected and imaged onto a red sensitive photocathode (Hamamatsu H7421-50) and gated photon counting techniques (Stanford Research Systems, SRS 400) were employed to discriminate against prompt background signals. Laboratory measurements and comparison in the field showed the two TD-LIF instruments to have calibrations that were identical to within 4\% (slope: 1.039 +/- 0.10 , R\textsuperscript{2}: 0.92). Allowing the intercept to vary from zero did not improve the R\textsuperscript{2}. 
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The cell pressures in the flux system were reduced to 0.17-0.19 Torr to achieve the high expansion ratios for the superconic jet cooling by using Lysholm twin screw blowers (Whipple model 2300 superchargers) backed by an oil-sealed rotary vane pump. The jet nozzles and this pump system combined to maintain a 580-700 sccm flow through each of the four cells (total flow of 2300 sccm). To reduce high frequency damping of turbulent eddies and interference from secondary chemistry in the heated inlet and sampling lines (100ft), we added a diaphragm bypass pump and maintained the total flow of a 13000 sccm. For the gradient system, critical orifices as pressures restrictors (AirLogic, F-2815-251-B85, 0.025” orifice diameter) were placed at the end of the inlet manifold to reduce the pressure along the sampling line.

Calibrations in the field were repeated once/twice per hour for both the NO and NO₂ instruments. NO₂ standard gas (4.9 ± 0.2 ppm NOx in N₂, PRAXAIR) was diluted to 3-20 ppb in zero air and added to system at the inlet tip. For NO, 2.25-6.7 ppb of NO (5.4 ppm ± 5% NO in N₂, PRAXAIR) was diluted with zero air and added at the inlet. Both cylinders were referenced to a library of calibration standards maintained in our laboratory. The mixing ratios were corrected (<2%) for quenching by water using the north tower RH measurement. To evaluate the background counts due to cell scatter and photocathode dark noise, we flowed excess zero air into the inlet once/twice per hour. The diagnostics for the NO and NO₂ flux instruments (calibration and zeroing) were completed within the first 3 minutes of every 30 minute duty cycle (Figure 2.2a). Flux data for both species were collected at 18m during the first 30 minutes, from the 3rd minute to the 30th minute, and for the last 30 minutes, from the 33rd minute to the 60th minute each hour (Figure 2.2a). NO and NO₂ at the lower levels were measured by switching between the 9, 5, and 0.5m heights and sampling at each height for 2 minutes (Figure 2.2b). Calibrations and zeros were completed in last 4 minutes from 56th to 60th minutes of every hour for both gradient systems (Figure 2.2b).

Data affected by exhaust plumes from a nearby propane electrical generator (mostly at night) and the infrequent wafts of car exhaust were removed prior to analysis. These spikes were defined as variations in the NO or NO₂ concentration in excess of 3 times the standard deviation of the 10-minute running mean. A few remaining spikes were identified through correlations with CO and removed by hand. Over the campaign, the NO₂ detection limit (defined as S/N = 2) was ~45 ppt (1 second) for the flux system and was ~10 ppt (1 minute) for gradient system. The NO detection limit for flux cell was ~58ppt (1 second) and for gradient cell was ~11 ppt (1 minute) in midday (12:00-14:00).

2.3. Eddy-Covariance calculation

The flux of an atmospheric constituent \( F_c \), i.e. the turbulent mass transport of constituent \( c \) through a vertical reference layer, can be evaluated from the covariance between the concentration of \( c \) and the vertical wind \( w \) in a method known as eddy-covariance (EC) Eq. (2.1) (e.g. Foken, 2006; Lee et al., 2004; McMillen, 1988):
\[ F_c = \int_0^t w'c' \, dt = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} (w_i - \bar{w})(c_i - \bar{c}) = \bar{w}'c' \]  \hspace{1cm} (2.1)

In Eq. (2.1), the primes are the deviation from the mean, the subscripts \( i \) refer to individual high-time resolution measurements (NO or NO\(_2\)), and the bar indicates the mean over the averaging interval. In this work, the flux of NO\(_X\), \( F_{NOX} \), is defined as the sum of the separately calculated \( F_{NO} \) and \( F_{NO2} \).

We used 5Hz data for the flux calculations and averaged for ~30 minutes—a time scale that spanned the range of the major flux-carrying eddies at this site (e.g. Wolfe et al., 2009; Farmer et al., 2006). Prior to calculating fluxes, we rotated the wind measurements to ensure that the vertical winds were normal to the shear plane (Baldocchi et al., 1988; McMillen, 1988). We also de-spiked and de-trended the concentration data, where spikes were defined as data greater than 3 times the standard deviation of the 10-minute running mean, and where the 10-minute running mean was also used for de-trending.

To synchronize the timing of wind and concentration measurements, the lag was determined from the maximum in covariance of the deviation from the mean of vertical wind speed and concentration. Figures 3a-c show the lag correlation between wind and temperature (as a check), NO, and NO\(_2\), respectively. The data plotted in Figure 2.3 are the averaged midday (12:00-14:00) lag over the whole field campaign. As expected, 0 lag was observed between vertical wind speed and temperature since both quantities are synchronously measured by same instrument. Lag times for NO and NO\(_2\) were measured to be 1.4 seconds and 2.6 seconds, times that were consistent with transport times in the tubing (<0.8 sec) plus the time difference between sonic anemometer computer and computers for 2ch-CL and TD-LIF.

To assure that each 30-minute flux was representative of the average surface exchange over the sampling period, we tested the calculated fluxes for stationarity (Farmer et al., 2006; Foken 2006; Wolfe et al., 2009). To do this, five equally divided subsets of each 30-minute flux period, \( F_{sub} \), were averaged and compared with that of the full period, \( F_{30min} \). If \( F_{sub} \) differed from \( F_{30min} \) by more than 30% then that measurement period was defined as non-stationary and that half hour excluded from further analysis (Foken and Wichura, 1996). Also, the calculated flux data with a tilt angle greater than 5° from the wind rotation (Lee et al., 2004) and with a friction velocity smaller than 0.1m/s or larger than 1.5m/s (Foken 2006) were excluded for further analysis. Approximately 2/3 of the daytime and half the nighttime data remained after application of these filters.

We estimate the total systematic uncertainty in the NO and NO\(_2\) flux estimation following Moore et al. (1986) and Massman (1991) (details are in Farmer et al., 2006 and Wolfe et al., 2009). Systematic uncertainties in EC fluxes arise from data acquisition sequencing, laser line-locking cycling or frequent background checking, sensor separation, inlet dampening, instrument time response, and concentration estimation. Random uncertainty arises from the statistics of photon counting. Flux underestimation caused by data acquisition sequencing and frequent background checking in the NO measurement (<2%) and laser line-locking cycling for the NO\(_2\) measurements (<3%) were estimated for flux calculation by forcing the sonic temperature data to mimic the both the frequent background checking (NO) and laser line-locking cycling (NO\(_2\)) and
comparing this to the non-treated data. Sensor separation error and inlet dampening error were estimated using transfer functions as in Massman (1991) and Moore (1986). We found these effects were small, <2% for both the NO and NO\(_2\) measurements. Flux estimation errors due to instrumental time response (Moore et al., 1986) are typically <0.2% (NO) and <0.7% (NO\(_2\)) for daytime. Errors from the absolute concentration estimation are 5 % for both of NO and NO\(_2\) (see Day et al., 2002) and are accounted for in the systematic error. Random uncertainties in EC fluxes from the statistics of photon counting are <20% and <10% for NO and NO\(_2\).

These errors are uncorrelated and combining them in quadrature, we calculate <6% systematic uncertainty in the NO and NO\(_2\) fluxes and 56% and 10% random uncertainty in half hour average flux estimation. Variances due to precision terms decrease as the square root of the total number of half hour measurements and are therefore much smaller than the observed natural variability.

Spectral analysis supports the validity of the flux estimation from the instrumental setup and sensitivity. Spectral analyses of the fluxes are shown in Figure 2.4 and include the cospectral density (Figure 2.4a), the normalized cospectrum (Figure 2.4b), and the normalized cumulative cospectrum, or ogive, (Figure 2.4c) for both temperature and NO\(_X\). We show each measurement for the time interval 9:00-12:00 when the chemistry affecting NO\(_X\) is slowest. By analyzing the NO\(_X\) cospectrum, rather than the spectra of NO and NO\(_2\) separately, we are insensitive to the effects of the rapid chemical conversion of NO to NO\(_2\) and vice versa.

The spectral analysis of NO\(_X\) provides additional evidence that our instruments for NO and NO\(_2\), 2-ch CL and TD-LIF, observe the full range of flux carrying eddies at this site. We see in Figure 2.4a, that the observed cospectral density of sensible heat, \(w'T'\), decreases in inertial subrange (above 0.003 Hz) with a linear slope between that predicted by surface layer theory (-5/3) (Kaimal and Finnigan, 1994) and that slope observed previously at this site (-7/3) (Farmer et al., 2006; Wolfe et al., 2009). Because the cospectral density of vertical wind speed and NO\(_X\) as parallel to that of sensible heat, we have confidence that our sampling interval was long enough and the data acquisition time resolution fast enough to capture all the flux carrying eddies. Additionally, the comparable behavior observed in the \(w'T'\) and \(w'NO_X'\) cospectrum confirmed that those frequencies characteristic of our instruments’ sampling and operative cycles (eg. regular patterns in on-line/off-line sequencing in both NO and NO\(_2\)) do not interfere with the measurements. Agreement between \(w'T'\) and \(w'NO_X'\) in the inertial sub-range (above 0.003 Hz), demonstrates that measured fluxes were not dampened by the sampling lines. Finally, we note that we observe both upward and downward NO\(_X\) fluxes at different frequencies. In Figures 4a-c triangles refer to downward fluxes and solid lines to upward fluxes.

The normalized cospectrum, shown in Figure 2.4b, indicates the fraction of the total flux at each frequency. It is calculated as the cospectra multiplied by the frequency and divided by the covariance of temperature, or NO\(_X\), with the vertical wind, which is the integrated value under the curve. Generally, the shape of the normalized cospectrum of \(w'NO_X'\) is similar to that of \(w'T'\) with a maximum in the range 0.005-0.1 Hz (200-10 second), with values consistent with previous observations at this site (Farmer et al., 2006; Wolfe et al., 2009). A steeper falloff at high-frequencies (>0.01 Hz) for \(w'NO_X'\) (especially in the afternoon, not shown) than for \(w'T'\) was reported in previous studies of PAN at this site (Wolfe et al, 2009) and in a Loblolly pine
forest (Turnipseed et al., 2006) as well as for a variety of BVOCs at this site (Park et al., 2012). The deep feature seen at frequencies of 0.001-0.005 Hz is associated with downward fluxes (▲).

Figure 2.4c shows the normalized cumulative distributions of the cospectra and ogives of \( w'T' \) and \( w'NO_X' \). The ogive for \( w'T' \) approaches a horizontal asymptote at both ends of the spectrum, providing additional confirmation that the sampling interval and time resolution was both long enough and the sampling frequency fast enough to capture all the important flux-carrying eddies. The ogive pattern of \( w'NO_X' \) is generally comparable to that of \( w'T' \), except for frequencies in the ranges 0.001-0.005 Hz and 0.1-1 Hz, where fluxes are downward. Here, we use the absolute value of the frequency weighted normalized cospectrum of \( w'NO_X' \) for the ogive calculation noting that the frequencies of \( w'NO_X' \) that are downward vary with time of day, suggesting they are not internally generated, but are rather the result of time-of-day dependent atmospheric processes.

### 2.4. Gradients and Fluxes

The diurnal variations in the concentrations of \( O_3, NO_X, NO, \) and \( NO_2 \) are shown in Figure 2.5 and are similar to previous observations at this site (Day et al., 2003; Farmer et al., 2006). The patterns are affected by transport from Sacramento, emissions from soils, deposition, and chemistry, \( O_3, NO_X, \) and \( NO_2 \) increase as air is transported in from the west carrying the remnants of emissions from the Sacramento metropolitan area and reach a maximum after sunset between 18:00 to 21:00. Generally, \( NO \) can be thought of as controlled by the amount of \( NO_X \) and local photochemistry. In the morning, we observe enhancements in \( NO \) and \( NO_2 \) and a decrease in \( O_3 \). Vertical gradients are also present. We observe the highest \( NO \) concentrations above the canopy, decreasing \( NO \) within the forest canopy and increasing \( NO \) concentrations again near the forest floor—except in the late afternoon when turbulent mixing is strongest and dry soils result in \( NO \) emissions that are at their daily minimum.

Typical \( NO \) mixing ratios above the canopy during BEARPEX 2009 ranged from 10 to 100 ppt with a daytime (9:00-18:00, local time) mean (±1σ) of 45 ± 19 ppt. This concentration is ~20% lower than observed at this site during same time of year in 2001 (Day et al., 2003). The highest \( NO \) concentration near the forest floor was 270 ppt following rainfall on the evening of day 192 (July 11). The mixing ratio of \( NO_2 \) above the canopy varied from 80 to 550 ppt with a daytime mean concentration of 188 ± 86 ppt. This is a 65% decrease from the 533 ppt mean observed in 2001 (Day et al., 2003) and is in agreement with previously reported \( NO_X \) decreases in upwind Sacramento of approximately 13%/yr, which accumulate to an approximately 67% decrease between 2001 and 2009 (Cox et al., 2009; Russell et al., 2010; LaFranchi et al., 2011).

Figure 2.6 shows the vertical gradients of \( NO, NO_2, \) and \( NO_X \) throughout the course of the day: early morning (6:00-9:00, blue), late morning (9:00-12:00, cyan), midday (12:00-14:00, red), afternoon (14:00-18:00, magenta), evening (18:00-24:00, green) and night (24:00-6:00, black). For the purpose of discussion we define an enhancement factor (\( ΔX \)) to be the concentration
difference between each height and that measured above the canopy \( (\Delta X = X_T - X_{15m}) \). Positive values of \( \Delta X \) indicate concentration enhancements and negative values indicate depleted concentrations relative to above the canopy. In Figure 2.6a, NO was depleted within the canopy and, in Figure 2.6b, NO\(_2\) was enhanced at all times of day. In general, we observed the highest NO enhancement near the soil (except for night time) and larger NO\(_2\) enhancements at mid- and top-canopy heights. This pattern is qualitatively explained by emissions of NO at the soil followed by the conversion of NO to NO\(_2\) until the steady-state ratio is established by the reaction of NO with O\(_3\) and photolysis of NO\(_2\).

If soil NO emissions and the chemical cycling of NO/NO\(_2\) are the only two process controlling NO\(_X\), then we expect the gradient in the sum of NO and NO\(_2\) to be a straight line connecting the enhanced concentration at forest floor with the above canopy (boundary layer value) so long as sufficient turbulent mixing exists (Vila-Guerau de Arellano et al., 1993; Gao et al., 1991; Jacob and Wofsy, 1990). This, however, is not what we observe (Figure 2.6c). Rather we observe a NO\(_X\) enhancement during daytime and depletion during nighttime within the canopy. In addition, the amount of the enhancement at the forest-floor, mid-canopy, and top-canopy heights changes within different time windows, indicating the existence of multiple processes other than soil NO emission and simple inter conversion of NO and NO\(_2\). For example, the within-canopy gradients at 6:00-9:00 and 14:00-18:00 are opposite each other and the 6:00-9:00 NO\(_X\) gradient indicates the existence of a NO\(_X\) sink process as the height increases from mid to top-canopy, while the 14:00-18:00 gradient indicates a NO\(_X\) source process. This is a direct evidence for processes in addition to NO\(_X\) partitioning affecting the concentration gradient on the timescale of canopy exchange. While there have been a number of indirect lines of evidence for this idea (Jacob and Wofsy 1990; Yienger and Levy 1995; Wang et al., 1998; Lerdau 2000; Wolfe et al., 2011; Min et al., 2012a), to our knowledge these observations provide the first direct measurements.

In Figures 7a-c, we show the eddy-covariance fluxes of NO, NO\(_2\) and NO\(_X\). We observed upward fluxes from 9:00 to 15:00. Fluxes of NO and NO\(_X\) were slightly downward from 6:00-9:00. The midday (12:00-14:00) median fluxes of NO, NO\(_2\) and NO\(_X\) are 0.32 ± 0.27, 0.67 ± 0.21 and 1.0 ± 0.43 ppt m/s. A comparison the direction of the observed flux of NO\(_2\) and NO\(_X\) to the gradients in Figures 6b and c gives a picture of molecular movement consistent with standard ideas of turbulent transport moving material from a region of high to low concentration. For NO, however, the direction of the flux is counter to that of the concentration gradient (“counter-gradient”).

The observed midday fluxes of NO\(_X\) of 1.0 ± 0.43 ppt m/s are smaller than the lower end of soil NO emission measured at this site (2.9-22.9 ppt m/s in the morning) and smaller than other studies in the region. For example, at the Schubert Watershed at the Sierra Nevada Foothill Research and Extension Center in an oak forest, soil NO\(_X\) emissions of 5.8-15 ppt m/s were observed during the summer (Herman et al., 2003) and typical soil NO fluxes reported in California are 1.9 ppt m/s - 19 ppt m/s (Anderson and Poth, 1989; Davidson et al., 1993). Comparison of these soil NO\(_X\) emissions to our ecosystem scale flux measurements suggests the existence of NO\(_X\) removal process within the canopy—a NO\(_X\) canopy reduction factor.
To evaluate the contribution of soil NO emission to the NO\textsubscript{2} flux by the reaction with O\textsubscript{3}, we divide our system into a soil NO emission layer and a chemical conversion layer, where the latter layer includes the within and above canopy measurement heights. The noontime (12:00-14:00) ratio of NO and NO\textsubscript{2} in the conversion layer (estimated as the averaged value over all measured heights) is 1:4.7 indicating 0.83 NO\textsubscript{2} molecules are produced for every NO molecule emitted from soil emission layer. Using the lowest measured soil NO emission rate, we infer 0.3-4.3% of noontime downward flux of O\textsubscript{3} (14 nmol/m\textsuperscript{2}/s) is due to the conversion of NO to NO\textsubscript{2}. A similar magnitude of O\textsubscript{3} loss (1-8%) via NO and NO\textsubscript{2} interconversion was calculated by Kurpius and Goldstein (2003). This conversion of NO to NO\textsubscript{2} inducs a 1.0-1.7 ppt m/s NO\textsubscript{2} flux, which is 2-3 times bigger than the observed NO\textsubscript{2} flux (0.67 ± 0.21 ppt m/s), another piece of evidence supporting the existence of a canopy reduction process for NO\textsubscript{2}.

### 2.5. Analysis

For a conserved tracer, the direction and magnitude of the flux is controlled by the local concentration gradient and the vigorousness of vertical mixing—the tracer moving from high to low abundance and the rate of movement determined by the strength of both the gradient and the turbulent mixing. This concept is known as flux-gradient similarity or Bowen ratio theory, and is often used for estimating the exchange rate of non-reactive (conserved) species from their concentration gradient information (e.g. Mayer et al., 2011 and references therein). Similarity theory holds for conserved tracers when observations of fluxes are made above the roughness sublayer (Raupach and Legg, 1984) and this criterion was met at BEARPEX 2009 (18m flux measurement height with 8.8m mean tree height), as evidenced by a comparison of the flux data of the sensible heat and 3 biogenic VOC species with longer chemical lifetimes than the turbulent transport time (Park et al., 2012).

The fluxes of reactive species cannot be completely described through simple application of similarity theory. This is because reactive species will, to some extent, undergo chemical transformations faster then they will be transported by turbulent diffusion (Vila-Guerau de Arellano et al., 1993; Gao et al., 1991; Jacob and Wofsy, 1990). However, similarity theory is still a powerful tool, as quantifying the flux due to turbulence transport, allows estimation of the effects of other within-canopy processes.

A visual representation of this idea is shown in Figure 2.8. The red line shows the gradient where the flux-gradient similarity holds and the blue line shows the gradient if the concentration is chemically, or otherwise, perturbed. This is known as Localized Near-Field (LNF) theory (Vandenhurk and Mcnaughton, 1995; Raupach, 1989). In the analysis below, we will assess the within-canopy behavior of NO, NO\textsubscript{2}, and NO\textsubscript{X} through pictorial relationships analogous to Figure 2.8.

In Figure 2.8, the green dashed line divides two layers: a within canopy layer and an above-canopy layer. C\textsubscript{1} is the measured concentration in the above canopy layer and C\textsubscript{2} is the measured
concentration within the canopy. Using similarity theory and the measured fluxes we calculate \( C_F \), the concentration that would be observed for a conserved tracer. The difference between \( C_2 \) and \( C_F \), defines \( C_N \), represents the contribution to the concentration by other processes that act to perturb the flux gradient relationship. For conserved tracer with a chemical lifetime (\( \tau_{chem} \)) longer than the turbulent mixing time (\( \tau_{turb} \)), such as CO\(_2\), H\(_2\)O and some less reactive BVOCs, \( C_N \) is zero. For reactive molecules as NO and NO\(_2\), \( C_N \) will not be zero and, we can use \( C_N \) as a constraint on the extent to which chemistry occurring on fast timescales (i.e. faster than \( \tau_{turb} \)) within the canopy.

To quantify \( C_F \) we use flux-gradient similarity, Eq. (2.2), (Meyer, 1986) and the mixing rate, \( K \), the so called the eddy diffusivity constant, which is inferred from the observed sensible heat flux and temperature gradient. The difference between \( C_2 \), and \( C_F \) is then \( C_N \).

\[
\frac{\partial(C_F - C_1)}{\partial z} = \frac{F_X}{K} \tag{2.2}
\]

In an illustrative test of our approach we present our results for the conserved tracer, water. In Figure 2.9, the blue circles represent the measured gradient of H\(_2\)O and the red circles show the gradient inferred from the H\(_2\)O flux (\( C_F \)) in the within-canopy layer at midday (12:00 to 14:00 hrs). As expected, the difference between \( C_2 \) and \( C_F \) in the within-canopy layer, \( C_N \), shown as a black arrow, is negligibly small (<1\% of \( C_1 \)) with respect to the variability of H\(_2\)O and the measurement uncertainty (3\%). This implies there are no important additional source/sink process(es) aside from turbulent transport.

Applying same analysis to NO and NO\(_2\) (Figure 2.10), we find \( C_N \), the difference between the measured concentration and \( C_F \), is large compared to the measurement error. \( C_N \) for NO and NO\(_2\) are -12.4±3.3 ppt (23\% relative to \( C_1 \)) and 64.7±4.7 ppt (44\% relative to \( C_1 \)). Repeating this analysis assuming the canopy top height and the concentration at that height as representative of the within canopy layer, instead of averaging through the entire canopy, results in \( C_N \) values of similar magnitude, 27\% and 39\% for NO and NO\(_2\) respectively.

To understand contributions to \( C_N \), we begin with analysis of how fast photochemistry interconverts NO and NO\(_2\). Figure 2.10a indicates that to explain the observed NO flux, we need to account for 12ppt (\( C_N \)) more NO molecules than were observed in the canopy layer. Based on the observed gradient of NO, standard flux-gradient similarity predicts the downward flux of NO; however, we observed upward flux of NO (Figure 2.7). This counter-gradient flux can only be explained by the formation of NO during the transport process from within the canopy layer to the above canopy layer. This is reasonable as photolysis rates above the canopy should be faster than in the shade of the canopy. If the required NO is completely from NO\(_2\) photolysis then a corresponding amount of NO\(_2\) will be lost. Thus, roughly 20\% of the \( C_N \) for NO\(_2\) contributes 100\% of \( C_N \) for NO, 12.4 (±3.3) ppt and the remainder (80\% of \( C_N \) in NO\(_2\), 52.3 ppt) must be accounted for via other mechanisms.
To validate the assumption that the counter-gradient flux of NO can be 100% explained by NO₂ photolysis, we use two different methods. First we use the photostationary state analysis of NO, NO₂, and O₃ over 100 seconds (τ_{turb}) and compare the remaining C_N of NO₂ after converting NO via photolysis (80% of C_N NO₂, 52.3ppt). We use Eq. (2.3) to estimate the magnitude of NO and NO₂ inter conversion on turbulent timescales and estimate the loss rate of NO₂ on a 100 second timescale.

\[
L_{NO_2,net} = j_{NO_2}NO_2 - (k_{NO-O_3}O_3 + k_{NO-HO_2}HO_2 + k_{NO-RO_2}RO_2)[NO] \tag{2.3}
\]

The photolysis rate, \( j_{NO_2} \), is generated with the Tropospheric Ultraviolet and Visible (TUV) radiation model and then scaled with measured PAR. We treat RO₂ as equal to HO₂. Using the measured concentrations of NO, NO₂, O₃, HO₂, and temperature, we estimate a net loss of 22.8 ppt of NO₂, which is in excess of which is needed to explain the NO counter-gradient flux of 12.4 (±3.3) ppt.

The large value of C_N for NO_X (54.3±5.9 ppt, 29% relative to C₁) indicates the necessity of one or more within-canopy loss processes. To explore the mechanism(s) controlling the C_N for NO_X, we examine several chemical processes related to PNs, ANs, HNO₃, and HONO using our two-layer model. The magnitudes of each of the near-field processes for NO_X were inferred using Eq. (2.4) to estimate the contribution of certain processes on the ~100s timescale of turbulent mixing (τ_{turb}).

\[
L_x = P_x = \frac{\partial}{\partial t} \int_{z1}^{z2} C_x(z)dz \tag{2.4}
\]

Here, \( L_x (P_x) \) is the loss (production) rate of species x happening within the time window of turbulent air movement from within the canopy (height z₁) to above the canopy (height z₂). We choose 4.4m, averaged throughout the canopy, as a representative of z₁ and 18m above canopy layer as representative of z₂.

PNs can act as either a net source or a sink of NO_X through thermal dissociation (+1 NO₂ molecule) or PN formation (-1 NO₂). Calculating the steady-state chemical production and thermal and chemical loss of PAN (LaFranchi et al., 2009; Wolfe et al., 2009), yields 5.3 ppt of NO₂ formed in 100s. This mechanism thus implies an enhancement of NO_X within the canopy, discussed in more detail in Min et al. (2012c). However, we have also suggested that a local biogenic precursor drives PN formation within canopy (Min et al., 2012a). This BVOC PN species, denoted XPN, exhibited an upward flux and is a candidate for NO₂ loss not included in our steady-state calculation. We estimate that the flux of this XPN to be 2.274±0.357 ppt m/s corresponding to 16.7 ppt of NO₂ loss within canopy and explaining 31% of the NO_X C_N.

BVOC driven AN formation from OH initiation can be calculated as:

\[
P_{\Sigma AN} = \sum_i \alpha_i k_{OH+VOC_i} [OH] [VOC_i] \tag{2.5}
\]
Here, we estimate the effects of 2-methyl-3-butene-2-ol (MBO) and monoterpenes (two important BVOCs at the BEARPEX site (Bouvier-Brown et al., 2009a; Schade et al., 2000) on AN production (for 100s) and calculate 1.2-3.3 ppt (2.2-6%) and 0.11-0.6ppt (0.2-1.1%) NOX is removed by AN formation, respectively. A 3% branching ratio (\(\alpha_i\)) (Rosen et al., 2004), we used for each molecule. If we instead use a branching ratio of 20%, we estimate 8.3-21.9 ppt (15-40%) and 0.77-0.6ppt (1.4-3.7%) NOX is lost to MBO and monoterpene nitrates formation. If we consider AN formation from ozonolysis reactions of very reactive BVOCs, such as sesquiterpenes, in analogy to XPN formation through the channel described as BCSOZNO3 in MCM v3.2, we estimate additional 27 ppt (50%) of NOX consumed. These calculations indicate chemical formation of nitrates is rapid enough to affect the fluxes.

Formation of HNO3 is an important pathway to remove NOX from the system by wet and dry deposition after formation. Gas phase reaction of NO2 with OH has been known as a major source of HNO3 formation in rural areas (heterogeneous formation HNO3 from NO2 hydrolysis is slower by an order of magnitude order than the gas phase formation rate). The production rate can be calculated as:

\[
P_{HNO_3} = k_{OH+NO_2}[OH][NO_2]
\]  

(2.6)

Using the measured OH concentration, we estimate 0.6-2% of NOX is lost through gas phase reaction at this site. Compared to ANs and PNs, HNO3 formation is unimportant.

HONO formation is another candidate for altering the flux of NOX. HONO flux measurements at this site were observed to be small (-0.11 ± 0.69ppt m/s) and downward indicating possibly contribute the enhancement of NOX within canopy rather than loss.

Direct uptake through plant stomata might be responsible for the remaining NO2 removal within the canopy. However, the daytime NO2 concentration at this site of less than few hundred ppt suggests this site is a regime where NO2 emissions from plant biota likely dominate. Further evidence of an NO2 compensation point from canopy scale observations are presented in Min et al. (2012c).

Taken together as much as 100% of the CN for NOX (Table 2.1) can be explained by local chemical NOX loss mechanisms and the formation of higher nitrogen oxides. A subsequent paper will examine fluxes of ANs to assess overall closure in the N budget.

### 2.6. Conclusions

We observed upward fluxes of NO and NO2 from eddy-covariance flux measurements, large NO2 and NOX concentration enhancements within canopy, and counter-gradient fluxes of NO. Applying standard flux-gradient relationships indicates the existence of one or more NOX loss processes within the canopy, in addition to conversion of NO to NO2 by reaction with O3 and
peroxy radicals. We investigate multiple chemical processes to explain the NO\textsubscript{X} removal during vertical transport and conclude that the chemical formation of PNs and ANs can be responsible for the NO\textsubscript{X} canopy reduction factor. This study provides observational evidence of an ecosystem scale canopy reduction factor, a factor that has been relied on to reconcile discordance between leaf-level, soil-level, and atmospheric modeling studies. We find it likely that much of this reduction is chemical—implying that the reactive nitrogen does escape the canopy and may be returned by further chemistry as NO\textsubscript{x} downwind.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mechanisms</th>
<th>NO(_X) consumption</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Un-identified PN formation</td>
<td>&gt;31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MBO and monoterpene nitrates formation</td>
<td>2.4-43.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sesquiterpene nitrate formation</td>
<td>0-50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HNO(_3) formation</td>
<td>0.6-2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HONO formation</td>
<td>~0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total NO(_X) loss</strong></td>
<td><strong>34-100%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 2.1. Schematic of the various interactions involved in the exchange of nitrogen oxides between the atmosphere and the forest canopy. Bold arrows in blue (downward) and red (upward) represent the direction of the flux of each species across the canopy surface.
Figure 2.2. Data collection scheme for NO (2ch-CL) and NO$_2$ (TD-LIF) for flux (a) and vertical gradient (b) measurements. Colors represent the different measurement heights: 18m (black), 14m (light blue), 9m (blue), 5m (green), 1.5m (magenta), and 0.5m (red). Yellow periods are calibration cycles and white periods represent no data collected at that time.
Figure 2.3. Lag calculation of w’T', w’NO’ and w’NO₂’. Highest normalized correlation between wind and temperature/NO or NO₂ were observed as expected; 0 second for wind and temperature, 1.4 and 2.6 second for NO and NO₂.
**Figure 2.4.** Equally spaced logarithmic averaged (200 bins) absolute cospectral density (a), frequency weighted cospectrum (b), and normalized cumulative distributions of the cospectra of temperature (red) and NO\textsubscript{X} (blue) (c) with vertical wind from 9:00-12:00 when the chemical perturbation is small. Closed triangles represent the absolute value of the negative cospectral density, which has the opposite sign to the general flux direction. The black dotted lines in (a) are lines with slopes of $-7/3$ and $-5/3$ (see related text).
Figure 2.5. Diurnal patterns of O₃ (south tower), NOₓ, NO, and NO₂. The data are one-hour mean values and the error bars represent the variation defined as the observed variability (± 1σ) divided by square root of the number of measurements in that time bin. Colors represent the measurement heights: above canopy (18m) in black, top canopy (9m) in blue, middle canopy (5m) in green, and forest floor (1.5m for O₃ and 0.5m for NO and NO₂) in red.
Figure 2.6. Vertical gradients of NO, NO₂, and NOₓ. Dot and whiskers represent means and standard errors of the mixing ratio enhancement at each height. The colors represent the enhancement at 6 different times of day through the complete diurnal cycle: early morning (6:00-9:00, blue), late morning (9:00-12:00, cyan), midday (12:00-14:00, red), afternoon (14:00-18:00, magenta), evening (18:00-24:00, green) and night (24:00-6:00, black).
Figure 2.7. Diurnal patterns of the NO, NO₂, NOₓ, and sensible heat fluxes in panels a, b, c, and d, respectively. All fluxes are upward indicating molecular motion from forest to atmosphere. Median midday (12:00-14:00) fluxes are 0.32 ± 0.27, 0.67 ± 0.21, and 1.0 ± 0.43 ppt m/s for NO, NO₂, and NOₓ and that of sensible heat flux is 0.21 ± 0.08°C m/s. Black line represent means and the gray areas give 25-75% of flux data for hourly bins.
Figure 2.8. Schematic of our two-layered model based on the localized-near field, LNF, concept. 

$C_1$ represents the reference concentration, which for the above-canopy layer is defined as the measured concentration at height 18m. $C_2$ is the measured concentration within the canopy defined as the averaged concentration at 0.5, 5, and 9m. $C_F$ is estimated concentration from the measured eddy-covariance flux and the eddy diffusivity calculated from sensible heat flux. $C_N$ is the non-diffusive concentration estimated from the difference of $C_2$ and $C_F$ while, $C_F$ is the concentration from diffusion, where the standard flux-gradient relationship holds.
Figure 2.9. The estimated concentration, $C_F$ (red) using standard flux-gradient similarities of H$_2$O during midday (12:00-14:00) is shown. Blue represents the measured vertical gradient. Closed circles and whiskers represent the mean and the variability of H$_2$O. The difference between blue and red in the within-canopy level is shown in black arrow indicates $C_N$ and is negligibly small as expected for a conserved species.
Figure 2.10. The estimated concentration, $C_F$, (red) using standard flux-gradient similarities of NO and NO$_2$ at midday (12:00-14:00). Blue represents the measured vertical gradient. Closed circles and whiskers are the mean and standard errors. The differences between blue and red points in the within-canopy layer are $C_N$. 
Figure 2.11. The estimated concentration, $C_F$, (red) using standard flux-gradient similarities of NO$_X$ at midday (12:00-14:00). Blue represents the measured vertical gradient. Closed circles and whiskers are the mean and standard errors. The differences between blue and red points in the within-canopy layer are $C_N$. 
Chapter 3

Observational evidence for an ecosystem scale NO₂ compensation point

Abstract

The effects of vegetation and chemistry on exchange of nitrogen oxides (NOₓ = NO + NO₂) between the biosphere and atmosphere are poorly understood. We present an observational study of NO₂ exchange at the canopy scale, using eddy-covariance flux measurements along with simultaneous vertically resolved concentration measurements at multiple heights within the canopy. We derive exchange velocities for NO₂ and find they have an inverse relationship to NO₂ concentration and observe that the sign of the major flux carrying eddies varies with ambient NO₂ concentration. Relationships between exchange rates of NO and NO₂ with those of carbon dioxide (CO₂), ozone (O₃) and photosynthetically active radiation provide constraints that help to elucidate the mechanisms controlling NO₂ exchange.

3.1 Introduction

The exchange of nitrogen oxides (NOₓ = NO + NO₂) across the atmosphere-biosphere interface (Figure 3.1) affects (a) ecosystem nutrient cycling by influencing the amount of bioavailable N, (b) air quality as NOₓ is a key atmospheric reactant, and (c) climate change as the dry and wet deposition of oxidized reactive N may act to fertilize plant growth and thus increases sequestration of CO₂ with the biosphere. Our current understanding of the atmosphere-biosphere exchange of NOₓ is summarized in Figure 3.1. Soil NO emissions are the largest source of NOₓ from the biosphere and the rapid inter conversion between NO and NO₂ resulting from the reaction of NO with O₃ and the photolysis of NO₂ determines the form of NOₓ. To quantify the strength of the each arrow in Figure 3.1, multi-scale studies have been conducted at the inter-cellular (e.g. Rogers et al., 1979; Lee and Schwartz, 1981; Park and Lee, 1988; Okano et al., 1986; Nussbaum et al., 1993; Weber et al., 1995), leaf (e.g. Eller and Sparks, 2006; Teklemariam and Sparks, 2006; Chaparro-Suarez et al., 2011 and references therein), canopy (e.g. Hereid and Monson, 2001; Horii et al., 2004; Fang and Mu, 2006; Farmer et al., 2006; Min et al., 2012b), regional and global scale (e.g. Jacob and Wofsy, 1990; Yienger and Levy, 1995; Wang and Leuning, 1998; Ganzeveld et al., 2002; Delon et al., 2007) over the last few decades. Leaf-level studies, including inter-cellular studies, have largely focused on metabolic processes
of vegetation (plant centric), while canopy studies, including regional- and global-scale studies, have concentrated on the impacts of NO\textsubscript{x} exchange across canopies on air quality and climate change (atmosphere centric). Broadly speaking, results from leaf and canopy perspectives are contradictory (Lerdau et al., 2000), as at the leaf scale plants are able to act as NO\textsubscript{x} sources but at the canopy-scale vegetative canopies appear to act as NO\textsubscript{x} sinks. We discuss both perspectives in detail below.

At the leaf scale the role of vegetation as source and/or sink of NO\textsubscript{2} is determined by the ambient NO\textsubscript{2} concentration. Bi-directional exchange of NO and NO\textsubscript{2} has been observed (e.g. Wildt et al., 1997; Chaparro-Suarez et al., 2011 and references therein) and a compensation point, C\textsubscript{PT}, where the direction of net exchange changes sign has been identified for NO\textsubscript{2}. The C\textsubscript{PT} is defined as the ambient NO\textsubscript{2} concentration at which the net exchange of NO\textsubscript{2} becomes zero, below which the plant emits NO\textsubscript{2} and above which plants take up NO\textsubscript{2}. This pivotal point is thought to be determined by a balance between the production and consumption of NO\textsubscript{2} by plants rather than the Henry’s Law equilibrium of NO\textsubscript{2} between the atmosphere and the stomatal liquid (Conrad, 1996). Leaf-level branch enclosure studies have measured C\textsubscript{PT}S for NO\textsubscript{2} ranging from 0.1 to 3.2 ppb (Chaparro-Suarez et al., 2011 and references therein). Most of the ecosystems on Earth experience lower ambient NO\textsubscript{2} concentrations than any reported C\textsubscript{PT} implying that nearly all continental vegetation acts as a source of NO\textsubscript{2}. Yet some branch enclosure studies have suggested mechanisms other than plant metabolic processes are responsible for the observed NO\textsubscript{2} emissions. For example UV induced NO\textsubscript{2} emissions from deposited nitric acid (HNO\textsubscript{3}) or organic nitrates (Hari et al., 2003; Raivonen et al., 2006; Raivonen et al., 2009) have been proposed. Similar surface processes have been reported on snow and glass surfaces with emissions of NO\textsubscript{2}, NO, and HONO observed (Beine et al., 2002; Zhou et al., 2003; Zhou et al., 2011). UV induced emissions will also mean canopies may act as sources of NO\textsubscript{x}.

At the canopy scale, in order for chemical transport modeling studies to calculate reasonable concentrations of O\textsubscript{3} in remote regions, models invoke a “canopy reduction factor” to remove NO emitted from soils before it is injected into the atmosphere. This factor removes 25–85% of NO\textsubscript{x} within the canopy prior to its escape depending on the strength of the local soil NO emission and location (Jacob and Wofsy, 1990; Yienger and Levy, 1995; Wang and Leuning, 1998; Ganzeveld et al., 2002; Delon et al., 2007). There is observational evidence to support this canopy shielding effect (Lovett and Lindberg, 1993; Hereid and Monson, 2001; Fang and Mu, 2006; Min et al., 2012b) including a description of its meteorological controlling factors (Pang et al., 2009). Previous work from our group directly observed a within canopy NO\textsubscript{x} removal processes finding a canopy reduction factor was indeed needed to reconcile vertical NO\textsubscript{x} concentration gradient and flux measurements (Min et al., 2012b) and we proposed that the chemical production of the higher nitrogen oxides such as peroxy nitrates and alkyl nitrates was the mechanism behind the reduction factor (Min et al., 2012a). Canopy reduction factors imply that in remote regions vegetative canopies function as NO\textsubscript{x} sinks at ambient NO\textsubscript{x} less than most values of C\textsubscript{PT}.

In this paper, we (1) investigate whether —at the canopy scale— a forest acts as a source of NO\textsubscript{2} and (2) discuss how the existence of a CPT is consistent with the concept of a canopy reduction factor.
3.2 Methods

We use data collected during the BEARPEX 2009 campaign (June 15 – July 31, 2009) at a ponderosa pine plantation and located adjacent to the University of California at Berkeley Blodgett Forest Research Station (38°53’42.9”N, 120°3757.9”W and 1315m) on the western slope of the Sierra Nevada Mountains in California. A detailed description of the local meteorology, along with a campaign overview and other BEARPEX analyses can be found elsewhere (Cohen et al., 2012; articles in this special issue of ACP).

Briefly, the summer wind patterns are highly regular and characterized by flow from the southwest (210-240°) during daytime and from the northeast (30°) during nighttime. The dominant upper canopy trees are Pinus ponderosa L. with a few Douglas fir, white fir, and incense cedar. The lower canopy is mainly composed of mountain whitethorn (Ceanothus cordulatus) and manzanita (Arctostaphylos species) shrubs. The canopy height, defined by the mean tree height, was 8.8 m with a 3.7 m²/m² leaf area index (LAI). The leaf area density was estimated following Wolfe et al. (2011) and Misson et al. (2005).

All data in this study were measured from an 18 m tall scaffolding tower (hereafter the “north tower”) with the exception of O₃, which was measured from a 15 m walk-up tower (hereafter the “south tower”) and the two towers were 10 m apart. Vertically resolved concentration measurements of NO and NO₂ were made at multiple heights (0.5, 4.5, 8.8 and 17.5 m) using a two-channel chemiluminescence system (2ch-CL) and two thermal-dissociation laser-induced fluorescence systems (TD-LIF). In addition, higher oxides of nitrogen i.e. PNs, ANs and HNO₃ were also measured from same TD-LIFs and by two independent chemical-ionization mass spectrometry (CIMS) methods (Wolfe et al., 2009; Beaver et al., 2012). Details on the NO and NO₂ measurement configurations and data acquisition sequences are described in Min et al. (2012b).

At a height of 17.5 m on the north tower, a sonic anemometer (Campbell Scientific CSAT3 3-D Sonic Anemometer) was placed adjacent to the NO and NO₂ inlets with minimal displacement (0.02 m vertical and 0.2 m horizontal displacement) to monitor 3-D wind information to calculate fluxes. Fast response O₃ sensor using a chemiluminescence technique (Coumarin 47) and high-resolution infrared gas analyzer for CO₂ and H₂O (Licor 6262) were placed at a height of 12.5 m on the south tower with a sonic anemometer (Applied Technologies, Inc., Boulder, CO). Photosynthetically active radiation (PAR) was also measured. Detailed information on the setup and operating principles for the O₃ measurements can be found in Fares et al. (2010).

The flux, \( F_C \), is a measure of the direction and vertical transport rate of atmospheric constituent, \( C \). In this study \( F_C \) is calculated using the eddy-covariance method (EC) utilizing high-time resolution measurements (<1 Hz) of 3D-wind information and, in this paper, concentration observations of NO, NO₂, O₃, and CO₂. The eddy covariance flux is directly inferred from the deviation of covariances between \( C \) and vertical wind speed, \( w \), \( (F_C = w' C') \), Foken, 2006; Lee et al., 2004; McMillen, 1988). The exchange velocity of \( C \), \( V_C \), is defined as
the concentration normalized flux \( (V_C = F_C / [C]) \). Details of the EC flux observations and procedures used in this paper can be found in Min et al. (2012b).

To explore the mechanism controlling the \( \text{NO}_2 \) exchange, we use the normalized exchange velocity \( (nV_c) \). \( nV_c \) is defined as the exchange velocity of species \( C \) \( (V_C) \) divided by the maximum exchange velocity \( \left( nV_{C=V_C/V_{\text{max}_C}} \right) \). The \( nV_C \) is useful because it normalizes out the variations in the exchange rate caused by strong turbulent mixing since the \( V_{\text{max}_C} \) describes the aerodynamic limit of exchange rate. The calculation of \( nV_C \) is described in Appendix A.

### 3.3 Vertical gradients of NO and \( \text{NO}_2 \)

If the strength and direction of \( \text{NO}_2 \) emissions from the canopy is dictated by a \( C_{\text{PT}} \) then it is expected to be ambient \( \text{NO}_2 \) concentration dependent. Accordingly, Figure 3.2 shows the vertical gradients of NO, \( \text{NO}_2 \), and \( \text{NO}_X \) under high (red) and low (blue) \( \text{NO}_2 \) conditions. We define high and low \( \text{NO}_2 \) using the \( \text{NO}_2 \) concentration at 17.5 m (this is the above canopy \( \text{NO}_2 \) concentration) and a dividing line of 180 ppt. In early afternoon (12:00-15:00) we have a nearly equal number of 30 minute \( \text{NO}_2 \) flux observations, \( n_{\text{high}} = 67 \) and \( n_{\text{low}} = 73 \) binning the data in this way. We found that different time windows and/or concentration criteria do not affect our conclusions. We also sorted by day of week defining Saturday and Sunday as weekends and Tuesday, Wednesday, and Thursday as weekdays, where weekends have low \( \text{NO}_2 \) and weekdays have high \( \text{NO}_2 \) (this site is downwind of the city of Sacramento). Again, results were similar as when sorted above and below 180 ppt.

In the bottom panels of Figures 2, the gradients are shown as difference \( (\Delta C) \) of each measured concentration with respect to the above canopy concentrations at 17.5 m \( (\Delta C = C_{\text{height}} - C_{17.5m}) \). Within canopy concentrations greater than that above the canopy have positive values of \( \Delta C \) and within canopy concentrations that are smaller negative ones. In the first plot in Figure 3.2 the normalized leaf area density is shown along the measurement profile. The time derivative of \( \text{NO}_2 \), \( \Phi \), is calculated as:

\[
\Phi = k_{\text{NO}+\text{O}_3} [\text{NO}] [\text{O}_3] - j_{\text{NO}_2} [\text{NO}_2] 
\]

When the system reaches photostationary state \( \Phi \) equals 0. The photolysis rate of \( \text{NO}_2 \), \( j_{\text{NO}_2} \) is inferred from the photolysis rate calculated with the Tropospheric Ultraviolet and Visible (TUV) radiation model and an extinct rate that is assumed to depend on the leaf area density and scaled by PAR. We estimate 90% of the radiation is attenuated at the bottom of the canopy following Wolfe et al (2011).

We observe that less NO and more \( \text{NO}_2 \) and \( \text{NO}_X \) exist within the canopy than above. \( \text{NO}_2 \) and \( \text{NO}_X \) both peak near the forest floor. The depletion of NO within canopy is due to the conversion of NO to \( \text{NO}_2 \) by reaction with \( \text{O}_3 \) and reduced photolysis of \( \text{NO}_2 \) within the canopy. The positive \( \Phi \) at 0.5m confirms that conversion of NO emitted from the soil to \( \text{NO}_2 \) persists to
at least that height above the soil. By 5m NO and NO$_2$ are nearly in photostationary state ($\Phi \approx 0$). Above the canopy, we find NO and NO$_2$ are in photostationary state and that this is independent of the ambient NO$_2$. The higher photolysis rate above the canopy means that NO$_2$ is more quickly converted to NO compared to the shaded regions in the middle and at the top of the canopy. The observed gradients of NO and NO$_2$ are qualitatively consistent with the generally held model of biosphere-atmosphere NO$_X$ exchange, described in Figure 3.1, where soil NO emissions are the major source of NO$_X$. In this model, NO$_2$ exchange is controlled by the soil NO emission rate and chemical cycling between NO$_2$-O$_3$-NO, which happens sufficiently rapidly (~100 seconds) to affect the concentration within the canopy, the gradients, and the fluxes. The calculated $\Phi$ also supports this zero order model; the positive deviation from 0 near the forest floor indicates the soil NO emissions are a source of NO$_2$ and the $\Phi$ at 17.5m is close to 0 indicating that above canopy NO$_X$ is in photostationary state. If NO and NO$_2$ inter conversion from soil NO emission was the only within canopy process taking place, we would expect NO$_X$ to be conserved and to be described by a straight line pinned at the surface NO$_X$ concentration. However, this is not what we observe. Rather, we see more NO$_X$ within canopy than above. The drop in NO$_X$ concentration from within the canopy to above the canopy (~50 ppt) is due to the presence of processes that we ascribe to a canopy reduction factor (via comparisons with flux data) in Min et al. (2012b).

One interesting phenomenon shown in Figure 3.2 is that the shapes of the NO$_2$ and NO$_X$ gradients are dependent on NO$_2$ while the shape of the NO gradient is not. The bottom panel of Figure 3.2, we show that NO$_2$ is 55 ($\pm$ 12) ppt greater within the canopy compared to above the canopy, specifically near the forest floor, when NO$_2$ concentrations are high, and 82 ($\pm$ 10) ppt greater within the canopy when the above canopy NO$_2$ concentrations are low. At the same time, we do not observe any difference in NO in high versus low NO$_2$ concentration conditions. This is in part due to correlation with O$_3$ that result in higher photostationary state NO$_2$/NO ratios at high NO$_2$. This may also be an indication of a NO$_X$ source other than soil NO. We observe greater NO$_2$ and NO$_X$ concentrations with respect to the concentration at 17.5m at low NO$_2$ than we do at high NO$_2$, mostly apparent in lower canopy region, suggesting that this NO$_X$ source is affected by ambient NO$_2$ concentration and that it may be related to plant function. This within canopy NO$_X$ source is consistent consists with the mechanisms assumed to be responsible for a compensation pint for NO$_2$.

### 3.4 Exchange velocities of NO and NO$_2$

The NO$_2$ concentration dependence of the exchange velocity ($V_{NO2}=F_{NO2}/[NO2]$) during the daytime (9:00-18:00) is shown in Figure 3.3. The mean and median $V_{NO2}$ are shown as black diamonds and red lines; the blue boxes mark the central 50%. For the most part, the observed $V_{NO2}$ is positive indicating that, in the aggregate, NO$_2$ exchange is upward from the biosphere to the atmosphere. $V_{NO2}$ peak (1-2 cm/s) at 50-100 ppt of NO$_2$ and substantially decrease as NO$_2$ concentration increase. $V_{NO2}$ is near zero in the range 300-500 ppt of NO$_2$. 
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In Figure 3.4, the daytime $V_{NO_2}$ is separated into three ambient NO\textsubscript{2} concentration regimes: low (NO\textsubscript{2} < 125 ppt, n = 85), mid (155 ppt < NO\textsubscript{2} < 192 ppt, n = 85) and high (240 ppt < NO\textsubscript{2}, n = 84). The distribution of $V_{NO_2}$ under low NO\textsubscript{2} conditions spreads toward higher exchange velocities (Figure 3.3, top panel) compared to the distribution under high NO\textsubscript{2} conditions (Figure 3.3, bottom panel). Possible explanations for this behavior include a compensation point for NO\textsubscript{2} exchange—if there is a C\textsubscript{PT} then NO\textsubscript{2} emissions would be larger at low NO\textsubscript{2}. An alternative speculation is that emissions of NO are anticorrelated with NO\textsubscript{2} concentration. However, we are unaware of any process that would result in anticorrelation of NO emission and NO\textsubscript{2} concentration.

In Figures 5 and 6, we present the normalized NO ($nV_{NO}$) and NO\textsubscript{2} ($nV_{NO_2}$) exchange velocity plotted versus photosynthetically active radiation (PAR) and CO\textsubscript{2}, respectively. We find that $nV_{NO}$ and $nV_{NO_2}$ exhibit different dependences on these two parameters. The $nV_{NO}$ shows no dependence on PAR while $nV_{NO_2}$ is negative at low PAR and increases more or less linearly with PAR. The difference in the PAR dependence is direct evidence that $nV_{NO}$ and $nV_{NO_2}$ are controlled by different processes. In addition, it also suggests that soil NO emissions and NO/NO\textsubscript{2} conversion are not the only source of NO\textsubscript{2}. If soil NO were the only source of NO\textsubscript{2}, and the chemistry of NO to NO\textsubscript{2} conversion controlled the NO\textsubscript{X} partitioning, we would expect to correlated PAR dependence for both species.

The dependence of $nV_{NO}$ and $nV_{NO_2}$ on $nV_{CO_2}$ (Figure 3.6) also provides information that the processes controlling NO are not the same as those that control NO\textsubscript{2}. In Figure 3.6 we observe a linear increase of $nV_{NO_2}$ with increases in $nV_{CO_2}$, where faster upward movement of NO\textsubscript{2} molecules is correlated with a faster CO\textsubscript{2} deposition rate except for the smallest $nV_{CO_2}$. No clear relationship exists between $nV_{NO}$ and $nV_{CO_2}$. The correlation with $nV_{CO_2}$ and $nV_{NO_2}$ may be an indication of the connection between the within canopy NO\textsubscript{2} source and plant processes. However, CO\textsubscript{2} flux is correlated with PAR and it is difficult to disentangle a purely radiative effect from one involving plant stomata.

### 3.5 Cospectral analysis

Cospectral analysis can be used to characterize the contributions of the different frequency eddies to the total flux. Min et al. (2012b) show that our NO and NO\textsubscript{2} instruments, 2-ch CL and TD-LIF, observe the full range of flux carrying eddies without any significant biases in frequency. Here, we interpret the cospectrum of reactive species by comparison to the cospectrum of conserved tracers. The frequency weighted and covariance normalized cospectrum of sensible heat ($nCo_{w,T_v}$), NO\textsubscript{2} ($nCo_{w,NO_2}$), NO ($nCo_{w,NO}$) and O\textsubscript{3} ($nCo_{w,O_3}$) are shown in Figure 3.7. These curves represent the fraction of the total flux at each frequency. Higher frequencies are smaller eddies and lower frequencies are larger ones. The frequency weighted and covariance normalized cospectrum, $nCo_{w,c}(b)$, is calculated as:

```latex
nCo_{w,c}(b) = \frac{\int nCo_{w}(b) \cdot \int nCo_{w}(b) \cdot \Delta b}{\int nCo_{w}(b) \cdot \int nCo_{w}(b) \cdot \Delta b}
```
\[ nCo_{w'c'}(v) = \frac{vCo(v)}{\sigma_{w'c'}} \]  

(3.2)

\[ Co(v) = \text{real} \left( \frac{\text{fft}(w')^* \text{fft}(c')}{T} \right) \]  

(3.3)

In Eq. 3.3 \text{fft}(w') and \text{fft}(c') stands for the Fourier transforms of the deviation of vertical wind and concentration from the mean over sampling period, T, (30 minutes for this study) and \( * \) stands for the complex conjugate. The cospectrum, \( Co_{w'c'}(v) \), is the real part. \( nCo_{w'c'}(v) \) is calculated as cospectrum multiplied by each frequency, \( v \), and divided by the covariance of \( C \) with \( w', \sigma_{w'c'} \), at that frequency.

We show the frequency weighted normalized cospectra in both the high (>180 ppt, top panel) and low (<180 ppt, bottom panel) NO\(_2\) regime at 17.5 m within the 12:00-15:00 time window. Black lines are \( w'Ts' \), which are always positive, green lines are \( nCo_{w'NO_2} \), light blue dashed lines are \( nCo_{w'NO} \), and yellow lines are \( nCo_{w'O_3} \). Both positive and negative signs are observed in the cospectral density for NO\(_2\), NO and O\(_3\).

Generally, the shape of \( nCo_{w'O_3} \) and \( nCo_{w'Ts} \) are similar to each other, although opposite in sign, with the maximum flux contribution from frequencies in the range 0.005 Hz to 0.1 Hz (200-10 second). We infer these are the dominant flux carrying eddies at this site. The sign of the cospectrum is an indication of the direction of the flux; positive indicating upward from the canopy to the atmosphere and negative from the atmosphere to the canopy.

We do not observe significant differences in the flux-carrying eddy frequencies of \( nCo_{w'Ts} \) and \( nCo_{w'O_3} \) under high versus low NO\(_2\) conditions. We do, however, see strong differences in the cospectrum of \( nCo_{w'NO_2} \) and \( nCo_{w'NO} \). In the bottom panel, at low NO\(_2\), we see upward fluxes of NO\(_2\) for eddies slower than the frequency of 0.1 Hz (longer time scales than 10 seconds). These flux carrying eddies are not apparent at high NO\(_2\). At first glance this is surprising as the measurement precision is better at high NO\(_2\) and if fluxes were independent of concentration, we would expect better S/N in the higher NO\(_2\) cospectrum. In contrast, we observe downward or weaker upward motions of NO and NO\(_2\) under high NO\(_2\) conditions at the same frequencies where the maximum upward flux-carrying eddies are observed at low NO\(_2\) (0.013-0.02 Hz). The NO and NO\(_2\) cospectra exhibit coupling at some frequencies - one is up while the other is down - especially for longer eddies that reach the forest floor or small eddies that circle above the canopy.

Providing further evidence that these differences are real and require an explanation, we observed a concentration dependence of the cospectrum at other times of day. We also found that other nitrogen oxides exhibit bidirectional features. The HNO\(_3\) cospectrum is downward at all frequencies, while NO, NO\(_2\), \( \Sigma \)PNs and \( \Sigma \)ANs cospectra all have bi-directional components.
3.6 Discussion

Faster $V_{NO2S}$ are observed in lower NO2 conditions (50-100 ppt) and $V_{NO2}$ gradually decreases and becomes near zero in the range 300-500 ppt of NO2 which has some parallels to leaf level studies reporting emission at low NO2. The absence of deposition at any NO2 makes us reluctant to label the effect a “compensation point”. However, the mechanism is consistent with that idea. The daytime mean NO2 concentration at this site is $188 \pm 86$ ppt ($\pm 1\sigma$) falling at the lower range of previously reported CPTs from leaf-level studies. The CPT of the ponderosa pine has not yet been measured, although the compensation points for other conifers have been studied and are in the range 0.1-3ppb (e.g. Rondon and Granat, 1994; Gessler et al., 2002; Hari et al., 2003; Raivonen et al., 2009; Chaparro-Suarez et al., 2011). The observed gradient in NO2 is consistent with greater emission at low ambient NO2. Moreover, there are more upward frequency features in flux carrying eddies at lower NO2 than at high NO2. The dependence of $nV_{NO}$ and $nV_{NO2}$ on $nV_{CO2}$, and PAR suggest there is a below canopy NOX source that is independent of soil NO emission and the associated NO/NO2 conversion. We hypothesize that this component of the local NOX source is related to the shrubs and trees in the forest surrounding our observing site.

In Chapter 2, we showed from our interpretation of measured fluxes and their gradients that there are within canopy sinks of NOX and equated these sinks to a mechanistic description of the canopy reduction factor. We show in this chapter that the presence of a canopy reduction factor does not necessarily conflict with presence of an ambient NO2 dependent source from vegetation (Figure 3.8). Direct or indirect NO2 emissions from plants are a potential source for within canopy NOX in addition to soil NO. However, it is the total within canopy NOX regardless of its source, that is removed prior to escape from the canopy by the reduction factor; shown as BVOC-NO2 in Figure 3.8. Consequently it is difficult to directly observe NO2 fluxes associated with NO2 emissions by the forest. In this case, it is only the multiple lines of evidence from simultaneous flux and gradient measurements that point to emission from the biota within the forest.

3.7 Conclusions

We observed the NO2 exchange rate dependence on NO2 concentration using canopy scale measurements of EC fluxes and vertically resolved concentrations. Spectral analysis, the observed gradients and the fluxes suggest the existence of one or more mechanisms, which drive bi-directional NO2 exchange as the net flux is unidirectional upward. From the comparison of the NO and NO2 exchange rate dependence on PAR and CO2 we speculate that processes that are directly or indirectly related to stomatal conductance affect NO2. To our knowledge, this is the first observational study of NO2 emission sources at the canopy scale and it is consistent with mechanisms that could cause a compensation point.
Figure 3.1. Schematic of the atmosphere-biosphere exchanges of nitrogen oxides between. Bold arrows in blue (downward) and red (upward) represent the direction of the flux of each species across the canopy surface. Canopy reduction is in black dashed arrows within canopy.
Figure 3.2. Normalized vertical gradients of NO, NO\(_2\), and NO\(_X\) under high and low NO\(_2\) conditions during the early afternoons (12:00-15:00) along with the normalized leaf area density (norm LAD). The horizontal bars are the 1\(\sigma\) variance divided by square root of number of data points and indicating the natural variability.
Figure 3.3. The NO$_2$ concentration dependence of the NO$_2$ exchange velocity during the daytime (9:00-18:00). The blue boxes represent the lower and upper quartile values and red lines and black diamonds indicate the median and mean $V_{NO_2}$. Whiskers extend out to 99.3%. Bins with less than 5 points are ignored.
Figure 3.4. Histograms of $V_{\text{NO}_2}$ observations separated into three different NO$_2$ concentration regimes. Upper (blue), middle (green), and lower (red) panels represent low (<125 ppt), middle (155-190 ppt) and high (>240 ppt) above canopy NO$_2$ concentrations during the daytime (9:00-18:00). The low NO$_2$ category has 85 and the mid and high categories have 84 observations each.
Figure 3.5. Normalized exchange velocity of NO and NO$_2$ vs. PAR during daytime (9:00-18:00). The blue boxes represents lower and upper quartile values and the red lines and black diamonds indicate the median and mean nV$_{NC}$. Whiskers extend to 99.3%.
Figure 3.6. Normalized exchange velocities of NO and NO$_2$ vs. the normalized exchange velocities of CO$_2$ during the daytime (9:00-18:00). Blue boxes outline the lower and upper quartile values and the red lines and black diamonds indicate the median and mean. Whiskers extend to 99.3%. Negative sign indicate downward motion and bigger number of $nV_{CO2}$ indicate faster uptake of CO$_2$. 
Figure 3.7. Equally spaced logarithmic averaged (100 bins) frequency weighted normalized spectra of sensible heat ($w'T_s'$, black), NO$_2$ ($w'NO_2'$, green), NO ($w'NO'$, light blue), and O$_3$ ($w'O_3'$, yellow) under high NO$_2$ conditions (upper panel) and low NO$_2$ conditions (lower panel).
Figure 3.8. Conceptual model of NO\textsubscript{2} sources and sinks within the canopy and its exchange in atmosphere-biosphere interactions in low NO\textsubscript{2} condition. Bold arrows represent the exchanges in forest-atmosphere interphone; deposition is in blue and emissions in red. Solid red arrows indicate source processes and black arrows indicate chemical mechanisms take place.
Chapter 4

Observations of atmosphere-biosphere exchange of total and speciated peroxynitrates: nitrogen fluxes and biogenic sources of peroxynitrates

Abstract

Peroxynitrates are responsible for global scale transport of reactive nitrogen. Recent laboratory observations suggest that they may also play an important role in delivery of nutrients to plant canopies. We measured eddy covariance fluxes of total peroxynitrates (ΣPNs) and three individual peroxynitrates (APNs ≡ PAN + PPN + MPAN) over a ponderosa pine forest during the Biosphere Effects on AeRosols and Photochemistry EXperiment 2009 (BEARPEX 2009). Concentrations of these species were also measured at multiple heights above and within the canopy. While the above-canopy daytime concentrations are nearly identical for ΣPNs and APNs, we observed the downward flux of ΣPNs to be 30-60% slower than the flux of APNs. The vertical concentration gradients of ΣPNs and APNs vary with time of day and exhibit different temperature dependencies. These differences can be explained by the production of peroxynitrates other than PAN, PPN, and MPAN within the canopy (presumably as a product from oxidation of local biogenic VOC emissions) and upward fluxes of these PN species. The impact of this implied peroxynitrate flux on the interpretation of NOX fluxes and ecosystem N exchange is discussed.

4.1. Introduction

Peroxynitrates, PNs (RO2NO2 ≡ acyl peroxynitrates + non-acyl peroxynitrates) represent 25% or more of the reactive nitrogen in the troposphere. PNs are thermally unstable at characteristic surface temperatures but have very long lifetimes (days to weeks) aloft. As a result, peroxynitrates are temporary reservoirs of NOX (≡ NO + NO2) affecting regional and global tropospheric ozone formation (Hudman et al., 2004; Zhang et al., 2008; Parrish et al., 2009; Fiore et al., 2011) by sequestering NOX at the source and then releasing it in downwind rural and remote regions. PNs may also have a significant influence on climate via their effects on available nitrogen and thus ecosystem productivity (Bytnerowicz and Fenn, 1996; Goulding et al.,
1998; Sparks et al., 2003; Teklemariam and Sparks, 2004; Sparks, 2009) and via their phytotoxicity and thus ecosystem health (Okano et al., 1990; Goulding et al., 1998). Recent research has brought attention to new mechanisms by which peroxynitrates might participate in linking the atmospheric and biospheric N cycles (Townsend et al., 1996; Holland et al., 1997; Teklemariam and Sparks, 2004; Sparks, 2009).

Measurements at the leaf scale (Okano et al., 1990; Sparks et al., 2003) and studies assuming flux-gradient similarity (Doskey et al., 2004) have suggested that the direct uptake of PAN (CH$_3$C(O)OONO$_2$) by plants is fast and controlled by stomatal processes. Early work focused only on PAN’s phototoxicity (Taylor, 1969; Ordin et al., 1971; Okano et al., 1990; Okano et al., 2004) assuming exclusively negative impacts due to foliar uptake on ecosystem health (Bytnerowicz and Fenn, 1996). In contrast, Sparks (2009) pointed out that direct foliar uptake of atmospheric reactive nitrogen to biota could be a major source of global N input to ecosystems. Teklemariam and Sparks (2004) estimated as much as 20% of regional dry deposition of N occurs via foliar uptake of PAN and that this addition could serve to enhance productivity (Teklemariam and Sparks, 2004). To the extent that stomatal processes dominate, PN deposition will occur according to spatial and temporal patterns that are different from HNO$_3$, as HNO$_3$ deposition is thought to be controlled only by turbulent transport to surfaces and, as a result, PN deposition could be an even larger percentage of the total in some locations.

New measurement techniques have enabled the use of eddy-covariance methods (Turnipseed et al., 2006; Farmer et al., 2006; Wolfe et al., 2009) providing more detailed observations of the rate of exchange of PNs between the atmosphere and biosphere. Analyses of these recent experiments indicate that a complex interplay of chemistry and turbulent exchange occurs, making it difficult to isolate direct foliar uptake, but providing information about a variety of other chemical and micrometeorological processes. All of these new experiments suggest that our current understanding of the mechanisms governing ecosystem exchange of PNs is poor. Turnipseed et al. (2006) found the deposition of PAN to be four times faster than estimated based on a resistance analogy to H$_2$O. Farmer et al. (2006) found that the net flux of total PNs ($\Sigma$PNs) were upward - contrary to all prior expectations. Wolfe et al. (2009) observed downward fluxes of speciated PNs, at the same site as Farmer et al. (2006) but three years later, and observed that three individual PNs each deposits at a different rate (Wolfe et al., 2009).

Building on the prior experiments by Farmer et al. (2006) and Wolfe et al. (2009), we measured fluxes and gradients of total and speciated peroxynitrates ($\Sigma$PNs and APNs, respectively) above a ponderosa pine forest during the Biosphere Effects on AeRosols and Photochemistry EXperiment 2009 (BEARPEX 2009). Our goal was to develop an observational database that could provide insights into the chemistry and ecosystem biology that affect forest-atmosphere PN exchange. These measurements provide evidence for processes that result in both the upward and downward exchange of PNs and indicate that the net is a subtle balance between these opposing processes. They also provide evidence for PN formation from one or more unidentified VOC, within the forest canopy. These molecules, hereafter denoted XPNs, are then transported to the atmosphere above.
4.2. Research Site and Instrumentation

The observations used in this work were collected at a research site located on the western slope of the Sierra Nevada Mountains from June 15 to July 31 in 2009 as a part of the BEARPEX field campaign. An overview of this experiment is found in Cohen et al. (in prep.) and in the articles included in this special issue of ACP. The BEARPEX research site was located 75km downwind of Sacramento, California at a managed ponderosa pine plantation owned by Sierra Pacific Industries and near the University of California at Berkeley Blodgett Forest Research Station (38°53’42.9”N, 120°3757.9”W, and 1315m). In the summer (May to September), wind patterns at the site are controlled by the topography and are characterized by southwesterlies (210-240°) during daytime and northeasterlies (30°) at night. More detailed descriptions of the local and regional meteorology are available elsewhere (Dillon et al., 2002; Cahill et al., 2006; Choi et al., 2011; Bianco et al., 2011). The forest at this site is dominantly Pinus ponderosa L., planted in 1990, with some Douglas fir, white fir, and incense cedar. The canopy understory is largely mountain whitethorn (Ceanothus cordulatus) and manzanita (Arcostaphylos spp.) shrubbery (up to 2m in height). The average canopy heights in 2004, 2006, and 2009 were 5.1m, 7.9m, and 8.8m, respectively and the leaf area indices (LAI) determined to be 2.1m$^2$/m$^2$, 3.2m$^2$/m$^2$ and 3.7m$^2$/m$^2$ by onsite surveys conducted on April 8, 2004, October 4, 2006, and July 17, 2009 (following Misson et al., 2005).

At the BEARPEX site, there were two walk up towers separated by a distance of 10m, a 15m tower (south tower) and an 18m tower (north tower). On the south tower, meteorological parameters, including temperature, relative humidity, wind speed, net radiation, photosynthetically active radiation (PAR), and chemical species (water vapor, CO$_2$, and O$_3$) were monitored at 5 heights (1.2, 3.0, 4.9, 8.75, and 12.5m). Fluxes of water vapor, CO$_2$ and O$_3$ were also measured at 12.5m. On the north tower, vertical gradients of meteorological parameters were also monitored, including temperature, relative humidity and wind speed. Chemical species observed on the north tower, or on an adjacent height adjustable lift, included NO, NO$_2$, HONO, ΣPNs and PAN, PPN (CH$_3$CH$_2$C(O)OONO$_2$), MPAN (CH$_3$C(CH$_2$)C(O)OONO$_2$ ), total alkyl nitrates (ΣANs) and several speicated ANs, HNO$_3$, OH, HO$_2$, total OH reactivity, O$_3$, numerous BVOCs, formaldehyde, glyoxal, methylglyoxal, and several organic peroxides. Aerosol chemical and physical properties were also measured. While some measurements were made only at the 17.5m height many others were also collected at one or more of the following heights 0.5, 2.4, 5.4, 9.2 and 13.3m. For simplicity, we refer to these measurement heights as 0.5, 2, 5, 9, 13 and 18 m in the remainder of this text. Needle temperature, soil moisture, soil temperature, and soil heat flux were also monitored. Observations are available at http://www.cchem.berkeley.edu/rccgrp.

In this study we focus on the measurements of ΣPNs, PAN, PPN, MPAN, and meteorological parameters summarized in Table 4.1. The inlets for the flux measurements used in this study shared a single sonic anemometer (Campbell Scientific CSAT3 3-D Sonic Anemometer) located 0.2m horizontal and <0.01m vertical displacement from TD-CIMs inlet and with the same 0.2 m horizontal and 0.03m vertical displacement from the TD-LIF inlet.
Thermal dissociation – laser induced fluorescence (TD-LIF) was used for the measurement of NOyi (NO₂, ΣPNs, ΣANs and HNO₃). Briefly, thermal dissociation of each of these classes of higher oxides converts them to NO₂ and a companion radical at 180°C for ΣPNs, 350°C for ΣANs, and 600°C for HNO₃ (Day et al., 2002). NO₂ is then detected by LIF (Thornton et al., 2000). Two autonomous homebuilt TD-LIF systems were deployed at BEARPEX 2009 for the simultaneous measurement of fluxes and gradients. In both systems, excitation of a 585nm rovibronic feature of NO₂ was provided by a frequency doubled Nd:YAG laser (Spectra Physics, average power of 2 W at 532 nm, 30 ns pulse length) pumping a custom-built tuneable dye laser operating at 8kHz. The fluorescence signal long of 700nm was imaged onto a red sensitive photocathode (Hamamatsu H7421-50) and gated photon counting techniques (Stanford Research Systems, SRS 400) were employed to discriminate against prompt background signals. Laboratory measurements and in-field comparisons showed the two TD-LIF instruments to have calibrations that were identical to within 3% (±2.5%, 1σ, R²=0.92).

The APNs, PAN, PPN, and MPAN, were measured by thermal dissociation – chemical ionization mass spectrometry (TD-CIMS) with an iodide reagent ion source. A detailed instrument description, including a discussion of the specific configuration for the BEARPEX measurements, is presented in Wolfe et al. (2009). Briefly, thermally dissociated acyl peroxy (PA) radicals are reacted with iodide ion to form carboxylate anions, which are detected using a quadrupole mass spectrometer. Masses corresponding to PAN (m/z=58.7), PPN (m/z=72.7) and MPAN (m/z=84.7) were detected at 3.3Hz time resolution.

The sampling inlets for ΣPNs, as well as NO₂, ΣANs, and HNO₃, and APNs were co-located. The time sequence of the observations is shown in Figure 4.1. Fluxes from the TD-LIF system measurements were measured at 18m during the first 30 minutes from the 3rd minute to the 30th minute and the last 30 minutes from the 33rd minute to the 60th minute each hour (Figure 4.1. row a). NOyi measurements at the other heights were collected by switching between the 9, 5, and 0.5m heights sampling at each height for 2 minutes (Figure 4.1. row b).

TD-CIMS measurements had two different modes, a flux divergence mode (Figure 4.1. row c) and a normal mode (Figure 4.1. row d). During the flux divergence mode (day of year 165-183), concentrations at 18m and 13m were measured for 15 minutes each, alternating between either the first or last 30 minutes of the hour and measuring concentrations at 18, 13, 9, 5, 2 and 0.5m for 3 minutes each for the other 30 minutes of each hour. After day 183, fluxes were only monitored at 18m, from the 0th minute to the 25th minute (Figure 4.1. row d).

The data used in this study are from days after 176 when the TD-CIMS measurements were more reliable. Data affected by exhaust plumes from a nearby propane power generator (mostly at night) and the occasional wafts of car exhaust were removed prior to analysis. These spikes are defined as variations in the ΣPN or APN concentration in excess of 3 times the standard deviation of the 10-minute running mean. A few remaining spikes were identified through correlations with CO, NO, and NO₂ and removed by hand.

To ensure the time synchronous comparison of measurements by multiple instruments, 30-minute data resolution was calculated as the averaged value of the 0th to the 30th minute and from the 30th to the 60th minute at each height and is representative of the first and the last halves of
each hour. For the vertical gradients in Figure 4.6, 1-hour data resolution was achieved by averaging from the 0th to 60th minute.

The comparison of daytime (9:00-18:00) measurements of ΣPNs and APNs at 18m is shown in Figure 4.2. The measurements are identical to within 5%, and a least-square linear fit, forcing the intercept through zero, yields a slope of 1.02±0.026 with $R^2=0.92$. If we allow the intercept to vary we find a slope of 1.047±0.038 and an 8ppt intercept, however there is no improvement in the $R^2$. The quality of the comparison between ΣPN and APN measurements is consistent with previous studies (Wooldridge et al., 2010). It should be noted that attempts to cross-calibrate with a pure PAN source in the field were unsuccessful and that each instrument was calibrated independently with respect to a different reference gas.

### 4.3. EC flux calculation

Detailed procedures for flux calculations are described elsewhere for ΣPNs (Farmer et al., 2006) and APNs (Wolfe et al., 2009). Briefly, 3-D winds are rotated using the 2-step natural wind coordinate rotation, and concentrations data are de-spiked and de-trended using a 10-minute running mean. The time lag between wind and concentration signals is calculated by shifting the concentration time series relative to the winds and optimizing the covariance calculated by Eq. (4.1). Since this lag should depend only on the physical setup (particularly the inlet residence time), a single average lag was applied to all data. The eddy-covariance flux, $F_c$, of species $c$ is calculated using the covariance between the vertical wind speed, $w$, and the mixing ratio of $c$ by Eq. (4.1).

$$F_c = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} (w_i - \bar{w})(c_i - \bar{c}) = \bar{w'}c'$$

In this study, $c$ corresponds to ΣPNs, PAN, PPN, and MPAN, and $w$ represents the vertical wind speed. The primes in Eq. (4.1) are the deviation from the mean, the subscripts $i$ refer to individual fast time resolution measurements, and the bar indicates the mean of $n$ data points over the course of a single measurement period (15 – 30 min).

Several filters were applied to the derived fluxes to assure they are accurate. To assess stationarity (e.g. whether a 30-minute flux was representative of the average surface exchange over the sampling period), each flux measurement period (~30min) was divided into 5 equal periods and the averaged flux of each subset, $F_{sub}$, was compared to the 30-minute total flux, $F_{30min}$. If the ratio $F_{sub}/F_{30min}$ differed from unity by more than 30% then the measurement period was determined to be non-stationary and that entire half hour was removed from the dataset (Foken and Wichura, 1996). Flux data with large tilt angles (>5°) were also rejected (Lee et al., 2004). We also applied a frictional velocity filter keeping only that data with a range of frictional velocities between 0.1m/s and 1.5m/s (Foken, 2006). After the application of all filters, 67% of daytime and 61% of nighttime data remained and were used to calculate the flux.
The flux of the sum of individual APNs, $F_{APNs}$, is defined as the sum of the separately calculated PAN, PPN, and MPAN fluxes. We calculated the $\Sigma$PN flux, $F_{\SigmaPNs}$, using the concentration difference between ambient (NO$_2$) and the $180^{\circ}C$ (NO$_2$ + $\Sigma$PNs) channel. Nearly identical results are obtained if we calculated the flux of NO$_2$ and the flux of (NO$_2$ + $\Sigma$PNs) taking the difference to be the $\Sigma$PN flux.

TD-LIF systematic uncertainty (Farmer et al., 2006; Min et al., 2012b) terms in $F_{\SigmaPNs}$ estimation, include the line-locking cycle for the dye laser data acquisition scheme (<3%), sensor separation and inlet dampening (<2%), instrument response time (<8%), and the absolute concentration estimation (<15%). The random uncertainty term follows the statistics of photon-counting (<10%). Assuming all errors are uncorrelated, we calculate 17% systematic uncertainty (9% without errors from the concentration estimation) in $F_{\SigmaPNs}$ and 10% random uncertainty in half hour average $F_{\SigmaPNs}$.

Systematic and random uncertainties in $F_{APNs}$ measured by TD-CIMS are described in Wolfe et al. (2009). Systematic terms are the sensor separation and inlet dampening (<2%), response time (<12%), and the absolute calibration of the sum of all three APNs, which is taken to be 22% using the root-mean-square of 21% for PAN and PPN and 31% for MPAN weighted by their relative abundances. The total systematic error in $F_{APNs}$ is 25% (12% without errors from the concentration estimation). Random terms follow counting statistics and are <20% for half hour average flux measurements.

Many uncertainties are common to both techniques. The uncertainty in the measured concentration differences is constrained to be less than 5% based on the data shown in Figure 4.2 and the 4.7% slope derived from a fit allowing the intercept to vary. We believe this is a conservative estimate as the difference is 2% when the intercept is fixed at zero and allowing the intercept to vary in the fit did not reduce the $R^2$. Combining this 5% concentration with the 9% and 12% systematic uncertainties from other terms governing the behavior of each instrument as described above, we find the total systematic uncertainty in the difference in flux of $\Sigma$PNs and APNs ($F_{XPNs}$) to be 15% if we assume the three terms are uncorrelated. Variances due to precision terms decrease as the square root of number of half hour measurements and are much smaller than the observed natural variability. The natural variability dominates is shown by the vertical bars in the figures.

### 4.4. Results

As has been described previously, $\Sigma$PN and APN abundances at the BEARPEX site reflect advection of precursors from the city of Sacramento (~5h upwind) and from the nearer-field upwind oak belt (~3h upwind) (Dillon et al., 2002; Farmer et al., 2006; Day et al., 2009; LaFranchi et al., 2009; Wolfe et al., 2009). The concentrations of all PN species increased from noon to 18:00 (PST) and high concentrations of $\Sigma$PNs and APNs persisted past midnight (Figure 4.3). Both instruments observed similar diurnal patterns at all heights.
Figure 4.4 shows the diurnal pattern of XPNs — the difference between ΣPNs and APNs (XPNs ≡ ΣPNs – APNs) at the different heights. At 18m, XPNs increase beginning at 18hrs to a concentration of approximately 100ppt and are indistinguishable from zero between 9 and 18 hrs. In contrast, near the forest floor XPNs approach 100ppt during the afternoon (15:00-18:00) when the above canopy values are at a minimum. In the middle of the canopy there is an apparent transition region. While it is theoretically possible that the ΣPNs signal could be due to N₂O₅, we expect the contribution of N₂O₅ to the XPN is negligible since the lifetime of NO₃ at this site characterized to reaction with BVOC is too short to sustain concentrations of N₂O₅ that are more than a fraction of a ppt.

The diurnal pattern in eddy covariance ΣPN and APN fluxes (Figure 4.5) are similar in shape and direction with peak downward fluxes around 15hrs. This general pattern is similar to the APN flux observations reported by Wolfe et al. (2009) using measurements 2 years earlier at this same study site. Both the APN and ΣPN measurements give fluxes that are opposite in sign to the observations of ΣPN fluxes also made at this site during summer 2004 (Farmer et al., 2006). While the sign of the two flux measurements is the same, the magnitude of ΣPN and APN fluxes are significantly different. We observe a 30-60% slower deposition rate of ΣPNs than of APNs with a maximum difference during the daytime (9:00-18:00). This is surprising given the concentrations at 18m, the height where we observed fluxes, are identical to within 2-5%.

Two pieces of information provide hints about the source of the flux difference. For convenience we define $\Delta c$ to be the mixing ratio difference of species $c$ from 18m to height $i$, as:

$$\Delta c = c_i - c_{18m},$$

(4.2)

Positive values of $\Delta c$ indicate enhancements in species $c$ at height $i$ relative to 18m while negative values of $\Delta c$ indicate a depletion of $c$ at height $i$ relative to 18m. Figure 4.6 shows the vertical gradients ($\Delta c$) of ΣPNs and XPNs at five different times of day. During the daytime, ΣPNs and XPNs are larger within the canopy than above. At night, values of both observables are much lower near the forest floor than above the canopy indicating loss rates of ΣPNs or XPN are faster than the production rates. These profiles are suggestive of a daytime source of XPNs within the canopy.

A second piece of evidence indicating a within canopy source of XPNs is the temperature dependence of the XPN concentration at different heights. Figure 4.7 shows observations of the temperature dependence in the morning period (6:00-12:00), when large flux differences were observed alongside relatively shallow gradients. During this time period XPNs at 18m decrease with increasing temperature while at the forest floor (0.5m) XPNs increase with temperature. XPNs at 5m and 9m (not shown here) are intermediate between these two features. The temperature dependence of XPN at each height indicates that the production process is stronger within the canopy and that XPN loss processes dominate above the canopy. Although we chose this time interval to map directly to the time window shown in Figure 4.6, we arrive at the same conclusions if we use a narrower time window such as 6:00-9:00 or 9:00-12:00.
4.5. Discussion

We have investigated a variety of possible issues with our instrumentation finding no source of error able to explain the flux and gradient differences. This leads us to believe that there is an upward flux of one or more peroxynitrates that is or are not measured by the TD-CIMS. Other evidence supporting this suggestion is indicated by the temperature and PAR dependence of the XPN fluxes and exchange velocities, $V_{ex}$, (Figure 4.8). We defining the flux and $V_{ex}$ of XPNs as in Eq. (4.3):

$$F_{XPNs} = F_{\Sigma XPNs} - F_{APNs} \quad \text{or} \quad V_{ex XPNs} = \frac{F_{XPNs}}{[XPN]} \quad (4.3)$$

$F_{XPNs}$ and $V_{ex XPNs}$ are independent of canopy temperature below 20°C and then increase steeply with increasing temperature. $F_{XPNs}$ and $V_{ex XPNs}$ increase with PAR to 1200 µmol/m²/s then decrease. These features are similar to previously reported behavior for BVOC emissions at this site (Lee et al., 2005; Holzinger et al., 2005; Schade and Goldstein, 2001).

We can estimate the source strength needed to produce the observed XPN flux by assuming steady-state XPN chemical production and XPN flux out of the canopy:

$$F_{XPNs} \approx F_{P-XPNs} \cdot (4.4)$$

Here, $F_{P-XPNs}$ is the net chemical production of XPNs. Other terms in the flux budget including thermochemical loss, plant uptake, and canopy storage are calculated to be more than a factor of 10 smaller and can be neglected. The flux of XPNs, during daytime $(2.3\pm0.4 \text{ ppt m/s : mean } \pm 1\sigma$ divided by square root of number of data points) is then approximately the integral of chemical production within the canopy. To calculate the chemical production rate, we assume the canopy integrated chemical production of 2.3 ppt m/s occurs uniformly from the forest floor to the 18m measurement height (Eq. 4.5). The PA radical concentration needed to support the observed flux of XPNs is calculated by solving Eq. (4.5) and Eq. (4.6) for XO$_2$, using an average daytime concentration of NO$_2$ of 250ppt and a rate constant for $k_{XO2+NO2}$ of $1.1 \times 10^{-11} \text{ cm}^3/\text{molec/sec}$, chosen in analogy to the rate for PAN formation at 298 K and 868 mbar (Tyndall et al., 2001):

$$F_{P-XPNs} = \int_{0}^{s} (P_{XPNs})dz = 2.3(\pm0.4) \text{ pptm/s} \quad (4.5)$$

$$P_{XPNs} = k_{\omega XO2+NO2}[XO_2][NO_2] \quad (4.6)$$

Solving for XO$_2$, we find a concentration of 2.3±0.7 ppt. This is about 10% of the average daytime HO$_2$ observed at the site (22±11 ppt) (Mao et al., in prep). One plausible candidate for BVOC inducing XPN formation is sesquiterpene (SQT) oxidation. The observed sesquiterpene concentration within canopy at this site is approximately 85ppt during daytime. Using β-caryophyllene as an example, the OH and O$_3$ reaction rate constants are $1.97 \times 10^{-11}$
cm³/molec/sec and 1.16 x 10^{14} cm³/molec/sec, respectively (Shu and Atkinson, 1994; Shu and Atkinson, 1995). The typical concentrations of OH and O₃ within the canopy during BEARPEX 2009 were 0.16ppt and 54ppb. For a 100-second canopy mixing timescale (Wolfe et al., 2009), we calculate 198ppt of oxygenated BVOC (oBVOC) produced during SQT oxidation within the canopy. The source of XO₂ can be estimated considering the reaction of this oBVOC with OH radical, Eq. (4.7).

\[
\frac{d(XO_2)}{dt} = k_{oBVOC-OH}[oBVOC][OH]
\]  

(4.7)

Solving for the rate constant to form an XO₂ radical using this estimate of oBVOC and the observed OH we find a rate constant of 2.3 x 10^{11} cm³/molec/sec which is in the range of typical rate constants for the reaction of OH with aldehydes, confirming the plausibility of a sesquiterpene source of XPNs.

In addition to the reasonable value for the inferred rate constant there is laboratory and computational evidence supporting the idea that BVOC emitted by forest canopies can result in upward fluxes of PNs. For example, in a recent chamber study PNs built on a more complex organic framework than the three APNs observed in our study were observed during β-caryophyllene ozonolysis (Jenkin et al., 2012). Several other studies have discussed production of PNs built on a larger carbon backbone, including α-pinene (Noziere and Barnes, 1998), d-limonene (Leungsakul et al., 2005) and nonanal (Bowman et al., 2003) derived PNs. Using a canopy box model, Wolfe et al (2011) found upward fluxes of an PN derived from 2-methyl-3-buten-2-ol oxidation. This molecule is not likely the source or our upward flux as the chemical mechanism has been revised and that particular product is not formed (Carrasco et al., 2006), however the calculations show that products form and are transported out of the canopy on the relevant time scales.

4.6. Implications of XPNs formation

The formation of XPNs within the canopy suggests a complex array of effects on PN fluxes and, more broadly, on the biosphere-atmosphere exchange of reactive nitrogen. The first consequence is that the sign of the total PN flux depends on the relative magnitude of the upward flux of XPN and downward fluxes of PAN, PPN and MPAN. This offers one possible explanation for the upward ΣPN flux previously observed at this site (Farmer et al., 2006). If this is the case, in the Farmer et al., measurements, the upward flux of XPNs was a consequence of vegetation acting as a source of PN precursors rather than, as is often assumed, a sink through stomatal uptake. Explaining both data sets requires the biogenic source of PN precursors at the BEARPEX site to have decreased over the last decade.

A second implication is the possible role of XPNs in explaining poorly understood canopy reduction factors for soil NOₓ emissions. XPN formation affects the total N flux, as upward
fluxes of XPNs function to transfer within canopy NO\textsubscript{2} to the ΣPN pool. XPN formation is a plausible within canopy NO\textsubscript{X} loss process and is consistent with the long standing discussion about missing NO\textsubscript{X} sinks within canopies, which are parameterized as a canopy reduction factors and widely invoked in global models. These models otherwise find the strength of soil NO\textsubscript{X} emissions lead to dramatic overestimates of O\textsubscript{3} (e.g. Jacob and Wofsy, 1990). Deposition to vegetation is the most studied NO\textsubscript{X} sink process. However, the role of vegetation with respect to the NO\textsubscript{X} flux is still controversial (Lerdau et al., 2000). Here, we suggest that XPN formation is one possible mechanism of NO\textsubscript{X} loss within the canopy.

4.7. Conclusions

We observed a significant (30-60\%) difference between the deposition rate of ΣPNs, and that of the sum of three speciated PN\textsubscript{s}. The difference in these fluxes suggests formation within the canopy of PN\textsubscript{s} other than PAN, PPN and MPAN. The time of day and temperature dependence of the vertical gradient of XPNs also supports this idea. We show the flux of XPN must be upward, indicating the possibility that local vegetation acts as a source of PN rather than as a passive PN sink, a mechanism that can explain the upward ΣPN flux reported by Farmer et al. (2006). In this mechanism, oxidation of biogenic VOC may affect not only the magnitude of PN fluxes but also NO\textsubscript{X} fluxes supporting the ideas of a the strong connection between turbulent transport and chemical processes in biosphere-atmosphere exchange, as proposed by Wolfe et al. (2009 and 2011) and Farmer et al. (2006) and offering at least a partial explanation for canopy reduction factors.
Table 4.1. Vertical placement of measurements used in this study on north tower.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Height[m]</th>
<th>Met Data</th>
<th>NOyi (TD-LIF)</th>
<th>APNs (CIMS)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18 (17.5)</td>
<td>T, RH</td>
<td>NO₂, ΣPNs, ΣANs, HNO₃</td>
<td>PAN, PPN, MPAN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 (13.3)</td>
<td>T, RH</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>PAN, PPN, MPAN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 (8.8)</td>
<td>T, RH</td>
<td>NO₂, ΣPNs, ΣANs</td>
<td>PAN, PPN, MPAN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 (5.4)</td>
<td>T, RH</td>
<td>NO₂, ΣPNs, ΣANs</td>
<td>PAN, PPN, MPAN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 (2.4)</td>
<td>T, RH</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>PAN, PPN, MPAN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.5 (0.5)</td>
<td>NA/</td>
<td>NO₂, ΣPNs, ΣANs</td>
<td>PAN, PPN, MPAN</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 4.1. Colors represent difference measurement heights of 18m (black), 14m (light blue), 9m (blue), 5m (green), 2m (magenta) and 0.5m (red). Yellow and shaded periods are calibration and zero cycles and white periods represent no data collected at that time. (a) Flux measurement of ΣPNs, (b) vertical gradient measurements from ΣPNs, (c) APNs measurement over the flux-divergence mode, (d) same as (c) but over the normal mode.
Figure 4.2. Comparison of TD-LIF ΣPNs and TD-CIMS APNs measurements from 9:00 to 18:00 hrs PST (blue circles). The slope of the line fitted line (black) is 1.02 with the intercept fixed at 0 ($R^2=0.92$).
Figure 4.3. Diurnal patterns of ΣPNs (solid lines) and APNs (dashed lines) at each height. The vertical bars are the 1σ variance divided by square root of number of data points. The left box indicates the measurement height, with green at or below the 9 m average canopy height and blue above that point. Dashed lines are the specific measurement heights.
Figure 4.4. Diurnal pattern of XPNs at different heights. The vertical bars represent the 1σ variance divided by square root of number of data points in the observations. The left box indicates the measurement height, with green at or below the 9 m average canopy height and blue above that point. Dashed lines are the specific measurement heights.
Figure 4.5. Diurnal pattern of $F_{\Sigma PN}$ and $F_{APNs}$. The vertical bars are the 1σ variance divided by square root of number of data points. Both species exhibit a downward flux, indicating the dominance of in-canopy sinks, though PNs 30-60% less negative than $F_{APNs}$ during daytime.
Figure 4.6. Diurnal pattern of vertical mixing ratio differences of ΣPNs (left) and XPNs (right) with respect to the 18m mixing ratios. The horizontal bars are the 1σ variance divided by square root of number of data points. Positive values of ΔΣPN and ΔXPN indicate enhanced concentrations and negative values represent depleted concentration compared to 18m. Colors represent the time of day black (21:00-3:00), blue (3:00-6:00), green (6:00-12:00), red (12:00-18:00) and magenta (18:00-21:00).
Figure 4.7. Temperature dependence of XPNs at 0.5 and 18m during mornings (6:00-12:00). The vertical bars represent the 1σ variance divided by square root of number of data points.
Figure 4.8. Canopy temperature (left) and PAR (right) dependence of $F_{XPN}$ and $V_{exXPN}$. The vertical bars are the 1σ variance divided by square root of number of data points.
Chapter 5

Conclusion

5.1 Summary of this work

The study of biosphere-atmosphere exchanges requires an interdisciplinary approach: air masses within the canopy are affected by plant biota and the escaping efficiencies of molecules from the canopy to the atmosphere are determined by both micrometeorological factors and chemical reactions of molecules taking place during vertical transport. For a comprehensive understanding, we must integrate knowledge from forestry, micrometeorology, and atmospheric chemistry, especially when we consider reactive species.

In this dissertation, I focused on the exchange of reactive nitrogen oxides, NO\textsubscript{x}, specifically NO, NO\textsubscript{2}, RO\textsubscript{2}NO\textsubscript{2}, RONO\textsubscript{2}, and HNO\textsubscript{3}. By merging the eddy covariance method and state of the art measurement techniques for NO\textsubscript{x} species, I directly measured the exchange rates and magnitudes along with vertically resolved abundances as a part of the collaborative Biosphere Effects on AeRosols and Photochemistry EXperiment (BEARPEX). The findings described in the previous chapters are summarized below.

In Chapter 2, I described observational evidence for removal of NO\textsubscript{x} within a canopy. Canopy reduction factors are currently used as non-mechanistic parameters invoked in models to reconcile the gap between observed soil NO emissions and modeled O\textsubscript{3} concentrations in remote regions. Typically 25-80% of the NO emissions are removed within a canopy before transport into the boundary layer where they would contribute to the formation of O\textsubscript{3} (Jacob and Wofsy, 1990; Yienger and Levy, 1995; Wang and Leuning, 1998). Smaller fluxes of NO\textsubscript{x} than are expected based on the vertical gradients I measured during BEARPEX 2009 indicate that there is a removal process within the canopy. Multiple mechanisms were considered and formation of higher oxides of nitrogen was shown to be an important (perhaps sole) mechanism for canopy reduction of NO\textsubscript{x}.

In Chapter 3, I showed that even as the canopy is removing NOx the exchange rate of NO\textsubscript{2} is inversely correlated with NO\textsubscript{2} concentration—in other words there are processes akin to an NO\textsubscript{2} compensation point.

In Chapter 4, I examined the fluxes of some of the higher oxides of nitrogen—total peroxynitrates. I found that the total flux was smaller than the sum of fluxes for the 3 most abundant peroxynitrate species. Analysis suggests that a small concentration of a peroxynitrate derived
from BVOC is produced within the canopy and that upward flux of this species is responsible for the differences observed.

**5.2 Recommendations for future work**

From the research summarized above, I am able to augment our understanding of how reactive chemistry impacts the vertical movement of molecules out of a forest canopy to the boundary layer above. These results and conclusions raise new questions for the further investigation and I list some of these questions below:

1) What chemical form of PNs and ANs are responsible for NO\textsubscript{X} loss within the canopy? To explore this question, mechanistic studies of the conversion of larger carbon backbone compounds to higher nitrogen oxides are recommended. There are a few previous laboratories studies that suggest this possibility (Noziere and Barnes, 1998; Bowman et al., 2003; Leungsakul et al., 2005; Jenkin et al., 2012). Attempts to understand the detailed kinetic mechanisms in laboratories along with monitoring corresponding molecules in ambient air are recommended.

2) What mechanism(s) drive(s) the NO\textsubscript{2} compensation point? Is the compensational behavior observed at the canopy scale directly controlled by plant metabolic processes or by a process external to plant function? Branch enclosure tests with high performance instruments with simultaneous measurements of a complete set of NO\textsubscript{y} species spanning the NO\textsubscript{2} concentration from 0 to 3ppb are highly recommended. Previous branch enclosure studies have not attempted to thoroughly investigate at concentrations below 1 ppb because of their instrumental limitations (Chaparro-Suarez et al., 2011 and references therein). Canopy modeling studies taking into account both compensational behavior of plants and complex chemistry are also recommended to investigate the vegetation impact on tropospheric chemistry.

3) Expand the interpretation of cospectra for reactive species to the formation of the higher nitrogen oxides and O\textsubscript{3}. During BEARPEX 2009, I saw upward eddies at some frequencies for PNs, ANs, HNO\textsubscript{3}, and O\textsubscript{3} even though their net fluxes were all downward. Can this analysis be used to better understand the existence of active within canopy chemistry? The cospectral analysis of reactive species will further link the fields of micrometeorology and atmospheric chemistry. Can we convert the observed frequencies to length information so as to spatially locate sources?

4) What are the regional and global impacts of within canopy NO\textsubscript{X} to NO\textsubscript{Z} conversion? Prior to this work, most PNs and HNO\textsubscript{3} were thought to be formed during transport from urban areas and then deposited to remote regions; however, along with previous observations of upward fluxes of PNs and HNO\textsubscript{3} (Farmer et al., 2006) and the XPN work described in chapter 4, there is evidence that NO\textsubscript{X}’s influence extends further downwind than conventionally thought by slowing the PN and HNO\textsubscript{3} deposition rate or even through upward fluxes from the forest to the atmosphere.
5) How are carbon and nitrogen coupled on regional and global scales? Traditionally, carbon and nitrogen coupling is thought to be limited to the CO$_2$ fertilization effect. How for example, might XPN change our understanding of the CO$_2$ fertilization effect though its influence on BVOC fluxes? The carbon balance needs to be taken into account for BVOCs and CO$_2$, where NO$_X$ may perturb the BVOCs exchange. Further developing our understanding of carbon and nitrogen cycling through, particularly, observational approaches may help us better predict the impacts of climate change.
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Appendix A

The normalized exchange velocity of species C, $nV_c$ are estimated from the ratio of exchange velocity and maximum exchange velocity of C as AE1. Here C refers NO, NO$_2$, CO$_2$ and O$_3$.

$$nV_c = \frac{V_c}{V_{\text{max}_c}} \quad \text{(AE1)}$$

$$V_c = \frac{1}{R_a} + \frac{1}{R_b} + \frac{1}{R_c} = \frac{\text{Flux}_c}{[C]} \quad \text{(AE2)}$$

$$V_{\text{max}_c} = \frac{1}{R_a} + \frac{1}{R_b} \quad \text{(AE3)}$$

The $V_{\text{max}_c}$ is defined from resistance analogy (Wesley et al., 1989) by assuming canopy resistance, $R_c$, is 0 as AE3 to describe the vigorousness of turbulent mixing. Here, $R_a$ stands for aerodynamic resistance to describe the turbulent transport from the mixed layer to the surface and defined as AE4. The laminar sublayer resistance, $R_b$, parameterized as AE5, describe the molecular diffusion through the thin viscouse layer on surface.

$$R_a = \frac{\overline{U(z-d)}}{u^2_s} - \frac{\psi_H \left( \frac{z-d}{L} \right) - \psi_M \left( \frac{z-d}{L} \right)}{ku_s} \quad \text{(AE4)}$$

Here $\overline{U(z-d)}$ is the average wind speed at height $z-d$ (the top of the surface layer), $u_s$ is the friction velocity, $\kappa$ is von Karman’s constant (0.4), $L$ is the Obukhov length, and $\Psi_H$, $\Psi_M$ are the integrated stability corrections for sensible heat and momentum, respectively (Dyer, 1974; Arya, 1988).

$$Rb = \frac{\nu}{D_c u_s} \left[ \frac{100 \cdot l \cdot u_s}{(LAI)^2} \right]^{1/3} \quad \text{(AE5)}$$

Here $\nu$ is the pressure corrected kinematic viscosity of air ($1.7 \times 10^{-5}$ m$^2$ s$^{-1}$), $D_c$ is the diffusion coefficient for species c (Massman, 1998), LAI stands for leaf area index (3.7 m$^2$ m$^{-2}$) and l=0.001m is the “characteristic length scale” of the canopy surface elements,
roughly the thickness of a pine needle (Jensen and Hummelsøj, 1995, 1997).