The constraint of denitrification and leaching in the CLM5.1

Jinmu Luo^{1,2}; Peter Hess^{2,1}; Steven Hall³; Danica Lombardozzi^{4,5}

¹ Earth and Atmospheric Sciences, Cornell University;

² Biological and Environmental Sciences, Cornell University;

³ Department of Plant and Agroecosystem Science, University of Wisconsin-Madison;

⁴ Ecosystem Science and Sustainability, Colorado State University;

⁵ National Center for Atmospheric Research.



Leaching and denitrification are the two major pathways for nitrogen leaving the soil.

https://www.onlinebiologynotes.com/nitrogen-cycle-steps-of-nitrogen-cycle/

Overestimated denitrification and **small** leaching compared to isotopic inferred budget



- Overestimation of denitrification in 13 ESMs from CMIP6 is almost a factor of two larger than that estimated from isotopic benchmarking over natural soil.
- Denitrification in CMIP6, 73 ± 31 Tg N yr⁻¹, **Isotopic benchmarking** estimated denitrification is 38 ± 11 Tg N yr⁻¹
- Leaching/denitrification ESMs: 0.3 Isotopic benchmarking 1.4

⁽Feng et al., 2022).

Fraction of denitrification N loss simulated by CESM2 compared to isotopic inferred fraction





Feng et al., 2022

Flow of Agricultural Nitrogen (FANv3)



- FANv2 diagnoses NH₃ emissions • from agriculture from manure and fertilizer inputs. It explicitly models NH₃ flows and transformations in top layer of CLM. (Vira et al., 2020, 2022).
- FANv3 extends FANv2 by coupling FANv2 to the CLM5.1 and the hole-in-the-pipe model.
- FANv3 changes the leaching, • nitrification, and denitrification in CLM.

Mesocosm measurements (agricultural site)

What it measured.

- Fertilizer usage
- NO_x , N_2O emissions
- Harvest N

.

- Inorganic N runoff
- NO_3^- , NH_4^+ in soils
- Soil properties

These unique observations give us a chance to further evaluate the model.











CLM5.1 Simulates Low Leaching in the Agricultural Site



- CLM5.1 predicts small leaching for 2022 (a high leaching year).
- Clarion and Webster are different soil types
- Three fertilization experiments are set up in the Mesocosm measurements

Solutions: Vertical transport of nitrate





CLM5.1 default

 Nitrogen doesn't move with water vertically (remains at a fixed profile)
CLM predicts the total water drainage but redistributes the drained water back to different layers based on the soil moisture profile.
N leaching is evaluated in different layers from the redistributed drained water.

CLM-FANv3

- (1) Nitrogen moves downward with soil water
- (2) Leached nitrogen is taken out at the bottom of the column.

Vertical transport of nitrate

CLM5.1 default

CLM5.1-FANv3

Luo et al (to be submitted)

After incorporating our leaching method



- CLM-FANv3 performance is better than CLM5.1 default for all soil types and fertilization experiments.
- Different initial seeding densities could affect the leaching (0.5 gC/m² or 3gC/m²)

Comparison of different denitrification limited functions



Most of site research suggest no denitrification happen under 55% WFPS

Luo et al (to be submitted)

Why denitrification flux is large in CLM?



- Basing denitrification on the anaerobic fraction in CLM5.1 gives significant denitrification at moderate WFPS.
- Basing denitrification on WFPS in CLM-FANv3 gives the highest denitrification at higher WFPS.

Luo et al (to be submitted)

Water filled pore space (WFPS) %

Simulated nitrogen budgets

Leaching/Denitrification



Conclusions

(1)A more physical leaching method in CLM-FANv3 improves CLM performance in high-leaching years.

(2) The **anaerobic fraction function** used in the denitrification module partially explains why CESM2 has larger denitrification than isotopic observations suggested.

(3) Changes in CLM-FANv3 modify the ratio of leaching/denitrification from 0.014 (in CLM5.1) to 1.7 (in CLM-FANv3) more in line with expectations and Mesocosm measurements.