Air pollution and forest water use

ARISING FROM T. F. Keenan *et al. Nature* **499,** 324–327 (2013)

Forests in North America and northern Europe increased their water-use efficiency (WUE)—the ratio of photosynthetic CO_2 uptake to water loss through evapotranspiration—over the last two decades, according to a recent Letter[1]. Keenan *et al.* attribute the rising WUE to fertilization by increasing levels of atmospheric CO_2 (ref. 1), although biosphere models predict this effect to be much smaller than the observed trend. Here, I show that falling concentrations of ozone and other phytotoxic air pollutants, which were not considered in ref. 1, may explain part of the WUE trend. Future efforts to reconcile biosphere models with field data should, therefore, use integrated modelling approaches that include both air quality and CO_2 effects on forest growth and water use. There is a Reply to this Brief Communication Arising by Keenan, T. F. *et al. Nature* **507,** http://dx.doi.org/10.1038/nature13114 (2014).

Tree injuries caused by ozone, the most phytotoxic air pollutant—including visible foliar injury, reduced photosynthesis and diminished biomass—depress global ecosystem productivity[2] and are well documented in field observations from North America and Europe[3,4]. Ozone enters leaves through stomata and causes internal oxidative stress and membrane damage that reduce photosynthetic CO_2 assimilation[5,6]. During ozone injury, transpiration usually falls less than does photosynthesis, but transpiration can sometimes rise because of ozone injury to stomata[6–8]. In either case WUE declines.

Surface ozone concentrations during the summer growing season have fallen significantly in eastern North America and modestly in northern Europe owing to emission controls on vehicles and industrial sources of ozone precursors[9,10]. Figure 1 shows ozone trends in regions around the rural forest sites analysed in ref. 1, evaluated as summer daytime-mean mole fraction (Fig. 1a) and as the accumulated concentration over a threshold of 40 nmol mol^{-1} (AOT40, defined as in the literature[11,12]), which is a common predictor for plant injury (Fig. 1b). I calculated both ozone metrics using only rural sites—from the US Clean Air Status and Trends Network (CASTNET; http://epa.gov/castnet) and the European Monitoring and Evaluation Programme (EMEP; http://www.nilu.no/projects/ccc/emepdata.html)—reporting at least 14 years of hourly ozone data during the period 1995–2010 (Fig. 1c and d). By either metric, ozone significantly decreased at all sites in the midwestern USA ($n = 11$, $P < 0.001$–0.02 for Kendall's τ test) and northeastern USA ($n = 5$, $P = 0.001$–0.004). For averages over all sites within each region, AOT40 fell by half in the period 1995–2010 in both regions ($P < 0.002$). Over northern Europe most sites had negative trends, but with smaller magnitudes, consistent with other recent analyses[10].

The first-order effect of these ozone trends in the Midwest, using sensitivities for broad-leaf trees[6,12,13], would be a 0.6% annual increase in biomass accumulation and a 0.3% annual improvement in WUE. In addition, partial closure of stomata in response to rising CO_2 (ref. 14) and rising vapour pressure deficit[1] reduces leaf uptake of ozone by approximately 0.9% per year regardless of ozone trends. Combining all these effects, improvements in ozone air quality over the period 1995–2010 probably increased forest WUE by approximately 0.33% per year in the midwestern USA and slightly less in the northeastern USA. Using the range of ozone sensitivities reported for tree species[12,13,15], the ozone effect on WUE in the midwestern USA could be 0.1–0.8% per year. This predicted ozone effect is about one-sixth of the observed WUE trend (2% per year, calculated from the Supplementary Information to ref. 1) and larger than the mean simulated effect of CO_2 fertilization in the terrestrial biosphere models surveyed by ref. 1. Measuring ozone mole fractions and fluxes into the forest canopy simultaneously with



Figure 1 | Trends in ozone exposure metrics that correlate with tree injury. **a**, Daytime-mean ozone mole fraction; **b**, AOT40. Both metrics are calculated in April–September of each year during the hours 8:00–20:00 (local time) at rural sites in the USA (**c**) and Europe (**d**) near forest stations that monitor WUE. Lines show the mean trends (Sen's method) averaged across all stations within each region (±1 standard error, *P* values from Student's *t*-test). The unusually high mole fraction and AOT40 values in Europe in 2003 and 2006 were caused by extreme heatwaves.

WUE should constrain the effect, but the variability of WUE trends across sites and years illustrates that ozone data from multiple forests and many years are necessary to obtain robust results. In addition to the decline in ozone concentration, the concentrations of the air pollutants NO_x and SO_2, which also harm WUE both individually and through synergistic effects with ozone, have fallen quickly but the effects are not included here[11]. Thus, the benefits of improved air quality to forest productivity and WUE may be larger than I have estimated. Keenan *et al.*[1]

suggest that current terrestrial biosphere models underestimate the impact of CO_2 fertilization on WUE. The calculations here show that ozone trends help to reconcile the large differences between models and observations.

Methods

I calculated photosynthesis reductions from ozone AOT40 trends (-0.8 parts per million (p.p.m.) hours per year, where 1 p.p.m. $= 1\ \mu\mathrm{mol\ mol}^{-1}$, for the midwestern USA) using empirical correlations with ozone exposure for young broad-leaf trees (-0.7% per p.p.m. hour, for beech, birch and maple)[12,13]. Other tree species may be more (poplar) or less (conifers, oak) sensitive: -1.8% to -0.2% per p.p.m. hour (refs 12 and 15). Ozone-induced WUE changes are half those of photosynthesis and of the same sign[6]. Rising CO_2 (2 p.p.m. per year) and rising vapour pressure deficit (11 Pa per year; ref. 1) reduced stomatal conductance and ozone uptake by approximately 0.4% per year and 0.5% per year, respectively, based on empirical sensitivity factors[14] (conductance changes are -0.2% per p.p.m. of CO_2 and -0.05% per Pa).

Christopher D. Holmes[1]

[1]Department of Earth System Science University of California, Irvine, California 92697, USA.
email: cdholmes@uci.edu

Received 1 October 2013; accepted 22 January 2014.

1. Keenan, T. F. *et al.* Increase in forest water-use efficiency as atmospheric carbon dioxide concentrations rise. *Nature* **499,** 324–327 (2013).
2. Sitch, S., Cox, P. M., Collins, W. J. & Huntingford, C. Indirect radiative forcing of climate change through ozone effects on the land-carbon sink. *Nature* **448,** 791–794 (2007).
3. Chappelka, A. H. & Samuelson, L. J. Ambient ozone effects on forest trees of the eastern United States. *New Phytol.* **139,** 91–108 (1998).
4. Skärby, L., Ro-poulsen, H., Wellburn, F. A. M. & Sheppard, L. J. Impacts of ozone on forests: a European perspective. *New Phytol.* **139,** 109–122 (1998).
5. Ainsworth, E. A., Yendrek, C. R., Sitch, S., Collins, W. J. & Emberson, L. D. The effects of tropospheric ozone on net primary productivity and implications for climate change. *Annu. Rev. Plant Biol.* **63,** 637–661 (2012).
6. Wittig, V. E., Ainsworth, E. A., Naidu, S. L., Karnowky, D. F. & Long, S. P. Quantifying the impact of current and future tropospheric ozone on tree biomass, growth, physiology and biochemistry: a quantitative meta-analysis. *Glob. Change Biol.* **15,** 396–424 (2009).
7. McLaughlin, S. B., Nosal, M., Wullschleger, S. D. & Sun, G. Interactive effects of ozone and climate on tree growth and water use in a southern Appalachian forest in the USA. *New Phytol.* **174,** 109–124 (2007).
8. Lombardozzi, D., Levis, S., Bonan, G. & Sparks, J. P. Predicting photosynthesis and transpiration responses to ozone: decoupling modeled photosynthesis and stomatal conductance. *Biogeosciences* **9,** 3113–3130 (2012).
9. Cooper, O. R., Gao, R.-S., Tarasick, D., Leblanc, T. & Sweeney, C. Long-term ozone trends at rural ozone monitoring sites across the United States, 1990–2010. *J. Geophys. Res.* **117,** D22307 (2012).
10. Tørseth, K. *et al.* Introduction to the European Monitoring and Evaluation Programme (EMEP) and observed atmospheric composition change during 1972–2009. *Atmos. Chem. Phys.* **12,** 5447–5481 (2012).
11. WHO. *Air Quality Guidelines for Europe* 2nd edn, 219–251, http://www.euro.who.int/__data/assets/pdf_file/0005/74732/E71922.pdf (World Health Organization Regional Office for Europe, 2000).
12. Karlsson, P. E. *et al.* New critical levels for ozone effects on young trees based on AOT40 and simulated cumulative leaf uptake of ozone. *Atmos. Environ.* **38,** 2283–2294 (2004).
13. Calatayud, V., Cerveró, J. & Sanz, M. J. Foliar, physiological and growth responses of four maple species exposed to ozone. *Wat. Air Soil Pollut.* **185,** 239–254 (2007).
14. Franks, P. J. *et al.* Sensitivity of plants to changing atmospheric CO_2 concentration: from the geological past to the next century. *New Phytol.* **197,** 1077–1094 (2013).
15. Hoshika, Y., Omasa, K. & Paoletti, E. Whole-tree water use efficiency is decreased by ambient ozone and not affected by O_3-induced stomatal sluggishness. *PLoS ONE* **7,** e39270 (2012).

Competing Financial Interests Declared none.

doi:10.1038/nature13113