# Effects of CO<sub>2</sub> and nitrogen fertilization on vegetation and soil nutrient content in juvenile ponderosa pine

# D.W. Johnson<sup>1,2</sup>, J.T. Ball<sup>1</sup> and R.F. Walker<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Biological Sciences Center, Desert Research Institute, P.O. Box 60220, Reno, NV 89506, USA\* and <sup>2</sup>Environmental and Resource Sciences, College of Agriculture, University of Nevada, Reno, NV 98512, USA

Received 8 July 1996. Accepted in revised form 5 December 1996

Key words: Ca, CO<sub>2</sub>, fertilization, K, Mg, N, P, Pinus ponderosa, S, soils,

#### Abstract

This paper summarizes the data on nutrient uptake and soil responses in opentop chambers planted with ponderosa pine (*Pinus ponderosa* Laws.) treated with both N and CO<sub>2</sub>. Based upon the literature, we hypothesized that 1) elevated CO<sub>2</sub> would cause increased growth and yield of biomass per unit uptake of N even if N is limiting, and 2) elevated CO<sub>2</sub> would cause increased biomass yield per unit uptake of other nutrients only by growth dilution and only if they are non-limiting. Hypothesis 1 was supported only in part: there were greater yields of biomass per unit N uptake in the first two years of growth but not in the third year. Hypothesis 2 was supported in many cases: elevated CO<sub>2</sub> caused growth dilution (decreased concentrations but not decreased uptake) of P, S, and Mg. Effects of elevated CO<sub>2</sub> on K, Ca, and B concentrations were smaller and mostly non-significant. There was no evidence that N responded in a unique manner to elevated CO<sub>2</sub>, despite its unique role in rubisco. Simple growth dilution seemed to explain nutrient responses in almost all cases.

There were significant declines in soil exchangeable  $K^+$ ,  $Ca^{2+}$ ,  $Mg^{2+}$  and extractable P over time which were attributed to disturbance effects associated with plowing. The only statistically significant treatment effects on soils were negative effects of elevated  $CO_2$  on mineralizeable N and extractable P, and positive effects of both N fertilization and  $CO_2$  on exchangeable  $Al^{3+}$ . Soil exchangeable  $K^+$ ,  $Ca^{2+}$ , and  $Mg^{2+}$  pools remained much higher than vegetation pools, but extractable P pools were lower than vegetation pools in the third year of growth. There were also large losses of both native soil N and fertilizer N over time. These soil N losses could account for the observed losses in exchangeable  $K^+$ ,  $Ca^{2+}$ ,  $Mg^{2+}$  if N was nitrified and leached as  $NO_3^-$ .

#### Introduction

Forest ecosystems throughout the world have experienced and will probably continue to experience a significant increase in both atmospheric carbon dioxide ( $CO_2$ ) concentrations and nitrogen (N) deposition (Galloway et al., 1995: Kauppi et al., 1992; Strain and Thomas, 1992). The potential growth response to elevated  $CO_2$  is nearly always positive, but there are cases where excessive N deposition has caused deficiencies in other nutrients and growth declines (Schulze, 1989). Growth responses to elevated  $CO_2$  can occur even under N limitation because of reduced foliar N concentrations and consequent increases in the yield of biomass per unit of N uptake (Brown, 1991; Campagna and Margolis, 1989; Norby et al., 1986a, b; Samuelson and Seiler, 1993). One explanation for the often-observed decreases in foliar N concentration with increased CO<sub>2</sub> is that plants may produce lower concentrations of the enzymes of the photosynthetic carbon reduction (PCR) cycle, particularly the carboxylating enzyme Ribulose-1,5bisphosphatecarboxylase/oxygenase (rubisco) (Tissue et al., 1993). If this is a general response and occurs under most field conditions, it implies that the N deficiencies common to many forest ecosystems will not preclude a growth increase in response to CO<sub>2</sub>. No such convenient mechanism exists for increased biomass

<sup>\*</sup> FAX No:+17026737485.E-mail:dwj@maxey.dri.edu

yield per unit uptake of other nutrients, however. Thus, Conroy et al. (1990) found little effect of elevated  $CO_2$  on either growth or tissue P concentrations in Pdeficient *Pinus radiata* (D. Don). On the other hand, other investigators have found  $CO_2$  induced reductions in tissue P, K, S, and B in cases where these nutrients were apparently not limiting (Johnson et al., 1994a; Luxmoore et al., 1986; Norby et al., 1986a; O'Neill et al., 1987). These changes were probably due to growth dilution.

The few studies which have addressed the effects of elevated CO<sub>2</sub> on soils have produced conflicting results. Some investigators have found that elevated CO<sub>2</sub> causes a reduction in soil C, presumably because of stimulated decomposition through increased root exudation (Körner and Arnone, 1992; Zak et al., 1993) whereas others have found either no change or a net gain (Johnson et al., 1994b). Some investigators report that elevated CO<sub>2</sub> causes increased soil N availability (Körner and Arnone, 1992; Zak et al., 1993) whereas others report decreased N availability (Diaz et al., 1993) or no effect (Randlett et al., 1996). Norby et al. (1986a) found an increase in soil extractable P with elevated CO<sub>2</sub> whereas Johnson et al. (1994a) found no effect. Norby et al. (1986a) found no effect of elevated CO<sub>2</sub> on exchangeable K<sup>+</sup>, but a downward trend which could be attributed to increased uptake, whereas Johnson et al. (1995b) found decreases in exchangeable  $K^+$ ,  $Ca^{2+}$ , and  $Mg^{2+}$  with elevated  $CO_2$  in excess of that which could be accounted for by plant uptake.

In this paper, we report the responses of ponderosa pine (*Pinus ponderosa* Laws.) seedlings treated to elevated CO<sub>2</sub> and N fertilization. Based upon the literature cited above, we hypothesized that 1) elevated CO<sub>2</sub> would cause increased growth and yield of biomass per unit uptake of N even if N is limiting, and 2) elevated CO<sub>2</sub> would cause increased biomass yield per unit uptake of other nutrients only by growth dilution and only if they are non-limiting. Vegetation and soil nutrient pools in ponderosa pine subjected to three years of CO<sub>2</sub> and N treatments in a field study were inventoried to test these hypotheses.

## Materials and methods

Site

The open-top chamber site for the ponderosa pine research was located at the Institute of Forest Genetics in Placerville, California. The soil is Aiken clay loam, a Xeric Haplohumult derived from andesite. Soils were intensively sampled prior to chamber establishment, and were found to be very uniform. During February - April 1991, 24 hexagonal open-top chambers (3.6 m in diameter) were established on the site. The basic experimental design consisted of three levels of nitrogen (0,10, and 20 g m<sup>-2</sup> yr<sup>-1</sup> of N as ammonium sulfate, applied in early spring), and four CO<sub>2</sub> treatments (ambient, no chamber; ambient, chambered; 525  $\mu$ L  $L^{-1}$  CO<sub>2</sub>; and 700  $\mu$ L  $L^{-1}$  CO<sub>2</sub>). Water was delivered to each plot via a timed stand pipe to a looped one inch diameter manifold, and low pressure spray heads. Each of the chambered treatments was replicated three times, and each of the unchambered treatments was replicated twice. Only the results from the chambered measurements will be reported here. Due to cost limitations, the 10 g m<sup>-2</sup> yr<sup>-1</sup> N, 525  $\mu$ L L<sup>-1</sup> CO<sub>2</sub> treatment was excluded. Treatments were begun in May, 1991.

#### Sampling and analysis methods

In May of 1991, Ponderosa pine (*Pinus ponderosa*) was planted in each chamber. Seedlings were grown from seed (21 planting locations per chamber) and seedlings (21 per chamber), the latter being a backup in the event of excessive mortality. Seed-grown seedling survival was very good, and the seedling-grown stock was removed in October 1991.

In October 1991 (year 1), three trees from each chamber were harvested, including complete root systems. In October 1992 (year 2) and October 1993 (year 3), three trees from each chamber were harvested again, but only one complete root system per chamber was obtained because of the increased size of the seedlings and concern for excessive plot disturbance. The original plan was for a final harvest in October 1994, but additional funds became available for continuation of the project and this harvest was postponed until October 1996. Root biomass by size class and mycorrhizal infection were analyzed in each case and will be reported in later papers (R F Walker, unpubl. data). Only total root biomass will be reported here. Seedlings were dried, weighed by major component (foliage, branch, stem, roots), and analyzed for N on a Perkin-Elmer 2400 CHN Analyzer and for other nutrients at the Oregon State University (OSU) Soil and Plant Testing Lab. At OSU, plant samples were dryashed at 550 °C for 4 hours, dissolved in 5% (v/v) HNO<sub>3</sub>, and analyzed by ICP.

Soils were sampled by horizon in March of 1991 and March of 1993 by punch auger. Soils from

Table 1. Regression equations used to estimate seedling biomass  $ln(Comp) = a + (b)ln(d^2h)$ , where Comp =seedling component, d = diameter at 10 cm, h = height, and k = constant

Component	а	b	r <sup>2</sup>
1992 Harvest			
Needles	-2.9797	0.65540	0.692
Stems+Branches	-4.8812	0.86967	0.724
Roots	-4.9412	0.84429	0.615
1993 Harvest			
Needles	-6.2504	1.0395	0.729
Branches	-12.173	1.4685	0.631
Stems	-9.4724	1.3200	0.819
Roots	-6.7686	1.038	0.868

each sampling were analyzed for total C and N on the Perkin-Elmer,  $NH_4^+$ , and  $NO_3^-$  (2 *M* NH<sub>4</sub>Cl), exchangeable Ca<sup>2+</sup>, Mg<sup>2+</sup>, K<sup>+</sup>, and Al<sup>3+</sup> (1 *M* NH<sub>4</sub>Cl); and extractable P (0.5 *M* HCl plus 1 *M* NH<sub>4</sub>F; Olsen and Sommers, 1982). Soils from the 1991 sampling were also analyzed for  $SO_4^{2-}$  (0.016 *M* NaH<sub>2</sub>PO<sub>4</sub>; Johnson and Henderson, 1979), but there was insufficient sample for this analysis on the 1993 soils. In 1991, soils were also sampled for bulk density (core method, three replicates per chamber for each horizon). No bulk density samples were taken in 1993 due to the disturbance that would have been created.

Biomass estimates for trees within the chambers in years 2 and 3 were obtained from regressions of the type  $ln(Comp) = a + (b)ln(d^2h)$ , where Comp = the tree component in question (foliage, branches, stems, roots), d = diameter at 10 cm height, h = height, and a and b are regression constants. This approach to biomass estimation was used because we found that the average diameter and height of the harvested trees differed from that of the total number of trees in the chamber prior to harvest. There were no significant  $CO_2$  or N treatment effects on the regressions but there were significant differences between years, and thus all data were combined into one equation per year (Table 1).

Prior to seedling establishment in March 1991, soils were sampled for bulk density (core method) by horizon (three replicates per chamber) and for nutrient analyses with a punch auger (three replicates per horizon). In March 1993, soils were sampled again by punch auger for nutrient analyses. Bulk density sampling was judged to be too destructive in the 1993 sampling, and thus the values for 1991 were used to calculate changes in soil nutrient content.

Statistical analyses for treatment effects in any given year consisted of analysis of variance for a fractional factorial design using SYSTAT software (p < 0.10 was accepted as the level of significance). Analysis for temporal effects consisted of student's t-tests for changes from 1991 to 1993. Means and standard errors are reported in all tables and figures.

## Results

#### Biomass and nutrient uptake

Biomass and nutrient content for the three-year growth period are shown in Table 2. In all three years, there were significant (p < 0.05), positive treatment effects of both N and CO<sub>2</sub> on biomass and tree N, P, S, K, Ca, Mg, and B contents. In year 1, there was a trend (non-significant) toward highest biomass and nutrient content in the medium (525  $\mu$ L L<sup>-1</sup>) compared to the low and high (350 and 700  $\mu$ L L<sup>-1</sup>) CO<sub>2</sub> treatments. This same pattern was found in a previous controlled environment study (Johnson et al., 1994a). However, this effect was transient: in years 2 and 3 the high CO<sub>2</sub> treatment showed the largest biomass and nutrient content.

The fractions of total biomass and N in foliage, woody tissues, and roots during the first three years of growth are shown in Figures 1 and 2. As expected, the fractions of seedling biomass in foliage and roots decreased with time (from  $\approx 50\%$  foliage and  $\approx 30\%$ roots in year 1 to  $\approx$  30% foliage and  $\approx$  20% roots in year 3) and the fraction of woody tissues increased with time (from  $\approx 20\%$  in year 1 to  $\approx 40-50\%$  in year 3). As noted in a previous paper (Johnson et al., 1996), there was an increase in root/shoot ratio with elevated CO<sub>2</sub> in year 2 (especially in the Low N, Medium  $CO_2$  treatment). As shown in Figure 1, however, this effect was transient: in year 3, the fraction of roots in seedlings treated with elevated CO2 was either equal to or slightly less than (i.e. high N, high CO<sub>2</sub> treatment) that in seedlings treated with ambient CO<sub>2</sub>.

As is usually the case in coniferous seedlings, foliage accounted for a disproportionate fraction of seedling N content. Unlike the pattern in biomass, however, there was no clear trend toward decreasing fractions of foliage N with time: foliage contained  $\approx 60-70\%$  of seedling N in all three years. The lack of change in the foliage N fraction was due to the

Nitrogen	Unfertilized			10 g m	$^{-2} yr^{-1}$	$20 \text{ g m}^{-2} \text{ yr}^{-1}$		
$CO_2 (\mu L L^{-1})$	350	525	700	350	700	350	525	700
Biomass (g tree <sup><math>-1</math></sup> )								
Year 1	$0.8 {\pm} 0.1$	$1.5 {\pm} 0.1$	$1.2 {\pm} 0.2$	$1.5 {\pm} 0.2$	$1.7 {\pm} 0.2$	$1.7 {\pm} 0.4$	$2.4 {\pm} 0.3$	$2.2 \pm 0.1$
Year 2	49±3	62±4	62±6	$80{\pm}6$	83±5	90±4	100±6	$114 \pm 8$
Year 3	689±76	759±94	$1244 \pm 191$	941±121	$1407 {\pm} 174$	1386±136	$1218 \pm 85$	2363±348
N content (mg tree <sup><math>-1</math></sup> )								
Year 1	10.1±1.3	16.1±1.4	$12.2 \pm 2.1$	19.7±4.3	16.4±2.7	18.9±3.8	28.3±4.4	19.4±0.5
Year 2	421±18	455±24	490±32	614±33	561±31	$702 \pm 26$	740±35	816±49
Year 3	4339±341	4794±414	6998±917	5758±508	9082±976	8356±584	8124±493	$13491 \pm 1289$
<i>P</i> content (mg tree <sup><math>-1</math></sup> )								
Year 1	$1.8 {\pm} 0.2$	$2.8{\pm}0.2$	$2.0 {\pm} 0.3$	$3.4{\pm}0.8$	2.6±0.3	$3.2{\pm}0.7$	$3.6 {\pm} 0.5$	4.1±0.2
Year 2	61.6±0.5	59.4±0.4	62.7±0.4	74.6±0.6	77.5±0.7	81.9±0.5	94.0±0.7	116.1±2.3
Year 3	792±63	772±63	$1193{\pm}108$	974±79	$1317{\pm}105$	$1326 \pm 88$	1119±63	2257±195
S content (mg tree <sup><math>-1</math></sup> )								
Year 1	$1.2 {\pm} 0.2$	$2.2 {\pm} 0.2$	$1.5 {\pm} 0.3$	$2.5 {\pm} 0.7$	2.1±0.3	$2.3 {\pm} 0.5$	$3.2{\pm}0.5$	$2.8 \pm 0.3$
Year 2	41.6±0.5	$51.4 {\pm} 0.5$	40.1±0.3	55.7±0.6	72.3±0.9	73.8±0.5	57.3±0.5	90.5±1.5
Year 3	597±59	607±51	919±86	792±73	1103±91	985±77	826±51	$1521 \pm 140$
K content (mg tree <sup><math>-1</math></sup> )								
Year 1	6.3±0.9	9.8±1.6	9.0±1.4	12.4±3.4	11.3±1.5	11.5±2.4	18.1±2.4	15.3±0.3
Year 2	265.4±2.8	242.1±1.8	271.8±2.8	370.6±2.2	382.1±3.5	381.2±1.9	430.6±5.4	480.4±4.3
Year 3	3327±232	4027±323	6113±554	4685±386	7312±557	6325±391	5775±334	$11344 \pm 1042$
<i>Ca</i> content ( $mg$ tree <sup>-1</sup> )								
Year 1	$1.8 {\pm} 0.2$	$2.8 {\pm} 0.2$	2.5±0.3	$3.4{\pm}0.8$	2.8±0.3	3.2±0.7	$5.3 {\pm} 0.8$	4.5±0.3
Year 2	102.6±1.1	155.1±1.6	154.6±1.1	192.5±2.2	209.8±2.8	210.9±1.2	$241.9 \pm 1.7$	291.4±4.2
Year 3	1487±115	1534±138	$2564{\pm}245$	1859±152	2754±218	$2758{\pm}218$	2427±153	4379±371
$Mg\ content\ (mg\ tree^{-1})$								
Year 1	$0.8 {\pm} 0.1$	$1.4 {\pm} 0.1$	$0.9 {\pm} 0.1$	1.6±0.4	$1.2 \pm 0.1$	1.5±0.3	$2.3 {\pm} 0.3$	$1.9 {\pm} 0.1$
Year 2	48.8±0.3	59.5±0.5	56.8±0.3	79.1±0.5	72.7±0.5	107.6±2.2	79.6±0.6	114.7±0.8
Year 3	688±48	690±51	1176±123	992±81	$1296 {\pm} 104$	1379±95	$1150{\pm}68$	2322±206
<i>B</i> content ( $\mu g$ tree <sup>-1</sup> )								
Year 1	$0.02 {\pm} 0.00$	$0.04 {\pm} 0.00$	$0.04 {\pm} 0.00$	$0.05 {\pm} 0.01$	$0.04 {\pm} 0.01$	$0.05 {\pm} 0.01$	$0.06 {\pm} 0.01$	$0.06 {\pm} 0.01$
Year 2	$0.9 {\pm} 0.2$	$1.3 {\pm} 0.2$	$1.2 {\pm} 0.1$	1.6±0.2	$1.4 {\pm} 0.1$	1.8±0.2	$2.1 {\pm} 0.2$	2.5±0.4
Year 3	$10 \pm 1$	11±2	17±2	16±1	21±2	19±2	19±2	37±4

Table 2. Biomass and nutrient contents of ponderosa pine at the Placerville site (standard errors are given)

reductions in N concentrations in woody tissues and roots over time, which offset the effects of increasing biomass fractions in these components. The fraction of N in roots generally decreased over time (from  $\approx$  15-20% in year 1 to  $\approx$  6-10% in year 3), and the fraction of N in woody tissues increased with time (from  $\approx$  10-12% in year 1 to  $\approx$  22-30% in year 3).

Foliar nutrient concentrations over the three-year sampling period are shown in Table 3. There were significant negative effects of  $CO_2$  on foliar concentrations of all measured nutrients (N, P, S, K, Ca, Mg, and B) in the low N treatment in year 1 but these effects diminished greatly with time. By year 3, the only significant  $CO_2$  effects on foliar nutrient concentrations

32



*Figure 1.* Distribution (fractions of total) of seedling biomass in foliage, stem+branch, and roots in years 1-3.

were for P, S, Mn, and Zn in the low N treatment, S, Mg, Fe, and Mn in the medium N treatment, and Fe in the high N treatment. In all cases, these effects could be explained by growth dilution, since there were no reductions in foliar contents with  $CO_2$ . N fertilization caused either no change or reductions in foliar concentrations of all nutrients, including N itself.

Foliar concentrations of all nutrients except Cu were above deficiency thresholds for all three years using values from Hüttl et al. (1987). In year 3, however, foliar N, P, Mg, Cu, and Zn concentrations were well below the "interpretative values" ("survey average" values from "5.0 - 7.5 cm tips of young trees") given by Jones et al. (1991) for ponderosa pine. Foliar Cu levels were within the deficiency range for *Pinus radiata* in years 2 and 3 (1.5 - 5.0  $\mu$ g g<sup>-1</sup>; Turvey and Grant, 1990).

#### Soil changes

Analysis of variance for a fractional factorial design revealed no statistically significant overall treatment effects on soil C, N, C/N ratio (Figure 3) or on



*Figure 2.* Distribution (fractions of total) of seedling N content in foliage, stem+branch, and roots in years 1-3.

exchangeable Ca, K, Mg, or cation exchange capacity (CEC) (not shown). The magnitudes of the standard errors suggest that there were a few scattered significant  $CO_2$  treatment effects (i.e. an increase in C in the Low N, Medium  $CO_2$  treatment, an increase in N in the High N, Medium  $CO_2$  treatment, and a reduction in C/N in the High N, Medium  $CO_2$  treatment, however, and in one case (the increase in N in the High N, Medium  $CO_2$  treatment, however, and in one case (the increase in N in the High N, Medium  $CO_2$  treatment, however, and in one case (the increase in N in the High N, Medium  $CO_2$  treatment) the differences were also present in year 1 (prior to treatment).

Analysis of variance for a fractional factorial design revealed no statistically significant treatment effects on soil mineral N (NH<sub>4</sub><sup>+</sup> + NO<sub>3</sub><sup>-</sup>), and no significant pretreatment differences existed (Figure 4). There were significant negative effects of CO<sub>2</sub> on soil extractable P in both Ap and Bw horizons in year 3 and no significant pre-treatment differences existed (although there was a non-significant initial trend toward lower available P in the Ap horizons of the Low N, Medium and High CO<sub>2</sub> treatments). There were trends toward higher Ap horizon exchangeable Al<sup>3+</sup> with both N and CO<sub>2</sub> which may be relevant to the changes in avail-

Nitrogen	Unfertilized			10 g m	$^{-2} {\rm yr}^{-1}$	$20 \text{ g m}^{-2} \text{ yr}^{-1}$			
$CO_2 (\mu L L^{-1})$	350	525	700	350	700	350	525	700	
N (%)									
Year 1	$1.72 {\pm} 0.16$	$1.56 \pm 0.11$	$1.30 \pm 0.11$	$1.74 \pm 0.11$	$1.17 {\pm} 0.10$	$1.60 \pm 0.13$	$1.55 {\pm} 0.06$	$1.19 {\pm} 0.04$	
Year 2	$1.76 {\pm} 0.16$	$1.68 {\pm} 0.11$	$1.63 {\pm} 0.12$	$1.71 {\pm} 0.09$	$1.52 \pm 0.12$	$1.89 {\pm} 0.20$	$1.57 {\pm} 0.07$	$1.48 {\pm} 0.10$	
Year 3	$1.21 {\pm} 0.05$	$1.27 {\pm} 0.06$	$1.07 {\pm} 0.15$	$1.20 {\pm} 0.06$	$1.24 {\pm} 0.04$	$1.27 {\pm} 0.05$	$1.43 {\pm} 0.06$	$1.19 {\pm} 0.06$	
P (%)									
Year 1	$0.26 {\pm} 0.005$	$0.20 {\pm} 0.002$	$0.19 {\pm} 0.02$	$0.29{\pm}0.01$	$0.20 {\pm} 0.01$	$0.27 {\pm} 0.01$	$0.19{\pm}0.01$	$0.23 {\pm} 0.01$	
Year 2	$0.20 {\pm} 0.01$	$0.15 {\pm} 0.01$	$0.15 {\pm} 0.01$	$0.17 {\pm} 0.02$	$0.14 {\pm} 0.01$	$0.17 {\pm} 0.01$	$0.14 {\pm} 0.01$	$0.13 {\pm} 0.01$	
Year 3	$0.18 {\pm} 0.02$	$0.15 {\pm} 0.01$	$0.14 {\pm} 0.01$	$0.14 {\pm} 0.01$	$0.14 {\pm} 0.003$	$0.15 \pm 0.003$	$0.14 \pm 0.01$	$0.14 {\pm} 0.01$	
<b>F</b> (0/)									
S (70) Voor 1	0.20±0.02	0.16±0.00	0 12+0 01	$0.21 \pm 0.02$	$0.14 \pm 0.02$	0 17+0 01	0 15±0 004	$0.14 \pm 0.02$	
Year 2	$0.20\pm0.02$	$0.10\pm0.00$	$0.13 \pm 0.01$	$0.21\pm0.02$	$0.14 \pm 0.02$ 0.12 \pm 0.02	$0.17 \pm 0.01$	$0.13 \pm 0.004$	$0.14\pm0.02$	
Vear 3	$0.12\pm0.01$ 0.14 $\pm0.02$	$0.13 \pm 0.02$ 0.12 $\pm 0.01$	$0.09 \pm 0.01$	$0.11 \pm 0.02$ 0.14 $\pm 0.01$	$0.13 \pm 0.02$ 0.12 \pm 0.03	$0.14 \pm 0.02$ 0.10 \pm 0.1	$0.08 \pm 0.01$	$0.11 \pm 0.03$ 0.10 $\pm 0.01$	
Teal 3	0.14±0.02	0.12±0.01	0.11±0.01	0.14±0.01	0.12±0.005	0.10±0.01	0.09±0.01	0.10±0.01	
K (%)									
Year 1	$0.99 {\pm} 0.04$	$0.78{\pm}0.02$	$0.82 {\pm} 0.04$	$1.04{\pm}0.05$	$0.83{\pm}0.02$	$0.90 {\pm} 0.04$	$0.91 {\pm} 0.07$	$0.84 {\pm} 0.04$	
Year 2	$0.81 {\pm} 0.07$	$0.60 {\pm} 0.04$	$0.71 {\pm} 0.11$	$0.82{\pm}0.05$	$0.78{\pm}0.02$	$0.75 {\pm} 0.03$	$0.68{\pm}0.14$	$0.65 {\pm} 0.03$	
Year 3	$0.65{\pm}0.03$	$0.72{\pm}0.05$	$0.63{\pm}0.03$	$0.67{\pm}0.05$	$0.74 {\pm} 0.04$	$0.65{\pm}0.03$	$0.66{\pm}0.04$	$0.67{\pm}0.05$	
Ca (%)									
Year 1	$0.31 \pm 0.01$	$0.25 \pm 0.01$	$0.28 \pm 0.01$	$0.33 \pm 0.01$	$0.23 \pm 0.01$	$0.28 \pm 0.00$	$0.31 \pm 0.02$	$0.29 \pm 0.02$	
Year 2	$0.33 \pm 0.06$	$0.43 \pm 0.07$	$0.36 \pm 0.03$	$0.38 \pm 0.06$	$0.38 \pm 0.08$	$0.39 \pm 0.03$	$0.40 \pm 0.04$	$0.32 \pm 0.03$	
Year 3	$0.36 \pm 0.02$	$0.32 \pm 0.01$	$0.33 \pm 0.03$	$0.32 \pm 0.02$	$0.32 \pm 0.03$	$0.32 \pm 0.01$	$0.29 \pm 0.02$	$0.30 \pm 0.01$	
Mg (%)									
Year 1	$0.12 \pm 0.004$	$0.10\pm0.000$	$0.08 \pm 0.01$	$0.13 \pm 0.002$	$0.08 \pm 0.01$	$0.12 \pm 0.004$	$0.12 \pm 0.003$	$0.10 \pm 0.01$	
Year 2	$0.13 \pm 0.01$	$0.14 \pm 0.01$	$0.11 \pm 0.003$	$0.15 \pm 0.002$	$0.10 \pm 0.003$	$0.16 \pm 0.01$	$0.10 \pm 0.001$	$0.13 \pm 0.003$	
Year 3	0.15±0.01	$0.13 \pm 0.005$	0.15±0.02	$0.16 \pm 0.01$	$0.13 \pm 0.01$	$0.15 \pm 0.01$	$0.14 \pm 0.01$	$0.15 \pm 0.01$	
$B(\mu gg^{-1})$									
Year 1	$41\pm0$	$34\pm0$	37±1	42±2	29±3	43±2	29±1	39±3	
Year 2	36±9	43±9	33±3	42±4	28±3	44±7	$42\pm2$	31±2	
Year 3	27±5	26±6	23±3	34±1	26±2	22±3	29±5	30±4	
$C_{\mu}(\mu q q^{-1})$									
$Cu(\mu g g)$	$37 \pm 02$	33+02	3 5+0 5	$39 \pm 07$	45+11	41+06	60+24	3 5+0 5	
1993	$3.7\pm0.2$ $3.2\pm0.3$	41+0.8	$3.3\pm0.3$ $3.2\pm1.0$	$3.9\pm0.7$ $3.2\pm0.4$	38+05	$2.7\pm0.3$	$2.0\pm 2.4$	$3.5\pm0.5$ $3.2\pm0.8$	
1775	5.2±0.5	1.1 ± 0.0	5.211.0	5.2±0.1	5.0±0.5	2.7 ± 0.5	2.0±0.1	5.210.0	
$Fe(\mu g g^{-1})$									
1992	$325 \pm 110$	$318 \pm 60$	439±97	411±78	$579 \pm 107$	276±19	$470 \pm 100$	$294 {\pm} 60$	
1993	$188{\pm}18$	$200{\pm}13$	190±4	$185{\pm}27$	149±6	$241 \pm 24$	$215 \pm 35$	$163 \pm 11$	
1									
$Mn (\mu g^{-1})$	<b>2</b> 20 / · · ·	0.55 1 15	<b>A</b> <i>e e e e e e e e e e</i>	0071-55	0.001	202 L 5 /	<b>2</b> (0 ) 0	220 1 22	
1992	338±44	377±49	366±10	$325 \pm 29$	366±47	$393 \pm 24$	$349 \pm 8$	320±39	
1993	158±10	115±4	114±5	$153 \pm 12$	12/±7	131±7	$119 \pm 10$	133±4	
$Z_n(u_{\alpha}a^{-1})$									
1992	$57 \pm 10$	$61 \pm 22$	49+7	63+8	51+6	67+9	46+5	59+5	
1993	63±4	60±7	39±5	48±3	64±4	41±7	$40 \pm 10$	38±4	

Table 3. Foliar nutrient concentration of ponderosa pine at the Placerville site (standard errors are given)



Figure 3. Soil C, N, and C/N ratio in year 3 (standard errors are given).

able P (see Discussion); however, none of the trends in exchangeable  $Al^{3+}$  were statistically significant.

There were some significant changes in soil nutrients with time. There was an overall downward trend in total N from year 1 to year 3 in all horizons, resulting in a statistically significant reduction in soil N pools in many cases (Table 4). Thus, although there were no statistically significant changes in soil with time, there was an overall upward trend in C/N ratio (Figure 3). There were general downward trends and several statistically significant reductions in Ca, Mg, and K from year 1 to year 3, but no significant treatment effects at either sampling. There were no consistent patterns of change in CEC (not shown).

By far the largest change in soils with time was in the case of extractable P pools, which decreased by 80-99% between year 1 and year 3. Over this period of time a significant treatment effect of  $CO_2$  also developed: whereas there were no treatment effects on extractable P in year 1 (pre-treatment), there was a statistically significant, overall negative effect of  $CO_2$  extractable



*Figure 4.* Soil  $NH_4^+ + NO_3^-$ , extractable P, and exchangeable  $Al^{3+}$  in year 3 (standard errors are given).

P in both the Ap and Bw horizon in year 3 (Figure 4 and Table 4).

# Nutrient budgets

The net changes in soil C between year 1 and year 3 ranged from +1048 to -943 g m<sup>-2</sup> (+12 to -11%), but none was statistically significant (Table 4). Changes in vegetation C (all starting from 0, and therefore positive and statistically significant) ranged from 266 to 876 g m<sup>-2</sup>, adding +3 to +10% to total ecosystem C capital. If the soil changes are taken at face value (e.g. whether significant or not), the net ecosystem C balance was negative in two cases (Low N, Low CO2 and High N, Medium CO<sub>2</sub>), near zero in one case (High N, Low CO<sub>2</sub>), and positive in four cases (Low N, Medium and High CO<sub>2</sub>; Medium N, Low CO<sub>2</sub>, and High N, High CO<sub>2</sub>). There was no relationship between treatment and soil or ecosystem C balance, although there were significant, positive effects of both N and CO2 on biomass.

Table 4. Ecosystem carbon and nutrient pools in year 3 and changes from year 1 to year 3

N Treat (g $m^{-2} y^{-1}$ )	0	0	0	10	10	20	20	20		
$CO_2$ Treat ( $\mu$ L L <sup>-1</sup> )	350	525	700	350	700	350	525	700		
	(g m <sup>-2</sup> )									
Carbon content, year 3										
Vegetation	266	293	500	364	565	535	489	876		
Soil total	8228	8958	7654	8315	8061	7536	8577	8629		
Total	8494	9251	8154	8679	8626	8071	9066	9505		
Change, years 1-3										
Soil	-943	5	-234	-121	-374	-545	-925	1048		
Total ecosystem	-677	298	266	243	191	-10	-436	1924		
Nitrogen content, year 3										
Vegetation	3.7	4.1	6.3	5	8.1	7.2	7.3	11.1		
Soil, exchangeable <sup>a</sup>	1.8	1.5	2.0	2.0	2.1	2.0	1.9	1.8		
Soil, total	315	321	279	315	268	278	357	323		
Total	318.7	325.1	285.3	320	276.1	285.2	364.3	334.1		
Change, years 1-3										
Soil. total	-65*	-72	-50	-73*	-80*	0	-50*	-19		
Total ecosystem	-61.3	-67.9	-43.7	-68.0	-71.9	7.2	-42.7	-7.9		
Phoshorus content, year 3										
Vegetation	0.68	0.66	1.07	0.84	1.18	1.14	1	1.86		
Soil, extractable	1.2	0.7	0.5	1	0.4	1.1	0.3	0.1		
Total	1.88	1.36	1.57	1.84	1.58	2.24	1.3	1.96		
Change, years 1-3										
Soil	-11.4*	-5.9*	-5.7*	11.0*	-8.2*	-8.0*	-22.7*	-7.4*		
Total ecosystem	-10.72	-5.24	-4.63	-10.16	-7.02	-6.86	-21.7	-5.54		
Potassium content, year 3										
Vegetation	2.9	3.5	5.5	4	6.5	5.4	5.2	9.4		
Soil	112	112	117	166	114	110	136	112		
Total	114.9	115.5	122.5	170	120.5	115.4	141.2	121.4		
Change, years 1-3										
Soil, exchangeable	-42*	-19	-17*	19	-20	-20	-11	-21*		
Total ecosystem	-39.1	-15.5	-11.5	23	-13.5	-14.6	-5.8	-11.6		
Calcium content, year 3										
Vegetation	1.3	1.3	2.3	1.6	2.5	2.4	2.2	3.6		
Soil, exchangeable	382	450	412	531	378	419	424	348		
Total	383.3	451.3	414.3	532.6	380.5	421.4	426.2	351.6		
Change years 1-3										
Soil	-143*	-37	-33	-86	-57	-46	-56	-65		
Total ecosystem	-141.7	-35.7	-30.7	-84.4	-54.5	-43.6	-53.8	-61.4		
Magnesium content, year 3										
Vegetation	0.6	0.6	1.1	0.85	1.16	1.18	1.03	1.91		
Soil, exchangeable	292	306	278	371	248	299	251	233		
Total	292.6	306.6	279.1	371.85	249.16	300.18	252.03	234.91		
Change, years 1-3										
Soil	-84	-16	-16	-51	-48	-33	-31	-26		
Total ecosystem	-83.4	-15.4	-14.9	-50.15	-46.84	-31.82	-29.97	-24.09		

 $^a$  Values obtained one year after fertilization. \*Statistically significant difference between 1991 and 1993, Student's t-test, p <0.05.

The net changes in soil total N between year 1 and year 3 were negative in all but one case (High N, Low CO<sub>2</sub>, where the net change was 0) (Table 4). The losses of soil N ranged from 0 to 80 g m<sup>-2</sup> (0 to -29% of ecosystem capital) and many were statistically significant. There were significant, positive effects of both N and CO<sub>2</sub> treatments upon vegetation N content in year 3. However, the increases in vegetation N were small compared to the losses in soil N in most cases (ranging from +3.7 to +11.1 g m<sup>-2</sup>, or 1 to 3% of ecosystem capital). Thus, the ecosystem N balance was negative in all but one case. There were no relationships between either N or CO<sub>2</sub> treatments and soil or ecosystem C although there were significant, positive effects of both N and CO<sub>2</sub> on biomass.

Vegetation N pools were greater than soil mineral N (NH<sub>4</sub><sup>+</sup> + NO<sub>3</sub><sup>-</sup>) pools but considerably smaller than soil total N pools, as is usually the case in forest ecosystems (Johnson, 1992). Soil mineral N pools were substantially greater in the fertilized plots after fertilization each spring after the addition of 10 and 20 g m<sup>-2</sup> in the medium and high N treatments, respectively (data not shown). As is often the case following N fertilization (Johnson, 1992), however, soil mineral N levels in the fertilized chambers dropped to near control levels by the end of the year. Thus, there were no treatment effects on mineral N in March year 3, just prior to refertilization (Table 4).

As noted earlier, there were very large declines in soil extractable P pools between year 1 and year 3. There were positive and significant effects of both N and CO<sub>2</sub> on vegetation P content in year 3; however, the increases in vegetation P were small relative to the declines in extractable P (ranging from 0.68 to 1.86 g m<sup>-2</sup>, or 4 to 10% of the decline in soil available P). In year 3, the decreases in soil extractable P with elevated CO<sub>2</sub> were approximately the same magnitude as the increases in vegetation P with elevated CO<sub>2</sub>, and thus ecosystem P capital (defined here as the sum of vegetation and soil extractable P) was more constant with treatment than either soil or vegetation P content.

There were overall declines in soil exchangeable  $K^+$ ,  $Ca^{2+}$ , and  $Mg^{2+}$  pools from year 1 to year 3 (Table 4). These declines ranged from -15 to -27% for  $K^+$ , -8 to -27% for  $Ca^{2+}$ , and -5 to -22% for  $Mg^{2+}$ . The changes were statistically significant in three cases for  $K^+$  (Low N, Low and High CO<sub>2</sub> and High N, High CO<sub>2</sub>) and in one case for  $Ca^{2+}$  (Low N, Low CO<sub>2</sub>). None of the changes were significant for exchangeable  $Mg^{2+}$  pools. As was the case for N and P, there were significant and positive effects of both

N and  $CO_2$  treatments on vegetation K, Ca, and Mg contents in year 3. These increases were outweighed by the decreases in soil exchangeable pools, however, so that the net ecosystem changes in K, Ca, and Mg were negative in all cases.

# Discussion

#### Growth responses to N and $CO_2$

Both elevated CO<sub>2</sub> and N fertilization caused growth increases in ponderosa pine in this field study. The growth response to N fertilization indicates that N was a limiting nutrient in this soil, yet N limitation was clearly not severe enough to prevent a growth response to  $CO_2$  in the unfertilized treatments. This growth response to elevated  $CO_2$  was facilitated by increased N uptake more so than an increase in N "use efficiency" (e.g. lower tissue N concentrations). Contrary to the findings of Zak et al. (1993), we have found no evidence that CO2 treatment caused increased soil N availability: CO2 had no effect upon soil mineral N  $(NH_4^+ + NO_3^-)$  pools at the three year sampling, and ancillary studies have shown that CO<sub>2</sub> has a negative effect upon soil N mineralization rates (Johnson et al., 1996). Details of the effects of CO<sub>2</sub> on soil N availability, litter quality, and decomposition will be reported in another paper. For the purposes of this analysis, it is clear that the growth responses to  $CO_2$  in the absence of fertilization must have been facilitated by increased soil exploration. This increased root/shoot ratio in the Low N, elevated CO<sub>2</sub> treatments during year 2 suggests increased soil exploration at that time (Figure 1; Johnson et al., 1996). Although this root/shoot ratio effect disappeared in year 3, there was still greater root biomass (and total biomass) under the elevated CO<sub>2</sub>, which would continue to facilitate greater soil exploration.

The results of this field study contrast sharply with those from previous pot studies with ponderosa pine. In one pot study using an artificial, N-poor soil, ponderosa pine showed no growth response to  $CO_2$  without N fertilization (Johnson et al., 1994b). In other studies, ponderosa pine showed a toxic response to N fertilization which was either mitigated or reversed by  $CO_2$ (Griffin et al., 1995; Johnson et al., 1995a). Collectively, these studies demonstrate that 1) either extreme N deficiency or N toxicity can preclude growth response to  $CO_2$  in ponderosa pine, and 2) N deficiency should be thought of as a continuum rather than as an on/off situation, with the responses to CO<sub>2</sub> lessening as N supplies become either suboptimal or supra-optimal.

### Effects of N and CO<sub>2</sub> on vegetation nutrient status

As of year 3, there were no visual symptoms of nutrient deficiency in the seedlings. By 1996, however, there was some evidence of rosetting on terminal shoots, as is often observed with both B and Cu deficiency (Stone, 1990; Turvey and Grant, 1990). It is interesting that no P deficiency was encountered, even though soil extractable P levels had declined to very low levels by year 3. P uptake may have been facilitated by the greater mycorrhizal colonization with elevated  $CO_2$  noted by Tingey et al. (1995) in this study.

Both CO<sub>2</sub> and N treatments caused increased uptake of all measured nutrients, even when tissue nutrient concentrations declined. Increased nutrient uptake in combination with reduced tissue nutrient concentrations can be interpreted as growth dilution, and increased uptake with no change in tissue concentration can be interpreted as sufficiency (Timmer and Stone, 1978; Weetman, 1989). Foliar analysis indicated growth dilution responses to CO<sub>2</sub> for N, P, S, K, Ca, Mg, and B in year 1, and to a lesser degree in year 2. CO<sub>2</sub> continued to cause a growth dilution of foliar P, S, and B in year 3, also, but the effects of CO<sub>2</sub> on foliar N, K, and Mg had largely disappeared as concentrations declined.

There is no evidence that N behaved in a unique manner compared to other nutrients in response to elevated CO<sub>2</sub>, despite its unique role in rubisco. Although Hypothesis 1 (elevated CO<sub>2</sub> will cause increased growth and yield of biomass per unit uptake of N) was supported in the strictest sense for the first two years of growth, it was not supported in the third year. Hypothesis 2 (elevated CO<sub>2</sub> will cause increased biomass yield per unit uptake of non-limiting nutrients due to growth dilution) was supported: elevated CO<sub>2</sub> caused increased biomass per unit uptake for all major nutrients. In the cases where foliar concentrations were at deficiency thresholds, (e.g. Cu and B in year 3), there were no effects of elevated CO<sub>2</sub>, as hypothesized. However, there were also no effects of elevated CO<sub>2</sub> on foliar N in year 3, even though continued growth response to N fertilization indicated continuing N limitation. Thus, once again, there is no evidence that N is behaving in a unique manner compared to other nutrients.

The N responses were somewhat different from the  $CO_2$  responses, as would be expected. First of all,

there was no consistent, statistically significant effect of N treatment on foliar N concentration. On a wholetree basis, N concentration actually decreased with N fertilization (not shown). Thus, although there was a significant growth response to N additions, N itself was diluted by the increased growth that occurred (the "Steenbjerg effect"; Weetman, 1989). The effects of N fertilization on other nutrients was inconsistent. In year 1, N fertilization had no consistent, statistically significant effect on any measured nutrient in foliage. In year 2, N caused growth dilution of foliar P, and in year 3 N caused growth dilution of foliar Cu and Zn.

# Effects of N and $CO_2$ on soil nutrients and nutrient budgets

The declines in soil C and N were probably a result of the plowing that took place prior to planting. Losses of soil C and N with cultivation are well-documented; Mann (1986) found that soil C losses averaged at least 20% over the first 20 years of cultivation. The losses of soil N in this study were surprisingly high, however, as was the increase in C/N ratio. One would normally expect C/N ratios to decline during organic matter mineralization, as C is usually lost prior to N. We speculate that after the initial loss of both C and N due to plowing, there was a re-introduction of C into the soil from root sloughing, exudation, etc. which caused the C/N ratio to increase.

The relatively large losses from the total soil N pool generally cannot be accounted for by vegetation uptake, and therefore must represent either leaching or denitrification. Fertilizer N recovered by trees ranged from  $\approx 4$  to 12% (using unfertilized trees as a base), values which are at the low end but not unusual for fertilizer N recovery by trees (Johnson, 1992). Soil pools are large compared to fertilization inputs and thus fertilizer N recovery by soils is difficult to assess without tracer studies. However, there is no indication that fertilizer accumulated in the soil in these systems: cumulative applied N was of the same order of magnitude as apparent net losses of soil N, and there was no consistent N fertilizer treatment effect on net changes in soil N.

The declines in exchangeable cations were probably caused by increased leaching following plowing. We speculate that the mineralization of C and N after plowing caused increased soil respiration and nitrification, which in turn caused increased rates of cation leaching associated with both bicarbonate and nitrate. A rough reality check of this scenario can be made by comparing the net losses of N (declines in native soil N plus fertilizer N) with the losses of total base cations in mol<sub>c</sub> m<sup>-2</sup>, assuming that all N was lost by NO<sub>3</sub><sup>-</sup> leaching. This analysis suggests that NO<sub>3</sub><sup>-</sup> leaching could account for an average of  $\approx 90\%$  of the base cation losses from these soils.

Extractable P was the only measured soil nutrient which was affected by treatment, aside from the previously noted negative effect of CO<sub>2</sub> on N mineralization (Johnson et al., 1996). The relatively large declines in soil available P far exceeded vegetation P uptake, and were most likely due to immobilization in the soil (either microbial or chemical). Leaching of P is nearly always minimal due to its high affinity for adsorption sites. It is not possible at this stage to differentiate between microbial P immobilization and adsorption as a cause of reduced soil extractable P with time. The increases in exchangeable Al<sup>3+</sup> with elevated CO<sub>2</sub> mirrored the decreases in extractable P fairly well and could have caused increased P adsorption. In recent samplings (1996), higher microbial biomass has been found in the soils subjected to elevated CO<sub>2</sub> (W Cheng, pers. comm.).

# Conclusions

Elevated CO<sub>2</sub> had a positive effect upon growth and nutrient uptake, with or without N fertilization, in field studies in ponderosa pine. This response occurred despite the fact that N was suboptimal, and was apparently facilitated by increased soil exploration. Despite its unique role in rubisco, there was no evidence that N responded to elevated CO<sub>2</sub> in a unique manner: there were short-term reductions in foliar P, S, B, and Mg as well as N concentrations with elevated CO<sub>2</sub>, and all could be explained by simple growth dilution. Elevated CO<sub>2</sub> caused reductions in soil available N and P and increases in exchangeable Al<sup>3+</sup>, but had no consistent or significant effects upon total C, total N, exchangeable  $Ca^{2+}$ ,  $K^+$ , or  $Mg^{2+}$ . The reductions in available P exceed that which could be accounted for by plant uptake and may have been due to increased P adsorption, increased microbial immobilization, or both.

#### Acknowledgments

Research Supported by the Electric Power Research Institute (RP3041-02), the US Department of Energy, and the Nevada Agricultural Experiment Station, University of Nevada, Reno. Technical assistance by Valerie Yturiaga, Carol Johnson, Peter Ross, and Greg Ross, is greatly appreciated.

#### References

- Brown K R 1991 Carbon dioxide enrichment accelerates the decline in nutrient status and relative growth rate of *Populus tremuloides* Michx. seedlings. Tree Physiol. 8, 161–173.
- Campagna M A and Margolis H A 1989 Influence of short-term atmospheric CO<sub>2</sub> enrichment on growth, allocation patterns, and biochemistry of black spruce seedlings at different stages of development. Can. J. For. Res. 19, 773–782.
- Conroy J P, Milham P J, Bevege D I and Barlow E W R 1990 Influence of phosphorus deficiency on growth response of four families of *Pinus radiata* seedlings to CO<sub>2</sub>-enriched atmospheres. For. Ecol. Manage. 30, 175–188.
- Diaz S, Grime J P, Harris J and McPherson E 1993 Evidence of feedback mechanism limiting plant response to elevated carbon dioxide. Nature 364, 616–617.
- Galloway J N, Schlesinger W H, Levy H, Michaels A and Schnoor J L 1995 Nitrogen fixation: Anthropogenic enhancementenvironmental response. Global Biogeochem. Cycles 9, 235– 252.
- Griffin K L, Winner W E and Strain B R 1995 Growth and dry matter partitioning in loblolly and ponderosa pine seedlings in response to carbon and nitrogen availability. New Phytol. 129, 547–556.
- Hüttl R F, Fink S, Lutz H-J, Poth M and Wizniewski J 1987 Forest decline, nutrient supply, and diagnostic fertilization in southwestern Germany and southern California. IUFRO Seminar, Management of water and nutrient relations to increase forest growth. IUFRO, Canberra.
- Johnson D W 1992 Nitrogen retention in forest soils. J. Environ. Qual. 21, 1–12
- Johnson D W, Ball J T and Walker R F 1994a Effects of CO<sub>2</sub> and nitrogen on nutrient uptake in ponderosa pine seedlings. Plant Soil 168, 144–153.
- Johnson D W, Geisinger D R, Walker R F, Vose J, Elliot K and Ball J T 1994b Soil pCO<sub>2</sub>, soil respiration, and root activity in CO<sub>2</sub>-fumigated ponderosa pine. Plant Soil 165, 111–121.
- Johnson D W and Henderson G S 1979 Sulfate adsorption and sulfur fractions in a highly-weathered soil under a mixed deciduous forest. Soil Sci. 128, 34–40.
- Johnson D W, Henderson P L, Ball J T and Walker R F 1996 Effects of CO<sub>2</sub> and N on growth and N dynamics in ponderosa pine: Results from the first two growing seasons. *In* Carbon Dioxide and Terrestrial Ecosystems. Eds. G W Koch and H A Mooney. pp 23–40. Academic Press, San Diego.
- Johnson D W, Walker R F and Ball J T 1995a Lessons from lysimeters: Soil N release from disturbance compromises controlled environment study. Ecol. Appl. 5, 395–400.
- Johnson D W, Walker R F and Ball J T 1995b Combined effects of nitrogen and elevated CO<sub>2</sub> on forest soils. Water Air Soil Pollut. 85, 1551–1556
- Jones J B, Wolf B and Mills H A 1991 Plant Analysis Handbook. Micro-Macro Publishing, Inc. Athens, GA.
- Kauppi P E, Mielikäinen K and Kuusela K 1992 Biomass and carbon budget of European Forests, 1971 to 1990. Science 256, 70–74.
- Körner C and Arnone J A 1992 Responses to elevated carbon dioxide in artificial tropical ecosystems. Science 257, 1672–1675.

- Luxmoore R J, Oneill E G, Ells J M and Rogers H H 1986 Nutrient uptake and growth responses of virginia pine to elevated carbon dioxide. J. Environ. Qual. 15, 244–251.
- Mann L K 1986 Changes in soil carbon storage after cultivation. Soil Sci. 142, 279–288.
- Norby R J, O'Neill E G and Luxmoore R J 1986a Effects of atmospheric CO<sub>2</sub> enrichment on the growth and mineral nutrition of *Quercus alba* seedlings in nutrient-poor soil. Plant Physiol. 82, 83–89.
- Norby R J, Pastor J and Melillo J M 1986b Carbon-nitrogen interactions in CO<sub>2</sub>-enriched white oak, physiological and long-term perspectives. Tree Physiol. 2, 233–241.
- Olsen S R, and Sommers L E 1982 Phosphorus. *In* Methods of Soil Analysis. Part 2. Chemical and Microbiological Properties. 2nd Ed. Agronomy 9. Eds. A L Page, R H Miller and D R Keeney. pp 403–430. American Society of Agronomy, Madison, WI.
- O'Neill E G, Luxmoore R J and Norby R J 1987 Elevated atmospheric CO<sub>2</sub> effects on seedling growth, nutrient uptake, and rhizosphere bacterial populations of *Liriodendron tulipifera* L. Plant Soil 104, 3–11.
- Randlett D L, Zak D R, Pregitzer K S and Curtis P S 1996 Elevated atmospheric carbon dioxide and leaf litter chemistry: Influences on microbial respiration and net nitrogen mineralization. Soil Sci. Soc. Am. J. 60, 1571–1577.
- Samuelson L J and Seiler J R 1993 Interactive role of elevated CO<sub>2</sub>, nutrient limitations, and water stress in the growth responses of red spruce seedlings. For. Sci. 39, 348–358.
- Schulze E-D 1989 Air pollution and forest decline in a spruce (*Picea abies*) forest. Science 244, 776–783

- Stone E L 1990 Boron deficiency and excess in forest trees: A review. For. Ecol. Manage. 37, 49–75.
- Strain B R and Thomas R B 1992 Field measurements of CO<sub>2</sub> enhancement and climate change in natural vegetation. Water Air Soil Pollut. 64, 45–60.
- Timmer V R and Stone E L 1978 Comparative foliar analysis of young balsam fir fertilized with N, P, K, and lime. Soil Sci. Soc. Am. J. 42, 125–130.
- Tingey D T, Johnson M G, Phillips D L and Storm M J 1995 Effects of elevated CO<sub>2</sub> and nitrogen on ponderosa pine fine roots and associated fungal components. J. Biogeogr. 22, 281–287.
- Tissue D T, Thomas R B and Strain B R 1993 Long-term effects of elevated CO<sub>2</sub> and nutrients on photosynthesis and rubisco in loblolly pine seedlings. Plant Cell Environ. 16, 859–865.
- Turvey N D and Grant B R 1990 Copper deficiency in coniferous trees. For. Ecol. Manage. 37, 95–122
- Weetman G F 1989 Graphical vector analysis technique for testing stand nutritional status. *In* Research Strategies for Long-term Site Productivity. Eds. W J Dyck and C A Mees. pp 93–109. Proceedings, IEA/BE A3 Workshop, Seattle, WA August 1988. IEA/BE A3 Report No. 8. Bull. 152. Forest Research Institute.
- Zak D R, Pregitzer K S, Curtis P S, Teeri J A, Fogel R and Randlett D L 1993 Elevated atmospheric CO<sub>2</sub> and feedback between carbon and nitrogen cycles. Plant Soil 151, 105–117.

Section editors: E Garnier and R F Huettl