

Copyright is owned by the Author of the thesis. Permission is given for a copy to be downloaded by an individual for the purpose of research and private study only. The thesis may not be reproduced elsewhere without the permission of the Author.

**EFFECT OF METHOD OF TILLAGE ON LOSS OF CARBON
FROM SOILS**

**A thesis presented in partial fulfilment of the
requirements for the degree of**

Doctor of Philosophy

in

Soil Science

at Massey University, Palmerston North, New Zealand.

Amandeep Singh Ghatohra

2012

Abstract

Soils represent the largest terrestrial carbon (C) pool. Different tillage practices have been shown to result in variable losses of soil C. Among these, No-tillage is regarded as an effective management practice for conserving SOC and reducing soil CO₂ emissions. Overseas research shows that No-tillage practice could reduce CO₂ emissions by approximately 3 Mg CO₂ ha⁻¹yr⁻¹.

Quantitative information comparing soil CO₂ emissions with No-tillage and conventional tillage is limited in New Zealand. Furthermore, little quantitative information is available on the effect of soil and climatic conditions in modifying these emissions. This Ph.D. study evaluated the potential for Cross Slot[®] No-tillage cultivation to reduce CO₂ emissions from cropped soils in New Zealand conditions.

A series of preliminary experiments were conducted to establish a suitable chamber method to collect and measure CO₂ emissions from soil. The alkali trap method was selected for use in traditionally cultivated agricultural soils. Another experiment was conducted to test whether pressure fluctuations caused by wind velocity differentially influence soil CO₂ emissions from conventionally and Cross Slot[®] No-tillage cultivated soils. Carbon dioxide emissions from conventionally cultivated soils rapidly equilibrated to the onset of lower (negative) pressure, whereas CO₂ emissions from No-tillage soils took longer to equilibrate.

Experiments on the potential savings of soil C with Cross Slot[®] No-tillage cultivation (NT) compared to simulated tillage, measured in the laboratory showed reduced (between 113 and 393 kg CO₂-C ha⁻¹) CO₂ losses in three out of four soils. This reduction in CO₂ losses was further verified with measurements made for one of the soils at a field site during autumn and summer seasons. Overall the results of field studies suggest that Cross Slot[®] No-tillage cultivation reduced ~3.0 Mg CO₂ ha⁻¹ compared with rotary tillage for combined autumn and summer sowings i.e. two cultivations.

A subsequent laboratory incubation study assessed CO₂ loss with different levels of residue addition to the four soils used in the previous laboratory and field experiments. A number of labile C fractions extracted from these soils were measured in an attempt to predict CO₂ losses. These did not show any relationship with the CO₂ respired during the incubation period. It was, therefore, not possible to develop a soil test to predict CO₂ losses using these extractions.

Modelling laboratory CO₂ respiration data for predicting the CO₂ losses from conventional and No-tillage soils was explored using relationships between short-term CO₂

respired and total CO₂ loss. The model developed from laboratory incubations was further improved with parameterising the soil temperature and moisture effects. The temperature and moisture sensitive model was used to predict the CO₂ emissions measured during the summer season. The model precisely predicted the amount of C lost from No-tillage soils but the amount predicted for rotary tilled soils was 30 per cent less than the amount of C that was lost in the field. Moreover, the model predicted C loss was higher for the No-tillage soils than the rotary tilled soils which was contradictory to the findings from the field study. Therefore, further work is required as the data obtained during this Ph.D. study was insufficient to provide, or develop a model that could be used to predict CO₂ loss from conventional and No-tillage cultivation in New Zealand soils.

DEDICATION

This work is dedicated to my wife Rupinder Kaur who gave me, more than strength,
a reason to go on.

Acknowledgements

I would never have been able to finish my dissertation without the guidance of my supervisors, help from laboratory staff, friends, and support from my family and wife.

I would like to express my deepest gratitude to Professor Dr Surinder Saggar, my chief supervisor for his excellent guidance, caring, patience, tremendous support during my times of hardship and for having faith in me.

I am sincerely grateful to my co-supervisor Professor Dr M. J. Hedley for his valuable scientific inputs and advice throughout the entire study period.

I would like to thank my co-supervisor Dr C. W. Ross for his continuous support and guidance.

I am grateful to BNT Carbon Limited and Nufarm NZ for providing me the financial support during the three years of my research.

I am thankful to Douglas Giles for timely help in coordinating tillage operations and soil cores collection at all the sites used in laboratory studies, and for allowing access to his farm to conduct field studies. I am indebted to all the farmers for allowing such ready access to their fields.

Many thanks to staff of the Soil and Earth Sciences group especially to Mr Lance Currie, Mr Bob Toes, Mr Ian Furkert, Mr Ross Wallace, Mr Mike Bretherton, Ms Glenys Wallace, Ms Liza Haarhoff, Ms Anne West, Ms Moira Hubbard and Dr Marta Camps for their support and encouragement during my study period.

My sincere thanks to Landcare Research for allowing me to use their research equipment. Thanks are also due to Mr Peter Berben, Ms Suzanne Lambie and Dr Donna Giltrap for their ever helping attitude.

My sincere thanks to Peter Bishop, Helen Walker, Neha Jha, Tao Wang, Saman Herath and Jeya Kumar for their invaluable support. I owe a big thanks to my dear friend Saleem Bhatti for always being kind, extremely helpful and supportive during my difficult stages of Ph.D.

I have no words to thank my father and parents in law for their love, help and encouragement.

My heartfelt respect for my dearest mother Late Ms 'Narinder Kaur', who always loved me, supported me, believed in me and was there for me. Had she been alive she would have been proud.

Finally, thanks a ton to a wonderful woman, my wife – Rupinder Kaur. A person who supports me, loves me, cares for me, no matter what.

Table of Contents

Abstract	i
Acknowledgements	iv
Table of Contents	v
List of Tables	x
List of Figures	xiii
List of Plates	xv
Chapter-1 Introduction	1
1.1 Issue	1
1.2 Research Objectives	3
1.3 Thesis structure.....	4
1.4 Significance of study	6
1.5 References	7
Chapter-2 Review of literature	9
2.1 Soil carbon contribution to global warming.....	9
2.2 Common tillage practices	10
2.2.1 Conventional tillage	11
2.2.2 Conservation tillage.....	11
2.2.3 No-tillage.....	12
2.3 Effect of tillage practices on soil carbon dynamics.....	13
2.3.1 Carbon storage.....	13
2.3.2 Carbon dioxide losses.....	21
2.3.2.1 Effect of wind speed on CO ₂ emissions from soil	22
2.3.3 Carbon fractions	26
2.4 Factors affecting soil carbon loss	27
2.4.1 Soil temperature	27
2.4.2 Soil moisture.....	29
2.4.3 Soil texture	30
2.5 Methods for measuring carbon dioxide fluxes.....	32
2.5.1 Chamber methods.....	32
2.5.1.1 Alkali trap approach	32
2.5.1.2 Flux gradient approach.....	33
2.5.1.3 Closed dynamic chamber approach.....	34

2.5.1.4	Open dynamic chamber approach	34
2.5.2	Micrometeorological techniques	35
2.6	Nature of soil organic carbon and separation techniques	35
2.6.1	Chemical characterisation	36
2.6.2	Chemical fractionation techniques	37
2.6.3	Physical characterisation	39
2.6.4	Physical fractionation techniques	40
2.6.4.1	Aggregate fractions	40
2.6.4.2	Particle size fractions.....	41
2.6.4.3	Density fractions.....	42
2.6.5	Biological characterisation	44
2.6.6	Biological approaches	44
2.7	Conclusions	45
2.8	References	47
Chapter-3	Comparisons of methods to measure carbon dioxide emissions from soils and wind effects on soil carbon dioxide fluxes under controlled laboratory conditions	76
3.1	Introduction	76
3.2	Material and methods	77
3.2.1	Description of soils.....	77
3.2.2	Measurement of CO ₂ flux.....	79
3.2.3	Statistical analysis	81
3.3	Results	81
3.3.1	Low emission study.....	81
3.3.2	High emission study	83
3.4	Discussion	84
3.4.1	Low emission study.....	84
3.4.2	High emission study	86
3.5	Summary and conclusions.....	88
3.6	Effect of wind induced pressure fluctuations on carbon dioxide fluxes from simulated tillage and No-tillage treatments	90
3.6.1	Introduction	90
3.6.2	Material and methods	90
3.6.2.1	Soil characteristics.....	90
3.6.2.2	Chemical and physical analysis.....	90

3.6.2.3	Collection of soil cores.....	91
3.6.2.4	Application of different pressures to soils.....	91
3.6.2.5	Carbon dioxide measurements	92
3.6.2.6	Statistical analysis	93
3.6.3	Results	93
3.6.4	Discussion	96
3.6.5	Summary and conclusions.....	97
3.7	References	98
Chapter-4	Carbon dioxide emissions from soils following rotary– and No-tillage seed bed preparation under field and controlled laboratory conditions	104
4.1	Introduction	104
4.2	Material and methods	105
4.2.1	Laboratory study.....	105
4.2.1.1	Sites and soils	105
4.2.1.2	Collection of soil cores and simulation of tillage.....	106
4.2.1.3	Carbon dioxide measurements	106
4.2.1.4	Calculations of CO ₂ fluxes for NT cores.....	107
4.2.1.5	Soil moisture content (SMC).....	108
4.2.1.6	Cumulative CO ₂ emissions.....	108
4.2.2	Field study	109
4.2.2.1	Site and soil	109
4.2.2.2	Establishment of field experiment.....	109
4.2.2.3	Carbon dioxide measurements	110
4.2.2.4	Soil temperature and moisture content.....	110
4.2.2.5	Cumulative CO ₂ emissions.....	111
4.2.3	Collection of soil samples for physical and chemical analysis	111
4.2.3.1	Physical analysis.....	111
4.2.3.2	Chemical analysis	111
4.2.4	Collection of climate data.....	111
4.2.5	Measurements of above- and below-ground residue inputs.....	112
4.2.6	Statistical analysis	112
4.3	Results	113
4.3.1	Laboratory study.....	113
4.3.2	Field study	117

4.4	Discussion	125
4.4.1	Laboratory study.....	125
4.4.2	Field study	126
4.4.3	Comparisons of CO ₂ emissions during laboratory and field studies.....	128
4.5	Summary and conclusions.....	128
4.6	References	130
Chapter-5	Influence of soil type and rates of residue addition on decomposition of residues in soils under controlled laboratory conditions and the relationship of CO₂ evolved during the entire incubation period with labile soil C fractions.....	134
5.1	Introduction	134
5.2	Material and methods	135
5.2.1	Soils.....	135
5.2.2	Plant material.....	136
5.2.3	Decomposition study.....	136
5.2.4	Soil fractionation	137
5.2.4.1	Light and heavy fraction density separation.....	137
5.2.5	Labile carbon fractions.....	137
5.2.5.1	Hot water extractable-C.....	137
5.2.5.2	Microbial biomass-C	138
5.2.5.3	Hydrogen peroxide oxidisable-C.....	138
5.2.5.4	Potassium dichromate oxidisable-C	139
5.2.5.5	Potassium sulphate extractable-C.....	139
5.2.6	Recover percentage of the added residue	139
5.2.7	Statistical analysis	139
5.3	Results	140
5.3.1	Soils.....	140
5.3.2	Decomposition of added ryegrass pasture residues.....	140
5.3.3	Residue-C recovery	146
5.3.4	Labile carbon fractions.....	149
5.4	Discussion	155
5.4.1	Decomposition of added ryegrass pasture residues.....	155
5.4.2	Residue-C recovery	155
5.4.3	Labile carbon fractions.....	156
5.5	Summary and conclusions.....	159

5.6	References	160
Chapter-6	Short term test plus development of predictive decomposition simulation model.....	165
6.1	Introduction	165
6.2	Methodology	166
6.2.1	Simple regression model	166
6.2.2	Two and three compartment decomposition models.....	167
6.2.2.1	Development of a temporally dynamic two compartment model using laboratory data	167
6.2.2.2	Model efficiency.....	168
6.3	Results and discussion.....	169
6.3.1	Simple regression model	169
6.3.2	Application of two compartment model to predict CO ₂ fluxes in laboratory for full measurement period.....	172
6.3.3	Application of temporally dynamic three compartment model to field data.....	179
6.3.4	Development of temporally and climatically dynamic three compartment model.....	181
6.3.4.1	Development of temperature scalar.....	181
6.3.4.2	Development of moisture scalar.....	182
6.3.4.3	Application of temporally and climatically dynamic three compartment model to field data.....	186
6.4	Summary and conclusions.....	189
6.5	References	191
Chapter-7	Conclusions and recommendations for future work.....	195
7.1	Conclusions	195
7.1.1	Selection of appropriate method for measuring CO ₂ fluxes.....	195
7.1.2	Reduction in CO ₂ emissions with No-tillage	196
7.1.3	Influence of soil type and residue input rates on CO ₂ emissions	197
7.1.4	Modelling laboratory CO ₂ fluxes to predict field CO ₂ emissions	198
7.2	Contribution to New Zealand agriculture.....	199
7.3	Future research	199
	Appendix 1	201

List of Tables

Table 2.1	Differences in soil organic carbon (SOC) between No-tillage (NT) and conventional plough tillage (CT) across a range of soils in different countries	16
Table 2.2	Summary of the results of studies conducted on tillage induced CO ₂ fluxes	24
Table 3.1	Effect of absorption intervals on the CO ₂ fluxes using closed static chambers with NaOH (alkali) traps of varying molarities	81
Table 3.2	Effect of absorption intervals on CO ₂ fluxes using closed static chambers with NaOH (alkali) traps of varying molarities compared with spot measurements made by EGM-1 equipped with SRC-1	82
Table 3.3	Carbon dioxide fluxes (mg CO ₂ -C m ⁻² hr ⁻¹) under lower (negative) and ambient pressures in laboratory conditions during 4 and 12 hour measurement period	95
Table 3.4	Accumulated carbon dioxide emissions (mg CO ₂ -C m ⁻²) over 4, 12 and 16 hour measurement period under lower (negative) and ambient pressures in laboratory conditions	95
Table 4.1	Physico-chemical characteristics of the five soil sites (0-10cm)	105
Table 4.2	Cumulative average CO ₂ -C emissions from simulated tillage (ST), No-tillage (NT) and Non-Disturbed (ND) treatments from Glen Oroua, Tangimoana, Kiwitea and Feilding site soils till day-54	114
Table 4.3	Pearson correlation coefficients of the total amount of CO ₂ -C lost till day 54 during laboratory incubation from ST treatment and different soil factors of the four test soils	115
Table 4.4	Multiple linear regression model between CO ₂ -C emissions during laboratory incubation and gravimetric moisture content (GMC), total carbon content (TC) and residues incorporated (RES) for studied ST treatment on the four test soils	115
Table 4.5	Coefficient of determination (R ²) comparing the CO ₂ -C fluxes from the RT, NT and ND treatments with gravimetric moisture content (GMC %) and soil temperature during the autumn and summer seasons	119
Table 5.1	Chemical characteristics of the four soils (0-10cm) used in the incubation study	135
Table 5.2	Percentage of added residue-C respired at different times of the incubation in the four different soils amended with different rates of pasture residues	145
Table 5.3	Percentage of added residue-C decomposed after 129 days in the four	

	different soils amended with different rates of pasture residues.....	145
Table 5.4	Light and heavy fraction-C as influenced by pasture residue addition and recovery (%age) of added C after 129 days of the incubation study	147
Table 5.5	Light and heavy fraction's-C at beginning (day-0) and after 129 days incubation study in control treatments of the four soils.....	148
Table 5.6	Labile C fractions (mg C g ⁻¹ soil) determined on the control treatments of the four soils at the beginning (day-0) of the incubation study	149
Table 5.7 A	Coefficients of determination comparing the CO ₂ -C respired during 129 days incubation period with the labile C fractions determined on the control treatments of the four soils	150
Table 5.7 B	P-values comparing the slopes for different labile-C fractions of Carnarvon SL, Ohakea stony SiL, Ohakea SiL with the slope of Horotiu SiL.....	150
Table 5.8	Hot water extractable-C at the beginning (day-0) of the incubation study in the four soils as influenced by pasture residue additions.....	151
Table 5.9	Hot water extractable-C after 129 days of the incubation study in the four soils as influenced by pasture residue additions.....	151
Table 5.10	Microbial biomass-C at the beginning (day-0) of the incubation study in the four soils as influenced by pasture residue additions.....	152
Table 5.11	Microbial biomass-C after 129 days of the incubation study in the four soils as influenced by pasture residue additions	152
Table 5.12	P-values comparing the slopes of the Carnarvon SL, Ohakea stony SiL, Ohakea SiL with the slope of Horotiu SiL for microbial biomass-C (MBC) and hot water extractable-C (HWC) determined at different residue rates	153
Table 5.13	Summary of the analysis of variance of the amounts of microbial biomass-C (MBC) and hot water extractable-C (HWC) determined on day-0	153
Table 5.14	Amount of carbon oxidised by 2% H ₂ O ₂ during 2 hour oxidation period at 35°C from the four soils	154
Table 6.1	Linear regression coefficients comparing the CO ₂ -C evolved during full laboratory incubation period (54 to 99 days) with CO ₂ -C evolved; until day 2, 4, 6, 8, 10 and 12 using soils from five sites.....	169
Table 6.2	Two carbon pools (Pool-C and A), their respective decay constants (k _c and k _a) and coefficient of determination (R ²) of the daily measured and predicted (modelled) CO ₂ -C fluxes for 12 days for developing the two compartment model	174

Table 6.3	Coefficient of determination (R^2) of the daily measured and predicted (modelled) CO_2 -C fluxes for the full measurement period of the five soils used in laboratory incubation study after application of the two compartment model	174
Table 6.4	Three carbon pools (Pool-C, A and B), their respective decay constants (k_c , k_a and k_b) and coefficient of determination (R^2) of the daily measured and predicted (modelled) CO_2 -C fluxes for 12 days for developing the three compartment model.....	177
Table 6.5	Coefficient of determination (R^2) of the daily measured and predicted (modelled) CO_2 -C fluxes for full measurement period of the five soils used in laboratory incubation study after application of the three compartment model	178

List of Figures

Figure.1.1	Thesis structure	5
Figure.2.1	Relative fractional change in soil C under No-tillage (NT) compared to conventional tillage (CT) as function of soil depth.....	20
Figure.2.2	Relative fractional change in soil C under No-tillage (NT) compared to conventional tillage (CT) in 0-30 cm soil depth	20
Figure.3.1	Comparison of CO ₂ fluxes measured by NaOH trap, EGM-1 and closed static flux gradient methods	84
Figure.4.1	Disturbed and undisturbed area by Cross Slot [®] opener in the soil core	107
Figure.4.2	Air temperature and precipitation at Sanson field site from April 2010 to February 2011	112
Figure.4.3	Daily average CO ₂ -C fluxes as influenced by tillage (ST, Simulated tillage; NT, No-tillage and ND, Non-Disturbed) from (a) Glen Oroua, (b) Tangimoana, (c) Kiwitea and (d) Feilding site soils	116
Figure.4.4	Cumulative average CO ₂ -C emissions from simulated tillage (ST), No-tillage (NT) and Non-Disturbed (ND) treatments from Glen Oroua, Tangimoana, Kiwitea and Feilding site soils	117
Figure.4.5	Daily average CO ₂ -C fluxes as influenced by tillage (RT, Rotary tillage; NT, No-tillage and ND, Non-Disturbed) during (a) autumn and (b) summer season from Sanson field site.....	120
Figure.4.6	Daily average CO ₂ -C fluxes from the rotary and No-tilled soils during the summer season from the Sanson field site affected by soil GMC	121
Figure.4.7	Gravimetric moisture content (GMC %age) at 0-10 cm depth during 4 hour CO ₂ measurements (a) autumn and (b) summer season	122
Figure.4.8	Soil temperature at 0-10 cm depth for 4 hour CO ₂ measurement period during (a) autumn season and (b) summer season	122
Figure.4.9	Daily average CO ₂ -C fluxes as influenced by tillage (ST, Simulated tillage; NT, No-tillage and ND, Non-Disturbed) during (a) autumn under field conditions and (b) summer season under laboratory conditions	124
Figure.4.10	Cumulative average CO ₂ -C emissions as influenced by tillage (ST, Simulated tillage; NT, No-tillage and ND, Non-Disturbed) during (a) autumn and (b) summer season.....	124
Figure.5.1	The CO ₂ -C emission rates from (a) Carnarvon SL and (b) Ohakea stony SiL as influenced by residue application during 129 days of laboratory incubation.....	142

Figure.5.2	The CO ₂ -C emission rates from (a) Ohakea SiL and (b) Horotiu SiL as influenced by residue application during 129 days of laboratory incubation.....	143
Figure.5.3	Cumulative CO ₂ -C emissions from Carnarvon SL, Ohakea stony SiL, Ohakea SiL and Horotiu SiL.....	144
Figure.5.4	Relationships between cumulative CO ₂ -C respired during 129 days incubation from the four soils at different residue rates with (a) microbial biomass-C and (b) hot water extractable-C measured at the beginning (day-0) of the incubation study	153
Figure.6.1	The relationship between the total CO ₂ -C evolved from simulated tillage and No-tillage soils until day-12 with CO ₂ -C evolved during full incubation period (54 to 99 days) from the five soil sites during laboratory incubation study.....	171
Figure.6.2	The relationship between the total CO ₂ -C evolved from simulated tillage and No-tillage soils until day-12 under laboratory conditions with total CO ₂ -C evolved from rotary tillage (RT) and No-tillage (NT) soils for the full measurement period (99 days) for Sanson field site	171
Figure.6.3	Comparison of observed and predicted (modelled) CO ₂ -C fluxes by two and three compartment models for 12 days (a, b) and full 92 days (c, d) measurement period for the Glen Oroua site for the simulated tillage (ST) treatment	175
Figure.6.4	Carbon dioxide contribution from pools-A & C of (a) two compartment model and pools-A, B and C of (b) three compartment models for the simulated tillage (ST) treatment for the Glen Oroua soil site	176
Figure.6.5	Comparison of observed and predicted (modelled) CO ₂ -C fluxes by the three compartment model for 99 days measurement period for the Sanson site from (a) rotary tillage (RT) and (b) No-tillage (NT) treatments	180
Figure.6.6	Comparison of observed and predicted (modelled) cumulative CO ₂ -C emissions by the three compartment model for 99 days measurement period for the Sanson site from (a) rotary tillage (RT) and (b) No-tillage (NT) treatments	180
Figure.6.7	Temperature scalar for the three compartment model	182
Figure.6.8	Moisture scalars for the three compartment model.....	184

Figure.6.9	Comparison of observed and predicted (modelled) CO ₂ -C fluxes by the three compartment model including temperature and moisture factors for the Sanson site from (a) rotary tillage (RT) and (b) No-tillage (NT) treatments for 99 days measurement period	188
Figure.6.10	Comparison of observed and predicted (modelled) cumulative CO ₂ -C emissions by the three compartment model including temperature and moisture factors for the Sanson site from (a) rotary tillage (RT) and (b) No-tillage (NT) treatments for 99 days measurement period	188

List of Plates

Plate.3.1	Closed static chambers: lower pressure and ambient pressure set up.....	93
-----------	---	----