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Wetlands promote carbon sequestration through saturated, anoxic soils. However, the persistent presence of water results in reduce conditions, which promotes methane (CH₄) production. The climatological variables responsible for the source/sink behavior are still unclear. This study quantifies temporal changes in the empirical drivers of the carbon fluxes of a constructed inland salt marsh in Camillus, New York. The mean CH₄ (0.328 µmol·m⁻²·s⁻¹) and carbon dioxide (CO₂) (0.195 µmol·m⁻²·s⁻¹) emissions from June 27, 2019 to November 11, 2019 show the site’s slight carbon source behavior. Latent heat flux had the strongest relationship with CH₄ and gross primary production (GPP), while air temperature best explained ecosystem respiration (Rₑ). The lag responses of Rₑ (3-hours) and CH₄ (5-hours) from air temperature are likely attributed to the lag response between the air and soil temperature. Whereas the lag response of GPP (1-hour), Rₑ (2-hours), and CH₄ (1-day) from rainfall events are likely a reflection of an increase in dissolved oxygen and soil moisture content.
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Chapter 1: Introduction

Wetlands offer a variety of ecosystem services, including biodiversity support, water quality improvement, flood abatement, and carbon management (Zedler and Kercher, 2005). The Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC; Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change and Edenhofer, 2014) lists wetlands as a potential mitigation strategy to combat climate change through the sequestration of carbon across soil pools, peat formation, sediment decomposition, and plant biomass (Bridgham et al., 2006). It is estimated that wetland soils contain 20-30% of the total storage of carbon in the earth’s soils (Bridgham et al., 2006; Roulet, 2000), the equivalent of 75% of the earth’s total atmospheric carbon (Piao et al., 2009). However, wetlands also emit 30% of the global methane (CH$_4$) emissions, which has 28 times the global warming potential (GWP) of carbon dioxide (CO$_2$) when considered over a 100-year time horizon (Edenhofer, 2015). Thus, wetlands occupy a unique climatological niche, where they can be carbon sinks but global warming sources. The ecological drivers responsible for the source/sink behavior of wetlands are still not clear; however, it is essential to understand the climatological variables that drive engineered wetlands’ CO$_2$ and CH$_4$ fluxes in order to optimize their carbon and warming budgets.

Over the last two decades, scientist conducted many observational studies (Baldocchi et al., 2001; Inglett et al., 2012; Kim et al., 1998; Morin et al., 2014a; Rey-Sanchez et al., 2018; Rinne et al., 2007, 2018) to measure the ecosystem-level greenhouse gas vertical fluxes of wetlands using the eddy covariance technique. The eddy covariance method provides temporally continuous and spatially integrated flux measurements of an ecosystem by measuring the
turbulent diffusion of gases at a set height above the atmosphere-ecosystem interface (Baldocchi,
2003; Schmid, 1994). The integration of fluxes originating from a large area referred to as the
tower footprint dampens the sampling bias due to spatially heterogeneous fluxes, which provides
an accurate estimation of the site-level total fluxes. Efforts have been made to use observed
responses to create and validate empirical models to examine the influence of any predictor
variable on the final observed fluxes. Empirical models for CO₂ and CH₄ fluxes may incorporate
a wide host of environmental variables (e.g., meteorological data, soil characteristics, types and
diversity of plants, etc.), which can provide insight into the underlying statistical relationships
from multiple data sets simultaneously (Morin et al., 2014b). For example, climatological
variables such as T_{Air} and PPT₇ affect the carbon behavior of wetlands based on their influence
on soil temperature and the water table level, which directly influence above- and below-ground
carbon fluxes.

Despite these efforts, discrepancies between estimated carbon responses among wetland types
and locations suggest a need for more ecosystem-level efforts to explain temporal (across
seasons and days) and spatial variation and for model validation (Kirschke et al., 2013).
Furthermore, environmental conditions may drive future CO₂ and CH₄ emissions, potentially
inducing a phase lag between the two signals (Kim et al., 1998). Lag response due to weather
events cause delayed effects due to changes in the water table level, altered vegetation activity,
and atmospheric stability and mixing. Continuous measurement of the fluxes permits temporal
analyses and provides insight into the temporal dynamics of the climatological variables and the
ecosystem carbon exchange.
Fluxes also vary spatially due in part to the spatial heterogeneity of above- and below-ground conditions, including the presence or absence of standing water, the vigor of plants, or the depth of labile carbon availability (Sha et al., 2011). The integration of these environmental variables into the eddy-covariance tower footprint metrics provides insight into spatial drivers. Recent developments in remote-sensing measurements allow for spatial variation in plant productivity in the form of the normalized difference vegetation index (NDVI). The integration of NDVI can provide understanding to gross primary production (GPP), CH₄, and ecosystem respiration (Rₑ) drivers, and CH₄ transport through the vegetation (Boon, 2000). Ultimately, NDVI and temporal changes in climatological variables may help offer insight into site-specific responses and model validation.

**The broad goal of this study is to characterize the empirical drivers of the carbon fluxes of a constructed inland salt marsh in Camillus, New York.** To accomplish this, we measured and modeled the CH₄, GPP, and Rₑ fluxes from the constructed inland salt marsh using the eddy covariance method from June 27, 2019 to November 11, 2019. We set three research objectives:

1) Determine temporal changes in the statistical relationships between the carbon fluxes and the climatological variables (air temperature, precipitation, vapor pressure density, net radiation, wind speed, wind direction, atmospheric pressure, heat flux, and low friction velocity) and vegetative distribution (NDVI footprint weighted total) using an empirical model.

2) Determine the frequency response of the ecosystem's carbon exchange (CH₄, GPP, Rₑ) to precipitation events and shifts in atmospheric temperature during the growing season.
3) Evaluate the spatial influence of a heterogeneous plant community from an individual NDVI event on site-level integrated carbon fluxes.
Chapter 2: Methods

2.1 Site Description

The Solvay inland salt marsh (Figure 1) is a 2.1 hectare (ha) wetland built on top of a sediment basin located in Camillus, New York. Historically, the Solvay Sediment Basins 12-15 (SSB), was filled with Solvay waste, composed of calcium carbonate and other salts of calcium, magnesium, and sodium, from a local soda ash production facility (mid-1900’s -1986) (Hewlett, 1956; Mirck and Volk, 2010). The original filling of the SSB left a depression in the center of sediment basin 14 (43°04’10” N, 76°15’45” W, 140 m altitude), which accumulated drainage from the surrounding SSB, leaving the depression with alkaline, infertile soil with a pH and total Nitrogen (N) approximately 8.5 and 0.5%, respectively (Eallonardo, 2010). In 2008, through a collaboration between the State University of New York College of Environmental Science and Forestry, Honeywell International, and O’Brien & Gere Engineers, the seasonally flooded depression was converted to an inland salt marsh and the surrounding SSB were enclosed in a willow-based evapotranspiration cover system (New York State Department of Environmental Conservation, 2010) to reduce leachate. The decision to select inland salt marsh as the restoration target was decided due to the extreme soil conditions caused by the high alkalinity, low total N (Eallonardo, 2010), and volumetric water content of 70% at saturation (Hewlett, 1956; Mirck and Volk, 2010).
The vegetation of the inland salt marsh is a combination of alvar grassland, inland salt marsh, Great Lakes dune, and marl fen plant communities which were introduced to the site from 2008 to 2010 (Eallonardo, 2010). Data collected from 2008 to 2013 demonstrated that vegetation development was rapid, with percent cover increasing from nearly 0% to 100% in six years. Herbaceous plant species that are 1 - 2 m tall dominate the site, with over 100% areal coverage.
The growing season typically lasts from the end of April through mid-October. The mean annual air temperature ($T_{\text{Air}}$) is 9°C (1989-2019) and the mean annual precipitation is 977 mm (1989-2019) (Binghamton, NY Weather Forecast Office, 2020).

2.2 Data Collection

We constructed the eddy-covariance tower on June 27, 2019 and ran continuously through November 11, 2019. The equipment on the tower includes two Infrared Gas Analyzers (IRGAs): a LI-7500RS (LI-COR Biosciences, Lincoln NE) for CO$_2$ and H$_2$O, and a LI-7700 (LI-COR Biosciences, Lincoln NE) for CH$_4$, and a CSAT3B sonic anemometer (Campbell Scientific, Inc. Logan, UT). The air pressure, three-dimensional wind velocities, and CO$_2$, CH$_4$, and H$_2$O concentrations were measured at 10 Hz and recorded on a CR3000 datalogger (Campbell Scientific, Inc. Logan, UT). The data were then transmitted from the tower via FM radio (RF451, Campbell Scientific, Inc. Logan, UT) to a nearby computer to be processed into 30-minute block averages using MATLAB (version R2018a, MathWorks, Natick, MA) using methods described originally in Morin et al., (2014a). Additional averaged hourly meteorological observations were recorded by a nearby meteorological tower (Figure 1), including $T_{\text{Air}}$, vapor pressure deficit (VPD), net radiation (netRad), atmospheric pressure (P$_a$), total rainfall (PPT$_T$), wind speed (wind$\_speed$), and wind direction (wind$\_dir$) throughout the observational period.

A DJI Matrice 100 drone (elevation 120 m) flew over the wetland on August 1, 2019 to capture multispectral data (blue, green, red, red edge, near-IR spectral bands) using a RedEdge-M multispectral camera (MicaSense, Inc., Seattle, WA) with an 80% front and side overlap and 4.2 cm$^2$ pixel resolution. The 5-band reflectance orthomosaic was processed using Pix4D mapper.
photogrammetry software, including MicaSense supplied calibration targets, which were factored into the data from the onboard down-welling light sensor. The NDVI map was calculated using the red and near-infrared bands from the reflectance orthomosaic in ESRI ArcMap (Esri, Redlands, CA) and converted to a 1 m² pixel resolution.

2.3 Tower Configuration

Based on theory and practice, the tower’s placement and design are determined to limit the systematic biases caused by flow distortions to best capture the climatological variables and processes from a heterogeneous environment. To do this, the tower’s location, height, and orientation were all considered. Before tower placement, we estimated the footprint size using historical wind data gathered at the meteorological station (Figure 1). We used those data to determine the location and height of the tower, where the setup would have a relatively homogeneous topography within the fetch for all wind directions. The location was near the center of the wetland (Figure 1) downwind of the most spatially homogeneous portion of the wetland and far from surrounding trees and depressions in the wetland soils that could introduce irregular vertical wind conditions. This placement reduced wind streamline distortion caused by changes in the wind displacement height from varying vegetation within the tower’s footprint.

We vertically positioned the sonic anemometer and the IRGAs by keeping in mind the following two considerations: 1) the instruments must be at least 1.5 times the vegetation height to be in the well-mixed surface layer and 2) the measurement height determines the fetch length of the tower, with a taller tower incorporating a larger area into each measurement. Prior to installation, we measured the height of the dead vegetation to determine the minimum height needed and
estimated the maximum height required from a preliminary footprint analysis. We mounted the CSAT3B and IRGAs at the height of 2.87 m as measured from the soil surface to the central point of the sensors (Figure 2). We also considered wind$_{dir}$ for the tower setup because the physical structure of the tower has effects on surrounding airflows, including the distortion of the wind velocity and direction. Because of this, we oriented the CSAT3B to point at 184°S to maximize the exposure time for winds blowing from the prevailing wind directions, southwest (SW). These design guidelines are necessary to capture $\geq 80\%$ contribution of the representative wetland, with the design goal of $\geq 90\%$ contribution (Lee et al., 2004).

Figure 2. Open-path eddy-covariance tower configuration approximately 2.87 m above the inland salt marsh floor.
The LI-7500RS was placed 0.23 m upwind from the centralized point of the transducers on the CSAT3B with a slight angle from the vertical direction (~10-15°) to prevent water accumulation on the sensor’s windows during rainstorms, as recommended by the LI-7500RS manual (LI-COR Biosciences, 2019). We installed the LI-7700 such that the center of the LI-7700 path was vertically aligned with the center of the CSAT3B transducers and was horizontally separated from the anemometer by 0.61 m. The sensor was oriented in a vertical mounting position to ensure 360° acceptance for wind$_{dir}$, as recommended by the LI-7700 manual (LI-COR Biosciences, 2020). The sensors were powered using photovoltaic cells installed 4.57 m from the tripod. The panels charged four 6V deep-cycle marine batteries with enough storage capacity for three days of power.

2.4 Flux Calculations

Flux measurements were calculated from the raw wind$_{speed}$ and gas concentration measurements using methods described originally in Morin et al., (2014b). In brief, we performed a 3-D coordinate rotation to the wind measurements to ensure the vertical and crosswind components average out to 0 for each 30-minute interval (Lee et al., 2004) and included the following corrections: (1) A lag correction accounting for the separation distance between the sonic anemometer and the IRGAs using the method of maximum covariance. (2) A spectral correction assessing for high-frequency data loss from IRGA path lengths (Massman, 2000). (3) Temperature correction for the dependence of the absorption spectrum of CO$_2$, CH$_4$, and water vapor (Kaimal and Gaynor, 1991), and (4) Webb, Pearman and Leuning (WPL) corrections to account for the changes in air density and water vapor for CO$_2$ and CH$_4$ concentrations (Webb et al., 1980). The corrections were completed on available despiked data.
Data were despiked using a series of filters. First, we filtered the data using internal diagnostic value information provided by the sensors to exclude situations when the measured concentration may not be reliable, as instructed by the manuals for LI-7700, LI-7500RS, and CSAT3B. We then evaluated data against seasonal maximum and minimum thresholds and identified and removed outliers by finding points six standard deviations away from the mean value of a measurement. A 30-minute interval is representative of the average surface exchange, capturing the major flux-carrying eddies (Farmer et al., 2006; Wolfe et al., 2009). The half-hour measurements were filtered using a friction velocity ($u^*$) threshold of 0.1 ms$^{-1}$, to account for periods of insufficient turbulent mixing (Reichstein et al., 2005).

The hourly meteorological data were converted to half-hour measurements and gap-filled using a bi-linear, periodic, trended interpolation relationship (Morin et al., 2014b). This method considers the diurnal variation using the closest available values for each variable. The hourly cumulative rainfall measurements were not gap-filled in this fashion, but instead, the hourly measurement was applied to the final half-hour of each hour, and the initial half-hour was expressed as 0 mm. All meteorological data and flux measurements were categorized to day-night measurements based on the corresponding photosynthetically available radiation (PAR). PAR values greater than 10 W m$^{-2}$ were determined to be day measurements. Otherwise, the value would be classified as night.
2.5 Footprint Model

We used a footprint model to estimate the land-source locations for the fluxes measured by the eddy-covariance tower. The footprint model is based on Morin et al., (2014b), an expansion of the 2-D model by Detto et al., (2006), which is built upon the 1-D model created by Hsieh et al., (2000). The model traces the probability that a parcel of air measured by the eddy-covariance tower derived from any point in the wetland using wind speed, wind direction, boundary-layer stability, and turbulence data. We overlaid the footprint model with the map of NDVI measurements to calculate a NDVI footprint-weighted total ($\text{NDVI}_{fwt}$), using a pixel resolution of one m$^2$ for each map for each 30-minute interval. The $\text{NDVI}_{fwt}$ is the integrated average NDVI value for each half-hour within the footprint contour bounds.

2.6 Modeling and Gap-filling of Fluxes

Following methods described in Morin et al., (2014a), artificial neural network (ANN) models were utilized to determine the empirical models for $\text{CH}_4$, GPP, and $R_e$ as a function of climatological variables (e.g., meteorological data and $\text{NDVI}_{fwt}$) and to gap-fill the flux measurements. We used a forward-stepwise linear regression model, evaluated with the Akaike Information Criterion (AIC) - to determine the climatological variables that were included in the final ANN models. The variables were only included in the ANN model if they lowered the AIC score of the linear stepwise model. All meteorological data ($T_{\text{Air}}$, VPD, netRad, $P_a$, PPT$_T$, wind$_{speed}$, and wind$_{dir}$), $u^*$, heat flux (LE), and the $\text{NDVI}_{fwt}$ were evaluated for each of the flux measurements. If a variable was selected by more than half of the forward-stepwise linear
regression models for a carbon flux, then we directly compared the variable against the carbon flux using pairwise linear regression.

The CO₂ (NEE) flux was partitioned into GPP and Rₑ. The nighttime NEE was used as the observed Rₑ values since no photosynthetic activity occurs then. We used an ANN to gap-fill the Rₑ for all missing values, including through the daytime (when no observations existed). The modeled Rₑ was subtracted from the NEE to calculate the GPP. The missing daytime GPP values were gap-filled using the ANN model. As defined in Rey-Sanchez et al., (2018), the ANN ran through 1000 iterations, and for each iteration, ANN chose an appropriate model if the model produced an $r^2 > 0.47$, $r^2 > 0.3$, and $r^2 > 0.7$ for Rₑ, CH₄, and GPP respectively. If the $r^2$ threshold was not met after 5000 attempts, ANN would accept a model with a $r^2$ greater than the mean of all $r^2 +0.1$. The final model was chosen based on an average of the top 10% iterations.

2.7 Lag Response

We also used the Granger causality test (G-causality) (Granger, 1969), to determine if the precipitation and atmospheric temperature time series were statistically significant predictors for the ecosystem’s carbon exchange (CH₄, GPP, Rₑ). We used the G-causality package 2020 in MATLAB (version R2018a, MathWorks, Natick, MA). The package created two modeled time series of each flux: (1) Using an auto-regression function, and (2) Combining the autoregressive function with prior values for the variable tested for causation. We compared each model to the true fluxes, and then the BIC was calculated. When the multivariate model’s (model 2) Bayesian Information Criteria (BIC) value significantly outperformed the univariate case (model 1), the driver was said to have a causal effect on the flux. The model’s maximum time lag response for
the fluxes and drivers was set to 24 hours for the hour lag response to eliminate spurious correlation. If no lag response was determined on an hourly scale, the lag response of the carbon fluxes from $T_{\text{Air}}$ and PPT events were assessed on a daily timescale with a maximum time lag response of 10 days. The causality of the drivers was evaluated based on hourly and daily intervals.
Chapter 3: Results and Discussion

3.1 Meteorological Conditions

Monthly rainfall ranged from 80 mm in July to 176 mm in October (Table 1), with the total precipitation during the observation period was 495.3 mm. The predominant wind\textsubscript{dir} was west south-west, with an average wind\textsubscript{speed} of 0.95 m/s (Figure 3). The stability of the wind\textsubscript{speed} and wind\textsubscript{dir} can be attributed to the wetland’s location on top of SSB 14 (elevation 140 m) because the wind\textsubscript{speed} and wind\textsubscript{dir} is less likely to be distorted by ground surface shear stresses.

Table 1. Monthly and seasonal averages for the climatological variables (air temperature (T\textsubscript{Air}), precipitation total (PPT\textsubscript{T}), vapor pressure deficit (VPD), net radiation (netRad), friction velocity (u*), normalized difference vegetation index footprint weighted total (NDVI\textsubscript{fwt}), wind speed (wind\textsubscript{speed}), wind direction (wind\textsubscript{dir}), atmospheric pressure (P\textsubscript{a}), and latent heat flux (LE)) used in the stepwise regression and neural network. The climatological variables were measured, averaged, and recorded on an hourly basis, while the eddy-covariance variables were measured, averaged, and recorded in 30-minute intervals. Therefore, the n values, listed in parentheses, for the climatological data is nearly half of the eddy covariance variables. PPT\textsubscript{T} values are expressed as a summation for each timeframe. Wind\textsubscript{dir} values are expressed as the resultant vector average Wind\textsubscript{dir}.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Jul. value (n)</th>
<th>Aug. value (n)</th>
<th>Sept. value (n)</th>
<th>Oct. value (n)</th>
<th>Nov. value (n)</th>
<th>Seasonal value (n)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T\textsubscript{Air} °C</td>
<td>23.2 (744)</td>
<td>20.01 (744)</td>
<td>17.3 (720)</td>
<td>10.5 (741)</td>
<td>1.5 (312)</td>
<td>16.4 (3384)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPT\textsubscript{T} mm</td>
<td>79.8 (744)</td>
<td>133 (744)</td>
<td>93.7 (720)</td>
<td>176 (741)</td>
<td>11.4 (312)</td>
<td>495 (3384)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VPD hPa</td>
<td>818 (1358)</td>
<td>719 (1288)</td>
<td>703 (1125)</td>
<td>490 (1123)</td>
<td>367 (469)</td>
<td>669 (1260)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NetRad W/m\textsuperscript{2}</td>
<td>138 (744)</td>
<td>113 (744)</td>
<td>85.1 (720)</td>
<td>27.6 (741)</td>
<td>4.64 (312)</td>
<td>85.7 (3387)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>u* m/s</td>
<td>0.170 (1443)</td>
<td>0.169 (1471)</td>
<td>0.186 (1361)</td>
<td>0.224 (1463)</td>
<td>0.273 (485)</td>
<td>0.194 (393)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NDVI\textsubscript{fwt} unitless</td>
<td>0.74 (1329)</td>
<td>0.74 (1279)</td>
<td>0.72 (1120)</td>
<td>0.75 (1133)</td>
<td>0.73 (442)</td>
<td>0.75 (1312)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wind\textsubscript{speed} m/s</td>
<td>0.802 (1443)</td>
<td>0.79 (1471)</td>
<td>0.84 (1361)</td>
<td>1.16 (1463)</td>
<td>1.52 (485)</td>
<td>0.95 (393)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wind\textsubscript{dir} deg</td>
<td>269 (1444)</td>
<td>268 (1471)</td>
<td>254 (1361)</td>
<td>241 (1463)</td>
<td>263 (485)</td>
<td>261 (392)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P\textsubscript{a} atm</td>
<td>0.99 (744)</td>
<td>0.99 (744)</td>
<td>0.99 (720)</td>
<td>0.99 (744)</td>
<td>0.99 (312)</td>
<td>0.99 (3384)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LE W/m\textsuperscript{2}</td>
<td>92.97 (1338)</td>
<td>75.72 (1279)</td>
<td>60.65 (1116)</td>
<td>29.54 (1107)</td>
<td>17.60 (446)</td>
<td>63.58 (1331)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 3. The direction (degrees) frequency and wind speed (m/s) of the 30-minute averaged observations from CSAT3B from June 27-November 11, 2019. The length of each “spoke” around the rings of the wind rose indicate the frequency (number of half-hour measurements) the wind blew in each direction and the color represents the speed. The primary wind direction (wind_dir) is west south-west and the average wind speed (wind_speed) is 0.95 m/s.

The time series represented in Figure 4a, Figure 5a, and Figure 6a, show the seasonal decrease in T_Air, net_Rad, and LE. The average T_Air, net_Rad, and LE ranged from 23°C – 1.5°C, 138 W/m² – 4.64 W/m², and 93 W/m² – 17.6 W/m², from July to November. The net_Rad observations were negative during the nighttime when there is no solar radiation and the net_Rad is dominated by the outgoing terrestrial longwave flux. The T_Air observations on October 1, 2019 (maximum of
29.5.6°C) were outside the whisker boundaries (90\textsuperscript{th} percentile) and were determined to be outliers for the month. The T\textsubscript{Air} variation, represented as the box portion (25\textsuperscript{th} and 75\textsuperscript{th} percentile) of the boxplot was constant, Figure 4b, while the variation of the net\textsubscript{Rad} and LE decreased through the season, Figure 5b and Figure 6b. The mean VPD and P\textsubscript{a} were 669 hPa and 0.99 atm, respectively.
Figure 4. (a) Air temperature ($T_{\text{Air}}$) timeseries (one-hour intervals) from July 27 - November 11 2019. (b) Monthly $T_{\text{Air}}$ variation expressed in a box and whisker plot. The bottom and top edges of the box plot indicate the 25th to 75th percentiles and the central mark (bullseye symbol) indicates the median. Each outlier (circle) represents an one-hour interval outside the 10th and 90th percentiles whisker boundaries.
Figure 5. (a) Net radiation ($\text{net}_{\text{Rad}}$) timeseries (one-hour intervals) from July 27 - November 11 2019. (b) Monthly $\text{net}_{\text{Rad}}$ variation expressed in a box and whisker plot. The bottom and top edges of the box plot indicate the 25th to 75th percentiles and the central mark (bullseye symbol) indicates the median. Each outlier (circle) represents an one-hour interval outside the 10th and 90th percentiles whisker boundaries.
Figure 6. (a) Latent heat flux (LE) timeseries (30-minute intervals) from July 27 – November 11, 2019. (b) Monthly LE variation expressed in a box and whisker plot. The bottom and top edges of the box plot indicate the 25th to 75th percentiles and the central mark (bullseye symbol) indicates the median. Each outlier (circle) represents a 30-minute interval outside the 10th and 90th percentiles whisker boundaries.
3.2 Ecosystem Carbon Exchange

3.2.1 Methane

From June 27, 2019 to November 11, 2019, we measured CH$_4$ fluxes for 5,471 of a possible 6,768 half-hours. The neural network gap-filled the remaining 1,297 samples of the CH$_4$ flux (see Figure 7 for final modeled time-series). CH$_4$ fluxes ranged from -0.18 μmol·m$^{-2}$·s$^{-1}$ to 0.22 μmol·m$^{-2}$·s$^{-1}$ (both extrema occurring in September) with a mean flux of 0.002 μmol·m$^{-2}$·s$^{-1}$ for the observational period. The mean CH$_4$ fluxes gradually decreased throughout the observational study, except for August. August’s mean flux was lower than expected for the decreasing trend but within the range of an acceptable mean flux. Since the mean flux does not account for winter months (which typically have low magnitude CH$_4$ emissions), we expect the annual mean flux to be lower than what was measured for the observational period. Seasonal emissions differ among ecosystem types (Ortiz-Llorente and Alvarez-Cobelas, 2012). The Solvay CH$_4$ fluxes are lower in magnitude than those reported for many freshwater systems but are comparable to observed in brackish and saltwater wetland systems (Table 2).
Figure 7. Overall modeled CH₄ fluxes from June 27 – November 11, 2019. The modeled CH₄ fluxes shows the best model for filling in the despiked CH₄ fluxes using the neural network.

Table 2. CH₄ fluxes from ranging ecosystems. CH₄ fluxes were captured using the eddy covariance (EC) technique or flux chambers (FC).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Wetland Type</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Timeframe</th>
<th>Technique</th>
<th>Mean CH₄ (μmol·m⁻²·s⁻¹)</th>
<th>Citation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Solvay inland salt marsh</td>
<td>Camillus, NY</td>
<td>Jul. – Nov., 2019</td>
<td>EC</td>
<td>-0.18 – 0.222</td>
<td>This study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freshwater marsh</td>
<td>Boutte, LA</td>
<td>Annual, 1992-1994</td>
<td>FC</td>
<td>0.035 – 0.65</td>
<td>Alford et al., 1997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freshwater estuarine marsh</td>
<td>Lake Erie, OH</td>
<td>Jun. – Oct., 2016 &amp; Apr. – Oct., 2016</td>
<td>EC</td>
<td>0.03 – 1.6</td>
<td>Rey-Sanchez et al., 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tidal freshwater marsh</td>
<td>Waccamaw, SC</td>
<td>May 2008 to Jan. 2010</td>
<td>FC</td>
<td>0.28 – 0.83</td>
<td>Neubauer, 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temperate Salt Marsh</td>
<td>Ribble, North-west England</td>
<td>Sept. 2010 – Aug. 2011</td>
<td>FC</td>
<td>0.00017-0.022</td>
<td>Ford et al., 2012</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.2.1.1 Methane Regression Model

The forward stepwise regression model trained on 1,297 CH₄ flux samples. We used only half-hours where there were valid measurements for all potential empirical drivers and the CH₄ fluxes. The model determined different relationships between climatological variables and the carbon fluxes for each month and the season; however, some general season trends emerged (Table 3). For each timeframe, the selected variables were included in the final ANN model. Ultimately, the r² for the seasonal CH₄ flux model improved from 0.23 using the forward stepwise regression to 0.27 using the ANN model.

Table 3. Monthly and seasonal CH₄ fluxes and climatological variables (air temperature (T_air), total precipitation (PPT_T), vapor pressure deficit (VPD), net radiation (net_Rad), friction velocity (u*), normalized vegetation difference index (NDVI_fwt), wind speed (wind_speed), wind direction (wind_dir), atmospheric pressure (P_a), and latent heat flux (LE)). The statistical relationship between the CH₄ fluxes and the climatological variables were determined through stepwise regression and were included in the neural network to determine the represented final modeled fluxes for each timeframe. The model’s stepwise regression order is the number listed in each of the columns.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Jul</th>
<th>Aug</th>
<th>Sept</th>
<th>Oct</th>
<th>Nov</th>
<th>Seasonal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>n</td>
<td>417</td>
<td>396</td>
<td>368</td>
<td>352</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>1734</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>μmol·m⁻²·s⁻¹</td>
<td>0.0036</td>
<td>0.0021</td>
<td>0.0035</td>
<td>0.0006</td>
<td>0.0003</td>
<td>0.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gC·m⁻²·d⁻¹</td>
<td>0.004</td>
<td>0.002</td>
<td>0.004</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gC·m⁻²</td>
<td>0.114</td>
<td>0.067</td>
<td>0.109</td>
<td>0.019</td>
<td>0.004</td>
<td>0.328</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T_air</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPT_T</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VPD</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>net_Rad</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>u*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NDVI_fwt</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wind_speed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wind_dir</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P_a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LE</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stepwise r²</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>0.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neural Network r²</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>0.27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
T_{Air}, \text{netRad}, P_a, \text{and LE} were identified to have a significant explanatory effect for more than half of the monthly models while also being chosen for use in the final seasonal timeframe model. We further tested these particular variables directly against CH₄ using a pairwise regression to explore the underlying reasons behind the linkage (Figure 8). Other variables, including wind_{dir}, wind_{speed}, VPD, u^*, and PPT_T were rejected from the final ANN model for the seasonal fluxes since their addition did not significantly improve the model. VPD and wind_{speed} were selected to have a significant explanatory effect for three of the months, where PPT_T and u^* were only chosen to affect November.

Figure 8. Pairwise relationships between the CH₄ fluxes and a) air temperature (T_{Air}), b) net radiation (\text{netRad}), c) atmospheric pressure (P_a), and d) latent heat flux (LE). The stepwise regression models (Table 3) selected T_{Air}, \text{netRad}, P_a, \text{and LE} to have a significant explanatory effect for more than half of the monthly and seasonal models.
LE and CH₄ fluxes were significantly correlated ($r^2 = 0.23$, $p<0.001$), and LE was the single most powerful statistical associate of CH₄ fluxes. LE was also the only variable to be selected for every monthly and seasonal stepwise regression model. This is comparable to the findings of Morin et al., (2014a), which demonstrated that LE was the strongest statistical associate for CH₄ fluxes during the daytime. Morin et al., (2014a) hypothesized that this relationship is a product of (1) an increase of the volatilization of methane and (2) the relationship between the stomatal conductance of water vapor and the methane transport through plant tissue. The pairwise regression (Figure 8d) indicates a positive relationship between LE and CH₄ fluxes, which is consistent with those findings. However, there was no standing water present at Solvay, which may indicate a stronger linkage with vegetative transmission since CH₄ transport from volatilization requires standing water.

Similar to LE, the pairwise relationship of netRad and CH₄ fluxes was positive ($r^2 = 0.18$, $p<0.001$) (Figure 8b). Incoming radiation and LE drive many of the same mechanisms. Increased netRad increases photosynthesis of the vegetation, resulting in the release of water vapor through the stomata pore, therefore, increasing LE (Ball et al., 1987). The stepwise regression identified netRad as a statistical associate for every month and for the season, except for August, which had anomalously low CH₄ fluxes that did not follow the seasonal trend (Table 3). The netRad in August was in par with the decreasing seasonal trend (Figure 8b). For October and November, netRad was the first variable added to the model. These were the only months that LE was not the first variable added to the stepwise regression models for CH₄, further showing the connection between LE and netRad at the site.
Our findings also found that $T_{\text{Air}}$ had a significant explanatory effect on the $\text{CH}_4$ emissions, consistent with other studies (Bloom et al., 2010; Bohn et al., 2007; Chu et al., 2014; Rey-Sanchez et al., 2018). $T_{\text{Soil}}$ is commonly cited as an environmental driver of $\text{CH}_4$ fluxes in wetlands due to its impact on microbial processes. Increased $T_{\text{Soil}}$ promotes an increase in competing metabolic interactions between anaerobic methanogenesis ($\text{CH}_4$ production) and aerobic methanotrophy ($\text{CH}_4$ consumption). The model selected $T_{\text{Air}}$ to have a significant explanatory effect for July, September, and October and the season. It was consistently the 3$^{\text{rd}}$ variable added to the stepwise models. The linear regression shown in Figure 8a resulted in a slightly positive pairwise relationship with $\text{CH}_4$ flux ($r^2 = 0.02$, $p < 0.001$) for the season.

Interestingly, $P_a$ was added as the 2$^{\text{nd}}$ variable to the stepwise regression models for the season and for August and September, and the 8$^{\text{th}}$ variable added to the model for November. The pairwise linear regression between $\text{CH}_4$ fluxes and $P_a$ (Figure 8c) showed a slight positive relationship ($r^2 = 0.02$, $p < 0.001$). There is one reported hypothesis that $P_a$ has a significant effect on $\text{CH}_4$ emissions through $\text{CH}_4$ transport; falling pressure destabilizes bubbles and transports $\text{CH}_4$ by increasing $\text{CH}_4$ ebullition (Tokida et al., 2007). However, this relationship requires standing water and would have resulted in a negative correlation. Therefore, we hypothesize that the primary interaction effects between the ecological drivers may be the primary way that $P_a$ interacts with $\text{CH}_4$ at our site.

3.2.2 Carbon Dioxide

The NEE of CO$_2$, as measured by the eddy-covariance tower, is the combination of two distinct processes: $R_e$ and GPP. Here, we have 3,609 of a possible 6,768 valid half-hour measurements of
NEE. The remaining 3,159 values were gap-filled by the neural network (gap-filled time series shown in Figure 9). The NEE fluxes ranged during the season from -30.93 \( \mu \text{mol} \cdot \text{m}^{-2} \cdot \text{s}^{-1} \) (in July) to 28.95 \( \mu \text{mol} \cdot \text{m}^{-2} \cdot \text{s}^{-1} \) (in August) with a mean flux of 0.1954 \( \mu \text{mol} \cdot \text{m}^{-2} \cdot \text{s}^{-1} \) for the observational period (Table 4). This indicated that the CO\(_2\) behavior of the site was a slight carbon source, which is comparable to the findings of Lu et al., (2017), who found that the average inland wetland was typically small CO\(_2\) sinks or was nearly CO\(_2\) neutral. This is consistent with the other reported NEE fluxes from freshwater wetlands sites (Table 5).

Figure 9. Final modeled NEE split into GPP (Orange) and \( R_e \) (Black) fluxes from June 27 – November 11, 2019. The red line indicates zero flux, for reference.
Table 4. Final modeled monthly and seasonal NEE (GPP + \( R_e \)) fluxes from the neural network. The \( n \) values are based on the rows included in the stepwise regression.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Jul</th>
<th>Aug</th>
<th>Sept</th>
<th>Oct</th>
<th>Nov</th>
<th>Seasonal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>( n )</td>
<td>406</td>
<td>381</td>
<td>373</td>
<td>361</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>1711</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \mu mol \cdot m^{-2} \cdot s^{-1} )</td>
<td>-1.25</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>1.83</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>0.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( gC \cdot m^{-2} \cdot d^{-1} )</td>
<td>-1.3</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( gC \cdot m^2 )</td>
<td>-40.2</td>
<td>21.9</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>58.8</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>28.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5. NEE fluxes from ranging ecosystems. NEE fluxes were captured using the eddy covariance (EC) technique or close flux chambers (FC).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Wetland Type</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Technique</th>
<th>NEE (( \mu mol \cdot m^{-2} \cdot s^{-1} ))</th>
<th>Citation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Solvay inland salt marsh</td>
<td>Camillus, NY</td>
<td>Jul. – Nov., 2019</td>
<td>EC</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>This study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freshwater swamp marsh</td>
<td>Southern Finland</td>
<td>Jul. 2004 – Dec. 2005</td>
<td>EC</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>Aurela et al., 2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freshwater marsh</td>
<td>Everglades, FL</td>
<td>Apr. 2008 – Aug., 2009</td>
<td>FC</td>
<td>2.92</td>
<td>Schedlbauer et al., 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tidal salt marsh</td>
<td>Hog Island, VA</td>
<td>Jul. – Aug., 2007</td>
<td>EC</td>
<td>-10</td>
<td>Kathilankal et al., 2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freshwater coastal marsh</td>
<td>Panjin, China</td>
<td>Jan. – Dec., 2005</td>
<td>EC</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>Zhou et al., 2009</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The monthly NEE fluxes indicated the site was a sink (negative flux) for CO\(_2\) in July and a source (positive flux) for CO\(_2\) in the remaining months (Table 4). The variation in the diurnal pattern lessens over the time series, showing high variation during the beginning months and less variation during the end of the observational period (Figure 10). The high diurnal variability during the summer months is due to elevated daytime photosynthesis (i.e. high GPP) and
elevated microbial and autotrophic respiratory processes (i.e. high $R_e$). The mean $R_e$ ($4.07 \mu\text{mol} \cdot \text{m}^{-2} \cdot \text{s}^{-1}$) from the inland salt marsh was higher than the mean GPP uptake ($-3.87 \mu\text{mol} \cdot \text{m}^{-2} \cdot \text{s}^{-1}$), resulting in the site being a slight CO$_2$ source of 28.6 gC·m$^2$ of CO$_2$ throughout the study. The GPP and $R_e$ were consistent with other observational studies (Chu et al., 2014; Hinojo-Hinojo et al., 2016) that reported their GPP and $R_e$ fluxes during the growing season to be 326.7 – 933 gC·m$^2$ and 282.8 – 561 gC·m$^2$, respectively. It is worth noting that the CO$_2$ source behavior of the site is only reflective of the observational period and does not describe the behavior of the site on an annual timescale. We anticipate that the wetland would take in CO$_2$ during the early growing season but would emit CO$_2$ during the winter (Wang et al., 2013). Because of this, the true annual CO$_2$ flux behavior cannot be determined here, but our results suggest that the site is likely a slight source of CO$_2$ to the atmosphere.
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Figure 10. Final modeled NEE fluxes from June 27 – November 11, 2019. The 1-day moving average shows the shift in the carbon behavior from a carbon sink in July to a slight carbon source in September.
3.2.2.1 Gross Primary Production Regression Model

We used 1,114 GPP flux samples in the forward-stepwise regression model to determine the relationship between the climatological variables and GPP (Table 7). Like CH\textsubscript{4}, we used only half-hours where there were valid measurements for all climatological variables and GPP fluxes. The GPP models showed to have the most statistical associates per timeframe out of the carbon fluxes (CH\textsubscript{4}, GPP, and R\textsubscript{e}), especially for the seasonal timescale where the stepwise regression model selected all but PPT\textsubscript{T} to have a significant explanatory effect on GPP. Over half the monthly and seasonal models selected T\textsubscript{Air}, P\textsubscript{a}, LE, VPD, net\textsubscript{Rad}, and wind\textsubscript{dir} as statistical associates for GPP (Table 6). We used a pairwise regression to test each of these variables against GPP for insight into the underlying cause of the correlation (Figure 11). The pairwise regressions showed the strongest trend between GPP and LE (Figure 11c: $r^2 = 0.66$, p $<$ 0.001), followed by GPP uptake and T\textsubscript{Air} (Figure 11b: $r^2 = 0.26$, p $<$ 0.001), net\textsubscript{Rad} (Figure 11b: $r^2 = 0.26$, p $<$ 0.001), and VPD (Figure 11d: $r^2 = 0.25$, p $<$ 0.001), all of which showed a positive relationship. Also, LE, net\textsubscript{Rad}, and VPD were consistently the 1\textsuperscript{st}, 2\textsuperscript{nd}, and 3\textsuperscript{rd} variables added to the models; the order in which T\textsubscript{Air} was added varied month to month. The strong trends and positive relationships between GPP uptake and LE, VPD, and net\textsubscript{Rad} are consistent with findings of other observational studies which reported that CO\textsubscript{2} uptake was tightly correlated with LE and net\textsubscript{Rad} and the relationship between the climatological variables themselves (Baker et al., 2003; Schäfer et al., 2014). LE itself may not be an actual driver of GPP, but may share the same underlying drivers with GPP, resulting in a strong agreement.
Table 6. Monthly and seasonal GPP fluxes and climatological variables (air temperature ($T_{air}$), total precipitation ($PPT_T$), vapor pressure deficit (VPD), net radiation ($net_{Rad}$), friction velocity ($u^*$), normalized vegetation difference index ($NDVI_{fwt}$), wind speed ($wind_{speed}$), wind direction ($wind_{dir}$), atmospheric pressure ($P_a$), and latent heat flux (LE)). The statistical relationship between the GPP fluxes and the climatological variables were determined through stepwise regression and were included in the neural network to determine the represented final modeled fluxes for each timeframe. The stepwise regression order is expressed by the number listed in each of the columns.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Jul</th>
<th>Aug</th>
<th>Sept</th>
<th>Oct</th>
<th>Nov</th>
<th>Seasonal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$n$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\mu\text{mol} \cdot m^{-2} \cdot s^{-1}$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$gC \cdot m^{-2} \cdot d^{-1}$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$gC \cdot m^{-2}$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$T_{air}$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$PPT_{Total}$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VPD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$net_{Rad}$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$u^*$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$NDVI_{fwt}$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$wind_{speed}$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$wind_{dir}$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$P_a$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$LE$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stepwise $r^2$</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>0.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neural Network $r^2$</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>0.82</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 11. Pairwise relationships between the GPP fluxes and a) air temperature ($T_{\text{Air}}$), b) net radiation ($\text{netRad}$), c) latent heat flux (LE), d) vapor pressure deficit (VPD), and e) atmospheric pressure ($P_a$). The stepwise regression models (Table 6) selected $T_{\text{Air}}$, $\text{netRad}$, LE, VPD, and $P_a$ to have a significant explanatory effect for more than half of the monthly and seasonal models.

NetRad is the primary driver of photosynthesis (Frolking et al., 1998; Lafleur et al., 2001; Lund et al., 2009). During periods of high netRad, there is high light availability which promotes photosynthesis in well-watered plants, causing low CO$_2$ concentrations within the plant, and therefore, maximizing the stomatal conductance rate. Stomatal conductance is the rate at which CO$_2$ enters (GPP) uptake, and water vapor (LE) exits through the stomate pores on the leaves. This is confirmed in our findings, where Figure 11b shows a positive relationship with daytime GPP uptake.

Stomata conductance regulates GPP and LE (Ball et al., 1987) through transpiration by the plant leaves and explains (1) the strong positive relationship that we found between GPP uptake and LE in the pairwise regression (Figure 11c) and (2) the selection of LE as the 1$^{\text{st}}$ variable to be added to the stepwise regression models (Table 6). GPP is mechanistically linked to LE, via
transpiration, since a plant that absorbs lots of carbon through photosynthesis will also transpire a lot. Because of this, we would expect that both variables would be driven by the same climatological variables (e.g., VPD and netRad) and would naturally be correlated, although neither was directly responsible for the other. Our stepwise model behaved as would be expected for this behavior, selecting VPD as the third variable, following LE and netRad, and showed a positive effect on GPP uptake in Figure 11d. VPD drives the stomata conductance (Penman, 1948) by providing the impetus for water diffusion across the stomate pore. However, many plants will reduce stomatal conductance during periods of high VPD between the leaf and the atmosphere to minimize water loss and to retain the hydration of the plant cells. The exact effect that VPD imposes on LE is dependent on the state as well as the change in VPD. If the initial VPD is low and increases, then the LE will also increase since the positive effect of VPD outweighs the negative effect. If the VPD is initially high and increases further, though, then the LE will decrease since the negative effect will outweigh the positive effect. These findings show that the relationships between netRad, VPD, and LE are not static, but instead, the impact of one variable depends on the variations of the other climatological variables.

TAir also had a positive correlation with daytime GPP uptake \( (r^2 = 0.37, \ p < 0.001) \), Figure 11a, which is expected since TAIR increases during the springtime and through the growing season, similar to netRad, so the two variables would be correlated absent direct driving behavior. However, vegetation vigor is also linked to TAIR (Xiao and Moody, 2005), indicating possible causation and not merely a correlation. The peak magnitude of GPP occurred on July 16th (-35.31 \( \mu \text{mol} \cdot \text{m}^{-2} \cdot \text{s}^{-1} \)), which is also the date with the highest recorded hourly temp (32.°C) during the observational period. The mean TAIR on July 16, 2019 was 4.1°C cooler than the daily high TAIR.
of 27.5°C that occurred on July 20, 2019. Surprisingly, the highest daily mean GPP (-8.22 μmol·m⁻²·s⁻¹) occurred on July 20th, supporting $T_{\text{Air}}$’s negative relationship with GPP. Hofstra and Hesketh et al., (1969) reported that cool-climate species had the widest apertures around 27 to 30°C. Stomata are not expected to close down unless $T_{\text{Air}}$ reaches 36°C under water-stressed conditions, which was never the case during the observational study. During colder $T_{\text{Air}}$ periods with lower $\text{net}_{\text{Rad}}$, the vegetation growth and GPP uptake potential decrease.

The stepwise regression also identified $P_a$ and $\text{wind}_{\text{dir}}$ to be other statistical associates for GPP. Shifts in $P_a$ are not reported in the literature to impact GPP, but it is related to VPD and $T_{\text{Air}}$. $P_a$ is determined by the weight of the air above where the measurement was taken (Priestley, 1946), and the weight of the air varies with inversely with $T_{\text{Air}}$. Typically, warm air rises and causes a decrease in surface pressure. Localized precipitation events or increased evaporation can also cause changes in $P_a$. $P_a$ decreases with precipitation but increases with evaporation. Therefore, the stepwise regression may be using $P_a$ as a proxy variable for a collection of other variables rather than suggesting that it is itself a direct driver of GPP.

3.2.2.2 Ecosystem Respiration Regression Model

For $R_e$, the model identified $T_{\text{Air}}$, LE, and $\text{NDVI}_{\text{fwt}}$ to have a significant explanatory effect for more than half of the monthly and seasonal timeframes (Table 7). We tested each of these variables against $R_e$ using pairwise regressions to determine the significance of the trends (Figure 12). The stepwise model consistently added $T_{\text{Air}}$ into the model as the first variable for all timeframes and $T_{\text{Air}}$ was the only variable tested in pairwise regression to show a trend (Figure
12a). The positive relationship between $T_{\text{Air}}$ and $R_e$, indicated that increased $T_{\text{Air}}$ resulted in increased $R_e$ at the site, consistent with the findings of Niu et al., (2012); Raich and Schlesinger et al., (1992); Schäfer et al., (2014); Singh and Gupta et al., (1977). Even though the positive trend between $R_e$ and $T_{\text{Air}}$ is well documented, there is no agreement on the exact form of the relationship (e.g., people hypothesize the linkage may be a linear relationship (Froment, 1972; Witkamp, 1966), Q10 exponential relationship (Hoff, 1898), or an exponential dependence (Raich and Schlesinger, 1992)). Lloyd and Taylor et al., (1994) compared the methods and found that an Arrhenius type equation where the effective activation energy for $R_e$ varies inversely with $T_{\text{Air}}$ accurately represents the relationship between $R_e$ and $T_{\text{Air}}$. 
Table 7. Monthly and seasonal $R_e$ fluxes and climatological variables (air temperature ($T_{air}$), total precipitation (PPT), vapor pressure deficit (VPD), net radiation (netRad), friction velocity ($u^*$), normalized vegetation difference index (NDVI$_{fwt}$), wind speed (windspeed), wind direction (winddir), atmospheric pressure ($P_{avg}$), and latent heat flux (LE)). The statistical relationship between the $R_e$ fluxes and the climatological variables were determined through stepwise regression and were included in the neural network to determine the represented final modeled fluxes for each timeframe. The stepwise regression order is expressed by the number listed in each of the columns.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Jul</th>
<th>Aug</th>
<th>Sept</th>
<th>Oct</th>
<th>Nov</th>
<th>Seasonal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$n$</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>597</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\mu$mol·m$^{-2}$·s$^{-1}$</td>
<td>6.41</td>
<td>6.49</td>
<td>4.43</td>
<td>3.78</td>
<td>1.35</td>
<td>4.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gC·m$^{-2}$·d$^{-1}$</td>
<td>6.64</td>
<td>6.73</td>
<td>4.59</td>
<td>3.92</td>
<td>1.40</td>
<td>4.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gC·m$^{-2}$</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>209</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>18.17</td>
<td>595</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$T_{air}$</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPT$_{Total}$</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VPD</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>netRad</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$u^*$</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NDVI$_{fwt}$</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>windspeed</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>winddir</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$P_{avg}$</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LE</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stepwise $r^2$</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>0.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neural Network $r^2$</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>0.43</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 12. Pairwise relationships between the $R_c$ fluxes and a) air temperature ($T_{Air}$), b) latent heat flux ($LE$), and c) normalized difference vegetation index footprint weighted total ($NDVI_{fwt}$). The stepwise regression models (Table 7) selected $T_{Air}$, $LE$, and $NDVI_{fwt}$ to have a significant explanatory effect for more than half of the monthly and seasonal models.

The uncertainty between $R_c$ and $T_{Air}$ is due to the complexity of $R_c$. $R_c$ is made up of a variety of autotrophic ($R_a$) and heterotrophic ($R_h$) processes, and each component reacts differently to the changes in the ecological conditions (Bahn et al., 2010; Davidson and Janssens, 2006; Hopkins et al., 2013; Teskey et al., 2007; Trumbore, 2006). $R_a$ is dependent on the carbon input from the canopy, while $R_h$ is moderated by the carbon storage and nutrient content within the soil (Binkley et al., 2006). $R_a$ contributes to a greater portion of ecosystem respiration in high-productivity sites than in low-productivity sites (Bond-Lamberty et al., 2004).

The NDVI has been proven to be a valuable tool to determine the productivity of sites as a proxy for leaf area index (Tucker, 1979), absorbed photosynthetically active radiation (Kumar and
Monteith, 1981), vegetation biomass (Sellers, 1987), $R_e$ (Boelman et al., 2003), and NEE (Goward et al., 1985). The stepwise regression added the NDVI$_{fwt}$ into the model as the fourth variable and showed a slightly positive trend with $R_e$ through pairwise regression (Figure 12c: $r^2 = 0.003$, $p < 0.001$). Boelman et al., 2003 suggested that the positive correlation between NDVI and $R_e$ could be attributed to the following relationships: (1) NDVI is a proxy for photosynthesis and a portion of photosynthesis produced goes to plant maintenance and growth respiration (Waring et al., 1998). (2) During peak season, the total plant biomass accounts for the majority of $R_e$ (Johnson et al., 2000), and (3) High plant biomass has high litter production and, therefore, more labile carbon substrates for soil microbes. Further NDVI readings and an updated vegetation survey is required to dive into the relationship between NDVI$_{fwt}$ and $R_e$ at the site.

The pairwise regression between LE and $R_e$ showed no discernable trend (Figure 12b: $r^2 = 0.11$, $p < 0.001$). The order in which LE was added to the stepwise regression models for $R_e$ varied month to month (Table 7), ranging from the first variable to be added to the model in October and the fifth variable to be added in July. This may indicate that the stepwise regression was picking up an interaction effect with other climatological variables that are dependent on LE and influence $R_e$, e.g., soil moisture or air and soil temperature.

3.3 Lag Response

We used the Granger Causality test to determine if $T_{air}$ and/or PPT$_T$ were a causal driver of the carbon fluxes (Table 8). The test was essential to avoid an assumption of causation to variables that simply exhibited a strong correlation, which could indicate a linkage via a shared third driver or could indicate pseudo replication due to the natural diurnal cycle of environmental variables.
The hourly lag response models were based on 3360 values, while the daily lag response models (only used in the event that no hourly lag response was detected) were based on 131 values. Similar to Sturtevant et al., (2016), we allowed a maximum lag of 24 hours when testing for hourly lag response, and 10 days when evaluating on a multiday scale. We determined that GPP, \( R_e \), and \( \text{CH}_4 \) fluxes were all driven by \( T_{\text{air}} \), showing a maximal covariance between three (\( R_e \)) to five (\( \text{CH}_4 \)) hours after \( T_{\text{air}} \). The Granger Causality test identified that GPP and \( R_e \) showed a hourly lag response from \( \text{PPT}_T \). \( \text{CH}_4 \) fluxes exhibited a lag response to \( \text{PPT}_T \) on a daily scale (peak at one day) but not an hourly scale.

Table 8. Lag Responses of \( \text{CH}_4 \), GPP, and \( R_e \) caused by total precipitation (\( \text{PPT}_T \)) and \( T_{\text{air}} \) in units of hours or days based on the timeframe.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Caused</th>
<th>Causal</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Timeframe</th>
<th>Lag Response</th>
<th>P-value</th>
<th>Granger-Caused?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>( \text{CH}_4 )</td>
<td>( T_{\text{air}} )</td>
<td>3360</td>
<td>Hourly</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>&lt; 0.001</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>( \text{PPT}_T )</td>
<td>3360</td>
<td>Hourly</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.0840</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>131</td>
<td>Daily</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>&lt; 0.001</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GPP</td>
<td>( T_{\text{air}} )</td>
<td>3360</td>
<td>Hourly</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>&lt; 0.001</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>( \text{PPT}_T )</td>
<td>3360</td>
<td>Hourly</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.0215</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( R_e )</td>
<td>( T_{\text{air}} )</td>
<td>3360</td>
<td>Hourly</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>&lt; 0.001</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>( \text{PPT}_T )</td>
<td>3360</td>
<td>Hourly</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>&lt; 0.001</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.3.1 \( \text{CH}_4 \) lag responses

For \( \text{CH}_4 \), there was a lag response of five hours from \( T_{\text{air}} \), which may be indicative of the time it takes for \( T_{\text{air}} \) to influence the soil temperature (\( T_{\text{soil}} \)). \( T_{\text{soil}} \) is widely supported as a driver of belowground ecosystem processes due to its effects on microbial respiratory processes. Lee et
al., (1978) found a four- to six-hour lag time between T_{soil} and T_{air} at a soil depth of 10 cm and also found that the exact lag time is influenced by topography, soil texture, and soil water content. The five-hour lag response between CH$_4$ and T$_{air}$ found here agrees with that range, strongly suggesting the link is ultimately via the lag response of T$_{air}$ on T$_{soil}$. This is also consistent with Reid et al., (2013) results that showed a lag between air and surface soil temperatures and depth-integrated CH$_4$ pools. Overall, our findings support our stepwise regression model, which identified T$_{air}$ as one of the four climatological variables that showed a significant explanatory effect on the CH$_4$ fluxes, and indicated that CH$_4$ emissions increase with temperature (Figure 8).

The lag response of one day from daily PPT$_T$ events could reflect changes in the water table depth and dissolved oxygen (DO) concentrations caused by PPT$_T$ events. Water table fluctuations are dependent on the inputs (precipitation, surface flow, and groundwater inputs) and outputs (evapotranspiration, surface flow, and groundwater efflux) of the water budget, and are sensitive to environmental and climatic changes (Sollid and Sørbel, 1998). At the Solvay site the soil gravimetric water content approaches 70% of the volumetric soil content at saturation. In some portions of the wetland, there is an impermeable layer of compacted Solvay soil approximately 460 mm below the soil surface (D. Daley, personal communication, March 23, 2020). Therefore, during and after significant precipitation events, we assume PPT$_T$ can be used as a proxy variable for water table depth since we expect nearly instantaneous shifts in the water table depth in response to PPT$_T$ events. Chamberlain et al., (2017) reported that during PPT$_T$ events, the DO concentrations increased to approximately 30 times the background concentrations within the water table and it took one day for the DO concentrations to reduce to
anoxic conditions (<1.0 mg·L⁻¹) after the rainfall event. These findings are consistent with our lag response, indicating the site may take one day for the DO to deplete after PPT_T events and to favor methanogenesis.

3.3.2 CO₂ lag responses

We tested CO₂ fluxes for lag responses by first partitioning NEE into GPP and R_e since each component could hypothetically respond to environmental stimuli in distinct ways. Both exhibited a lag response to temperature with a maximal covariance lag time of four hours (GPP) and three hours (R_e) (Table 8), both with a positive pairwise slope (Figure 11 and Figure 12). R_e had the strongest relationship with T_air out of all the fluxes, as identified by the stepwise regression (Table 7). Like CH₄, the R_e emissions of the site are likely directly driven by T_soil, which is slowly influenced by T_air. Our lag response for GPP from T_air is consistent with Admirall et al., (1976) and Colijn and Van Buurt et al., (1975) who all found that hourly T_air had a significant effect on primary production and growth rates (though the impact of these short-term changes is species dependent (Admiraal, 1977)).

Both carbon fluxes also had a response to PPT_T. R_e and GPP had much faster responses to PPT_T events than CH₄ fluxes, with two- and one-hour responses, respectively. The fast lag response of GPP to PPT_T events is indicative of the water limitation at the site during the growing season. During drought conditions, PPT_T events decrease water stress on vegetation and promote photosynthesis, increasing CO₂ uptake by plants. GPP was the only CO₂ flux that the stepwise regression identified PPT_T to be an ecological driver for any of the months during the observational period, which could be suggestive of the low lag response of one hour. For GPP,
the stepwise regression identified PPT\textsubscript{T} to be a statistical associate in August (7\textsuperscript{th} variable added), September (7\textsuperscript{th} variable added), and November (1\textsuperscript{st} variable added). Since PPT\textsubscript{T} was not selected as a driver for GPP on a seasonal timescale, we cannot determine the relationship using pairwise regression for the observational period. PPT\textsubscript{T} is a semi-discrete variable in that its value is zero except for during precipitation events. All other variables tested in this study were continuous, which may have discouraged the selection of PPT\textsubscript{T} in favor of other variables.

R\textsubscript{e} showed a two-hour lag response from PPT\textsubscript{T}, which could be attributed to an increase in DO concentrations and soil moisture content during PPT events. Rainfall can increase the DO concentrations of the groundwater to approximately 30 times the background concentrations (Chamberlain et al., 2017) and, therefore, increase R\textsubscript{e} with DO consumption. Many studies, Aerts and de Caluwe et al., (1997); Jeong et al., (2018); Meentemeyer et al., (1984), reported that R\textsubscript{e} mainly depends on T\textsubscript{soil} and soil moisture content. R\textsubscript{e} emissions could hypothetically increase in response to both rising and falling water tables. During soil drying events, the cracking of organic colloids can increase the “water-soluble organic substrate” availability (Birch, 1959). During periods of high soil saturation, some soil microbes may experience cell lysis (i.e., breaking down of the cell wall) due to high turgor pressure resulting in the release of an organic substrate which surviving microbes will readily uptake (Kieft, 1987). Jeong et al., (2018) saw R\textsubscript{e} increase immediately after hourly PPT\textsubscript{T} events of 4.6 mm or more for up to two hours after the precipitation ended, and then R\textsubscript{e} returned to normal levels.
3.4 Footprint Model and NDVI footprint weighted total

We determined the tower’s cumulative footprint for day and night for each of the months and for the entire observational period (Figure 13). The footprints for each of the timeframes had little variability and were stable in direction due to consistent wind direction during the observational period (Table 1). The size of the footprint depended on the time of day (daytime versus nighttime) and month. The footprint increased in size throughout the observational period and at night; the smallest occurring during the daytime in July (Figure 13a) and the largest during the nighttime in October (Figure 13d). We attribute the larger footprint during the night time and during the shoulder season to weak turbulent mixing and a stable boundary layer from lower surface temperatures. These atmospheric characteristics also caused some variability in the smoothness of the ovular shaped contour lines (best seen in Figure 13d).
Figure 13. The relative flux contribution for (a) July daytime, (b) July nighttime, (c) October daytime, and (d) October nighttime, overlaying the aerial NDVI values from August 1, 2019. The color legend represents the NDVI readings (ranging from 0.2 to 0.8).

Within the seasonal footprint’s boundaries, the NDVI ranged from 0.23 to 0.8, with a mean value of 0.75 from the August 1, 2019 flyover. The NDVI values were consistent across the site, except for low NDVI values in the north portion of the inland salt marsh, shown in green in Figure 13. The variation of the NDVI values could correspond with the differences in vegetation community composition since the plant communities (alvar grassland, Great Lakes dune, inland
For each measurement period, we also calculated the spatially and temporally integrated NDVI that contributed to the half-hour eddy covariance measurement ($\text{NDVI}_{\text{fwt}}$). The $\text{NDVI}_{\text{fwt}}$ time-series typically fluctuated between 0.7 and 0.8 (unitless) (Figure 14). The trend seemed more defined in the later months, beginning in September, and continuing through November. The $\text{NDVI}_{\text{fwt}}$ is calculated based on the NDVI readings from the August 1st flyover and the 30-minute measurements of wind$_{\text{dir}}$, wind$_{\text{speed}}$, $u^*$, Obukhov atmospheric stability length (L), and crosswind variation ($v'v'$). A time series of these variables were plotted to understand further the trend present in the $\text{NDVI}_{\text{fwt}}$ time series (Figure 15). The wind$_{\text{dir}}$ time series followed a similar pattern as the $\text{NDVI}_{\text{fwt}}$ (Figure 15a), indicating that some of the variation of the $\text{NDVI}_{\text{fwt}}$ time series could be explained by changes in wind$_{\text{dir}}$.

![Figure 14. NDVI$_{\text{fwt}}$ timeseries, based on the NDVI readings from the August 1st, 2019 flyover within the bounds of the seasonal footprint.](image-url)
Figure 15. Timeseries of variables that contributed to the footprint. (a) Radial wind direction, (b) wind speed, (c) friction velocity, (d) Obukhov length, and (e) crosswind variance.

As mentioned in section 3.2.2, the stepwise regression models only selected NDVI\textsubscript{fwt} as a key ecological driver for $R_e$ (Table 7). However, there was no clear relationship determined by the pairwise regression on the half-hour timescale (Figure 12c). Also, we compared each of the carbon fluxes with NDVI\textsubscript{fwt} on a daily scale to control for temporal dissonance since the time of day may have a strong explanatory effect. The pairwise regression on the daily timescale showed a negative relationship between NDVI\textsubscript{fwt} and $R_e$ (Figure 16a: $r^2 = 0.03$, $p = 0.032$), which was surprising since a substantial portion of $R_e$ is attributed to plant biomass respiration, which is itself directly driven by the aboveground biomass, and, thus, to NDVI (Gifford, 2003). However,
other factors, like PAR, PPT, soil moisture content, vegetation type, and $T_{\text{soil}}$ affect both $R_e$ and aboveground production and may overshadow and confound any relationship between NDVI and $R_e$. Our stepwise regression models had only a limit ability to explore the interaction between variables. Still, they may suggest that the negative correlation between $R_e$ and NDVI$_{fwt}$ could be attributed to the effects of other climatological variables based on the conclusions discussed in Huang et al., (2012) and La Puma et al., (2007), e.g., PAR and VPD.
Figure 16. Pairwise relationship between daily averaged NDVI\textsubscript{fwt} and (a) $R_e$, (b) GPP, and (c) CH$_4$. We determined the pairwise regression between the NDVI\textsubscript{fwt} and the carbon fluxes is best on a daily timescale to eliminate the systematic trends at the half-hour timescale related to the diurnal cycle.

NDVI\textsubscript{fwt} was selected by the stepwise regression models to influence the CH$_4$ and GPP fluxes for only some of the months (Table 3 and Table 6), but on a seasonal timescale, the stepwise regression models selected NDVI\textsubscript{fwt} for GPP and CH$_4$ fluxes. On the daily timescale the pairwise regression between CH$_4$ and NDVI\textsubscript{fwt} showed the best relationship out of the carbon fluxes (Figure 16c: $r^2 = 0.14$, $p < 0.001$), followed by GPP (Figure 16c: $r^2 = 0.13$, $p < 0.001$). The pairwise regression for CH$_4$ and NDVI\textsubscript{fwt} showed a negative relationship indicating that areas within the inland salt marsh with lower NDVI values were responsible for an increase in CH$_4$ fluxes. Conversely, GPP showed a positive relationship. The relationship of NDVI\textsubscript{fwt} with the carbon fluxes (GPP, $R_e$, CH$_4$) was the opposite of what was expected, suggesting that the vegetation’s spatial variability of the site may influence the carbon fluxes. Further NDVI\textsubscript{fwt} readings are required to understand the influence of temporal and spatial variability of phenology and the carbon fluxes at the site.
Chapter 4: Conclusion

This study combined three datasets to assess the empirical drivers of the carbon behavior of an inland salt marsh in Camillus, NY. We found that during the observational period the inland salt-marsh acted as a slight carbon source of 38 gC·m², including emissions of 9 gC·m² of CH₄, in CO₂ equivalent, and 29 gC·m² of CO₂. We attribute the site’s small carbon emissions to low CH₄ emissions (mean of 0.0022 µmol·m²·s⁻¹), and slight NEE emissions (mean of 0.20 µmol·m²·s⁻¹). The cumulative GPP uptake of 566 gC·m² nearly offset the cumulative Rₑ emissions of 595 gC·m². During the growing season, the CH₄ behavior of the site is comparable to saltwater systems, and the CO₂ behavior is on par with other inland marshes. Further observation through the winter and spring would be necessary to make a final determination of the full annual carbon behavior.

The major findings of the study are related to the research objectives outlined below:

**Research Objective 1:** Determine temporal changes in the statistical relationships between the carbon fluxes and the climatological variables (air temperature, precipitation, vapor pressure density, net radiation, wind speed, wind direction, atmospheric pressure, heat flux, and low friction velocity) and vegetative distribution (NDVI footprint weighted total (NDVIₚₑₚ)) using an empirical model.

The statistical relationships between the climatological variables and the carbon fluxes changed temporally, however, LE was identified to have a significant explanatory effect for CH₄ and GPP on a monthly and seasonal timescale, while the variation of Rₑ was best
explained by $T_{\text{air}}$. Both $LE$ and $T_{\text{Air}}$ were selected for more than half of the monthly and seasonal stepwise models for all the carbon fluxes, whereas other variables like $\text{netRad}$ and $P_a$ were specific to $CH_4$ and $GPP$ and were likely attributed to their influence on other critical climatological variables such as $LE$. These results further illustrate that the carbon fluxes are highly related to $LE$ and $T_{\text{Air}}$ and the relationship between the climatological variables themselves.

Research Objective 2: Determine the frequency response of the ecosystem's carbon exchange ($CH_4$, $GPP$, $R_e$) to precipitation events and shifts in atmospheric temperature during the growing season.

$CH_4$, $GPP$, and $R_e$ all showed significant lag responses to $T_{\text{air}}$ and $PPT_T$. However, the lag responses of $CH_4$ (5-hours) and $R_e$ (3-hours) from $T_{\text{Air}}$, we attribute to the lag response between $T_{\text{Air}}$ and $T_{\text{Soil}}$ rather than between $T_{\text{Air}}$ and the carbon fluxes themselves. $CH_4$ showed the longest lag response to $PPT_T$ of one-day that we attribute to the time it takes for the increased DO concentrations from $PPT_T$ events to reduce to anoxic conditions, versus $GPP$ and $R_e$, which showed a 1-hour and 2-hour lag response to rain events. The fast reaction from $GPP$ to $PPT_T$ is like an indicator of a water limitation at the site throughout the growing season and an immediate increase in DO within the water table.

Research Objective 3: Evaluate the spatial influence of a heterogeneous plant community from an individual NDVI event on site-level integrated carbon fluxes.
Surprisingly, $R_e$ was the only carbon flux that NDVI$_{fw}$ was identified to have a significant explanatory effect for more than half of the months and the season. The pairwise regression on a daily timescale indicated that land-cover heterogeneity (NDVI$_{fw}$) showed to have a slight positive relationship with GPP, and a negative relationship with CH$_4$ and $R_e$, all of which were the opposite of what we hypothesized. The NDVI values within the footprint contribution had a low variation, values fluctuated between 0.7 and 0.8, with a mean NDVI of 0.75. The low variability of the NDVI$_{fw}$ proposed a limitation for fine-scale analysis, likely contributing to the negative results. Additional NDVI readings are necessary to assess how the heterogeneity of the site influenced carbon behavior.

4.1 Future Direction

This study provides an analysis of the site-specific carbon flux empirical drivers at an inland salt marsh in Camillus, NY. There are many potential steps forward, including:

1) Expand analysis to include a comparison of the carbon fluxes captured at the inland salt marsh during this observational study and the carbon fluxes obtained during the water budget assessment conducted by O’Brien and Gere from April 2011 to December 2011 and April 2012 to May 2013.

2) Expand the observational period through winters to capture the carbon behavior during an annual timescale.

3) Further investigate the relationship between the NDVI values and the carbon fluxes of the site by conducting an additional observational study that includes monthly NDVI
readings, continuous measurement of the carbon fluxes, and a field survey of the present plant communities.

4) Utilize the data from Ameriflux to assess site-specific empirical drivers and to determine common drivers among the sites, including other ecosystems (e.g., forested, or tidal systems).

5) Determine a complete water budget of the inland salt marsh, including the measurement of unsaturated and saturated zones based on PPT\textsubscript{T} events.
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