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Abstract Winter soil respiration at midlatitudes can comprise a substantial portion of annual ecosystem carbon loss. However, winter soil carbon dynamics in these areas, which are often characterized by shallow snow cover, are poorly understood due to infrequent sampling at the soil surface. Our objectives were to continuously measure winter CO₂ flux from soils and the overlying snowpack while also monitoring drivers of winter soil respiration in a humid temperate forest. We show that the relative roles of soil temperature and moisture in driving winter CO₂ flux differed within a single soil-to-snow profile. Surface soil temperatures had a strong, positive influence on CO₂ flux from the snowpack, while soil moisture exerted a negative control on soil CO₂ flux within the soil profile. Rapid fluctuations in snow depth throughout the winter likely created the dynamic soil temperature and moisture conditions that drove divergent patterns in soil respiration at different depths. Such dynamic conditions differ from many previous studies of winter soil microclimate and respiration, where soil temperature and moisture are relatively stable until snowmelt. The differential response of soil respiration to temperature and moisture across depths was also a unique finding as previous work has not simultaneously quantified CO₂ flux from soils and the snowpack. The complex interplay we observed among snow depth, soil temperature, soil moisture, and CO₂ flux suggests that winter soil respiration in areas with shallow seasonal snow cover is more variable than previously understood and may fluctuate considerably in the future given winter climate change.

1. Introduction

Soil respiration during winter can globally contribute 5 to 60% of the total annual carbon dioxide (CO₂) flux from soils, and as much as 90% of carbon (C) fixed during the growing season can be lost during winter [Brooks et al., 2011; Contosta et al., 2011]. Because ~60% of the global land base experiences seasonal snow cover [Zhang et al., 2004], winter flux of CO₂ from soils to the atmosphere plays a significant role in the global C cycle.

While microbial activity can take place at temperatures as low as −39°C due to the presence of liquid water in thin films surrounding soil particles [e.g., Panikov et al., 2006], most winter soil respiration occurs under an insulating snowpack that keeps soil temperatures near freezing and maintains relatively constant soil moisture [Groffman et al., 2006; Aanderud et al., 2013; Wang et al., 2013]. However, seasonal snow cover is projected to decline with climate change due to higher winter temperatures [Hayhoe et al., 2007], resulting in a shallower snowpack and a shorter snow-covered period [Dye, 2002; Déry and Brown, 2007; Lawrence and Slater, 2010]. Some of the largest projections for diminished snow cover occur in midlatitude regions such as the northeastern U.S. [Mudryk et al., 2014]. In this region, both snowfall and the number of snow-covered days have declined over the past 40 years [Burakowski et al., 2008] and are predicted to decrease further in the coming century [Hayhoe et al., 2007]. These changes in snow cover could alter the soil microclimate, modifying soil respiration rates [Groffman et al., 2006; Aanderud et al., 2013; Wang et al., 2013].

Relationships among snowpack, soil microclimate, and winter soil respiration in the northeastern U.S. and similar temperate regions are poorly understood. Most research on winter soil respiration in temperate biomes has consisted of infrequent measurements using chamber-based methods that excavate collars from underneath the snowpack [e.g., DeForest et al., 2006; Contosta et al., 2011], float chambers on top of the snow [e.g., Savage and Davidson, 2001; Groffman et al., 2006], or that use tall chambers that extend from the soil to above the snowpack [e.g., Schindlbacher et al., 2007]. Artifacts associated with these methods...
can overestimate or underestimate winter respiration rates [McDowell et al., 2000; Schindlbacher et al., 2007; Björkman et al., 2010], which in turn can cause errors in annual estimates of soil C losses. In addition, infrequent sampling fails to capture dynamic changes in respiration associated with episodic events such as freeze-thaw [Bubier et al., 2002].

The gradient technique offers an alternative for measuring winter soil CO₂ dynamics. It quantifies CO₂ concentrations at different depths within soil or different heights within the snowpack and uses Fick’s law of diffusion to estimate flux [e.g., Brooks et al., 1997; Billings et al., 1998]. To date, the gradient method of calculating CO₂ flux from the snowpack (F_snow) has largely been applied in high altitude- and/or high-latitude areas characterized by deep and persistent snow cover, with only a handful of these studies making automated measurements of snow CO₂ efflux [Bowling et al., 2009; Liptzin et al., 2009; Seok et al., 2009]. Only recently has the gradient technique been applied for estimating snow CO₂ flux in low-elevation, temperate forest ecosystems [Suzuki et al., 2006; Seok et al., 2014]. While applications of the gradient method for measuring soil respiration are much more widespread than for determining snow CO₂ flux, these studies have occurred either in areas that do not experience snow cover [Tang et al., 2003; Vargas et al., 2010] or during the growing season [Jassal et al., 2005; Rivers-Iregui et al., 2008].

Our objective was to use the gradient technique to continuously quantify winter soil CO₂ dynamics and their abiotic drivers both within the soil profile and through the snowpack. For this investigation, we define F_soil as the production of CO₂ by heterotrophs and autotrophs within the soil profile, F_soil-snow as the release of this CO₂ from the soils into the overlying snow, and F_snow as the release of CO₂ from the snowpack to the atmosphere. We continuously measured these processes using the gradient technique to quantify winter soil CO₂ loss in a humid temperate forest system. Here we present the first automated, simultaneous measurements of soil and snow CO₂ efflux and their environmental controls in snow-covered soils during winter, both for midlatitudes and globally. These measurements are a crucial first step to understanding how rapidly fluctuating environmental conditions—which are likely to become more prevalent with climate change—affect the loss of soil CO₂ during the winter months.

2. Methods

2.1. Site Description and Study Design

Our measurements were made in an ~100 year old, even-aged mixed deciduous forest in Durham, NH (43.11°N, 70.95°W; 23 m above sea level) dominated by red maple (Acer rubrum), red oak (Quercus rubra), and white pine (Pinus strobus). Soils are of the Hollis-Charlton complex (Hollis series: loamy, mixed, active, and mesic Lithic Dystrudepts and Charlton series: coarse-loamy, mixed, active, and mesic Typic Dystrudepts). The depth of the organic horizon is ~4.4 cm and is ~12% organic C. Texture in the upper 10 cm of mineral soil is sandy loam (67% sand, 23% silt, and 10% clay), with an average pH of 4.4 and average organic C of 3%. Mean annual temperature is ~8.5°C, and average winter (December–February) temperature is ~−3.0°C. Mean annual precipitation (including snow water equivalent or SWE) is ~1250 mm [Diamond et al., 2013], while mean total snowfall is 1130 mm [New Hampshire State Climate Office, 2014].

2.2. Carbon Dioxide Sampling System

Carbon dioxide was measured in both the soil profile and the overlying snowpack. Soil CO₂ efflux through the snowpack (F_snow) was estimated based on the diffusion method outlined by Seok et al. [2009]. This method consisted of installing a “snow tower” at the site. The vertical portion of the tower was made from 2.54 cm aluminum square and was 150 cm high. Crossbars consisted of 2.54 cm aluminum angle that were attached to the vertical at 0, 20, 40, 60, 80, 100, 120, and 150 cm. Heights were selected to sample snow CO₂ concentrations at a variety of locations throughout the snowpack, from most concentrated at 0 cm (the snow-soil interface) to least concentrated in the atmosphere.

Each of the crossbars supported a pair of sampling inlets outfitted with 1 μm mesh Acrodisc® polytetrafluoroethylene syringe filters (Pall Life Sciences, Ann Arbor, MI, USA) that kept particulates from entering the sample lines. Sample lines consisted of perfluoroalkoxy Teflon® tubing (Parker Hannifin, Cleveland, OH, USA) with an inner diameter of 3.9 mm and an outer diameter of 6.4 mm. Sample lines were each 10 m in length and had a total volume of 1195 cm³.
Sampling through a pair of inlets was controlled by a Campbell Scientific CR10X Data Logger during the winter of 2013 and a Campbell Scientific CR1000 Data Logger in the winter of 2014 (Campbell Scientific, Logan, UT, USA). A Campbell Scientific SDM-CD16AC relay connected to an array of eight solenoid valves controlled the selection of pairs of inlets for sampling. Sample was transported from the tower to a LI-COR LI-840 CO\textsubscript{2}/H\textsubscript{2}O infrared gas analyzer (LI-COR, Lincoln, NE, USA) using a KNF N86KNDCB minidiaphragm vacuum pump (KNF Neuberger Inc., Trenton, NJ, USA) with a flow rate of 1 L min\textsuperscript{-1}. Because the samples were collected using paired inlets, the effective sampling rate for each inlet was 0.5 L min\textsuperscript{-1} or 500 cm\textsuperscript{3} min\textsuperscript{-1}. Each inlet was sampled for a total of 10 min. This time frame was determined based on Seok et al. [2009] to ensure complete flushing of sample lines before and after sampling as well as transport of interstitial gas to the analyzer during the middle 6 min of the sampling period. Based on Bowling et al. [2009] and Seok et al. [2014], we estimate that our system, with an effective flow rate of 0.5 L min\textsuperscript{-1} over 10 min, sampled a sphere of gas with a 11.6 cm radius around inlets placed 20 cm apart, where the radius was \( r = \frac{3}{4}(V \times \frac{3}{4})/a \) and \( V \) was the volume of the sampled sphere of gas adjusted for a snowpack with an average porosity of 0.695. Planar diffusion would reestablish this gradient in \( t = \frac{x^2}{4D} \) or \( (11.6 \text{ cm})^2/(4 \times 0.0796 \text{ cm}^2 \text{ s}^{-1}) = 423 \text{ s} \) (or 7.05 min) within our 80 min sample cycle, where 0.0796 cm\textsuperscript{2} s\textsuperscript{-1} was the estimated average snow diffusion coefficient over both winters.

Samples were collected sequentially from pairs of inlets, starting at 0 cm height and ending at 150 cm. Carbon dioxide concentrations were measured every 3 s, with average values recorded every 12 s. All eight pairs of inlets were sampled over an 80 min period, making 18 measurement cycles per day. Because CO\textsubscript{2} concentrations did not vary substantially within paired inlets during a measurement cycle, CO\textsubscript{2} values recorded every 12 s during the middle 6 min of sampling were averaged, making eight CO\textsubscript{2} concentrations—one for each paired inlet height—per 80 min sample cycle. These eight CO\textsubscript{2} concentrations were then used for calculating CO\textsubscript{2} flux through the snowpack. There was nearly continuous data collection in the winter of 2013, from 4 January 2013 until snowpack disappearance on 30 March 2013. In 2014, measurements of snow CO\textsubscript{2} concentrations were delayed until 23 January 2014 because of programming issues with the new CR1000 data logger and continued until snowpack disappearance until 4 April with a 5 day data gap in mid-February due to problems with power supply.

Fluxes of CO\textsubscript{2} within the soil \( (F_{\text{soil}}) \) were determined using the method outlined by Tang et al. [2003]. Two soil CO\textsubscript{2} concentration depth profiles were installed at the site and were located ~5 m from the snow tower. Soil CO\textsubscript{2} concentrations were measured continuously with Vaisala GMT 220 series solid state infrared CO\textsubscript{2} transmitters housed within in-soil adaptors (Vaisala Oyj, Helsinki, Finland). Sensors were installed in December 2013 but did not start recording data until 23 January 2014 due to the same programming issues outlined above. The 5 day gap in mid-February also occurred as a result of the same power issues. The CO\textsubscript{2} sensors were installed at two depths, −5 and −15 cm, which were the same depths at which soil temperature and volumetric water content measurements were made (see below; negative numbers for soil depths are used throughout to differentiate from depths in the snowpack). As with snow CO\textsubscript{2}, soil CO\textsubscript{2} concentrations were measured every 3 s and written every 12 s to the data logger. Because soil CO\textsubscript{2} concentrations did not change substantially over subhourly time periods, data were then averaged over the entire 80 min snow tower measurement period. This resulted in 18 calculations of \( F_{\text{soil}} \) per depth increment and soil profile gradient per day. Calculations of \( F_{\text{soil-snow}} \) were derived from measurements of CO\textsubscript{2} both in the snowpack and the soil (see below).

### 2.3. Snowpack, Soil, and Environmental Measurements

Soils measurements for calculating \( F_{\text{soil}} \) included estimating soil porosity using soil bulk density and soil organic matter (SOM) data, which were determined previously at an ongoing research plot located ~120 m from the site (A. Contosta unpublished data). Average bulk density and SOM between −5 and −20 cm were 0.80 g cm\textsuperscript{-3} and 4.72%, respectively. These were the values used to represent bulk density and SOM for the −5 to −15 cm depth increment over which CO\textsubscript{2} concentrations were measured and soil CO\textsubscript{2} production \( (F_{\text{soil}}) \) was calculated.

Additional environmental measurements for calculating \( F_{\text{soil}} \) and understanding drivers of CO\textsubscript{2} flux consisted of air temperature, ambient air pressure, soil temperature, and soil volumetric water content \( (\theta) \) measured at the site. Air temperature was recorded with a Campbell Scientific 107-L30 Temperature Probe used in tandem...
with a Campbell Scientific 41303-5A Radiation Shield to prevent solar radiation loading. Ambient air pressure was recorded by the LI-COR LI-840 every 3 s, written to the data logger every 12 s, and correlated well with measurements of air pressure made at Thompson Farm National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration United States Climate Reference Network site located ~300 m away in a nearby pasture [Diamond et al., 2013]. Soil temperature and moisture were measured at −5 cm with an ECH2O Soil Moisture Sensor STM (Decagon Devices Inc., Pullman, WA, USA). At −15 and −30 cm, temperature and moisture were recorded with a Campbell Scientific CS655-L 12 cm Soil Water Content Reflectometer. Both the near-surface and deeper soil moisture probes use time domain reflectometry (TDR) technology and are accurate at estimating liquid water content even in partially frozen soils [Spaans and Baker, 1996]. However, TDR measurements cannot detect soil ice content, which likely occurred when soil temperatures went below 0°C. We evaluated the phase change between liquid water and ice by modeling the relationship between soil temperature and soil moisture probes use time domain reflectometry (TDR) technology and are accurate at estimating liquid water content even in partially frozen soils [Spaans and Baker, 1996]. However, TDR measurements cannot detect soil ice content, which likely occurred when soil temperatures went below 0°C. We evaluated the phase change between liquid water and ice by modeling the relationship between soil temperature and soil moisture at the threshold of 0°C using the logistic model:

\[ \theta_i = \theta_0 + \frac{\theta_1}{1 + e^{\beta_2 + \beta_3 \times T_{\text{soil}}}} \]  

(1)

where \( \theta_i \) is the volumetric water content; \( T_{\text{soil}} \) is the soil temperature at depth \( i \); and \( \theta_0 \), \( \theta_1 \), \( \beta_2 \), and \( \beta_3 \) are the fitted parameters [Aanderud et al., 2013]. We wrote a self-starting function in R 3.0.1 [R Core Team, 2015] to fit the curve and then obtained parameter estimates and significance values using nonlinear least squares estimation (nls). The goodness of fit for the nonlinear model (i.e., whole model \( r^2 \)) was determined by modeling measured versus predicted values. We also corrected \( \theta \) measurements to include both solid and liquid phases by first determining ice content in partially frozen soil and then adding ice content to liquid \( \theta \) values. Ice content in partially frozen soil was calculated following Tian et al. [2015] as

\[ \theta_i = \frac{(\theta_{\text{in}} - \theta_{\text{meas}})}{\rho_1} \]  

(2)

where \( \theta_i \) is the soil ice content; \( \theta_{\text{in}} \) indicates the initial liquid water prior to freezing; \( \theta_{\text{meas}} \) is the measured liquid in partially frozen soil, all in units of \( \text{m}^3 \text{m}^{-3} \); and \( \rho_1 \) indicates the density of ice (917 kg m\(^{-3}\)). We then added ice content to liquid water content to obtain total soil \( \theta \), correcting for the density of ice relative to liquid water:

\[ \theta_{\text{tot}} = \theta_i + \theta_{\text{ice}} \times \left( \frac{917}{1000} \right) \]  

(3)

where \( \theta_{\text{tot}} \) is the total water content and \( \theta_i \) and \( \theta_{\text{ice}} \) indicate the liquid and ice content, respectively. Air and soil temperature and soil moisture were recorded every 10 min. For winter of 2013, these data were not available after day of year 84 due to battery failure. Soil temperature, soil moisture, site air temperature, and ambient air pressure were averaged over the 80 min sampling cycle.

Additional measurements for determining \( F_{\text{snow}} \) included snow temperature, depth, density, and snow water equivalent (SWE). Snow temperatures at each sampling inlet were measured using Omega Type-T thermocouples (Omega Engineering Inc., Stamford, CT, USA) sheathed in white heat-shrink tubing. Snow temperature was measured every 3 s, averaged and logged every 12 s, and then adjusted following Luce and Tarboton [2001] to remove large diel variation and above freezing temperatures related to erroneous corrections from the reference thermistor on the data logger face plate. As with other environmental measurements, snow temperatures were averaged over the 80 min sample cycle.

In addition to surface snow temperature, snow depth and density were measured daily at a snow pit located approximately 25 m from the tower. The presence of dense ice layers and packed, coarse granular snow layers precluded measuring at discrete intervals matching the tower heights. Total column snow depth was measured by inserting an aluminum snow tube (61 cm long \( \times \) 4.5 cm ID) vertically into the snowpack. Snow collected inside the tube was weighed using a CCI HS-30 digital hanging scale to calculate snow density. Total SWE was determined by multiplying snow depth \( \times \) density.

2.4. Diffusion Method for Estimating CO₂ Efflux

We calculated \( F_{\text{soil}} \) and \( F_{\text{snow}} \) using Fick’s law [e.g., Brooks et al., 1997; Billings et al., 1998]:

\[ F = -D \frac{\partial C}{\partial z} \]  

(4)
where $F$ indicates the CO$_2$ flux ($\mu$mol m$^{-2}$ s$^{-1}$), $D_i$ is the rate of diffusion of CO$_2$ through soils or snow (m$^2$ s$^{-1}$), $\partial C$ is the concentration gradient of CO$_2$ ($\mu$mol m$^{-3}$), and $\partial z$ is the depth of the gradient (m). While some of the theoretical coefficients differ in soil versus snow, the process is similar in that the density, porosity, and tortuosity of the media must be determined to estimate the diffusion of CO$_2$ from one layer in the snow or soil to the one above it.

We determined $F_{\text{soil}}$ between $-15$ and $-5$ cm depths in the soil based on Tang et al. [2003]. Deviations from that method included how we applied pressure and temperature corrections to the raw sensor output and how we estimated total soil porosity and tortuosity. Using instructions from Vaisala for GMT220 sensors, we made temperature and pressure compensations using the ideal gas law:

$$C_c = C_m\left(\frac{T_m \times 1013}{P_m \times 298.15}\right)$$

where $C$ is the CO$_2$ mixing ratio in ppm; $T$ stands for soil temperature in K; $P$ indicates the ambient pressure in hPa; and $c$ and $m$ stand for the corrected and measured values of $C$, $T$, and $P$, respectively. To calculate porosity, we estimated weighted average density of both minerals and SOM for $-5$ to $-20$ cm following Davidson et al. [2006b] and Moldrup et al. [2000] instead of using the assumed particle density of 2.65 g cm$^{-3}$ for mineral soil. We then corrected porosity to account for the presence of coarse rocks in the soil bed volume that were not included in our bulk density analyses. The presence of coarse rocks (>2 mm) in New England glacial tills such as those at our site can occupy 20 to 30% of the soil bed volume [Kulmatiski et al., 2003; Davidson et al., 2006b]. This, in turn, impacts the total pore space through which air and water can move, ultimately affecting estimates of diffusion through the soil profile. To account for this, we adjusted porosity downward as

$$\phi_{\text{corr}} = \phi - (\phi \times RF)$$

where $\phi_{\text{corr}}$ is the corrected porosity, $\phi$ is the soil porosity determined from measured bulk density and SOM, and RF is an assumed rock fraction of 20%. While this assumed rock fraction may be greater or less than the actual fraction of coarse rocks at our site, the resulting $\phi_{\text{corr}}$ value obtained from equation (6), 0.55, produced much more realistic estimates of diffusion and CO$_2$ flux than $\phi$ alone. We then estimated soil tortuosity with the Moldrup et al. [1997] model:

$$\bar{\zeta} = (\phi_{\text{corr}} - \theta_{\text{tot}})\left(\frac{\phi_{\text{corr}} - \theta_{\text{tot}}}{\phi}\right)^{\frac{1}{2.72}}$$

where $\bar{\zeta}$ is the gas tortuosity, $\theta_{\text{tot}}$ is the total volumetric water content (liquid and ice), and $m$ is a constant that equals 3. We chose this tortuosity model because it produced more plausible estimates of diffusion in our high-porosity soils as opposed to models such as Millington and Quirk [1961] and Moldrup et al. [2000], which can overestimate diffusion for highly porous substrates [Iyamada and Hasegawa, 2005; Pingintha et al., 2010].

We determined $F_{\text{snow}}$ for three depth increments in the snowpack: 0 to 20 cm, 0 to 40 cm, and 20 to 40 cm following Seok et al. [2009], as these were the only depths that were regularly covered with snow. The only differences were that we used the more general Duplessis and Masliyah [1991] method for determining snowpack tortuosity instead of the more site specific method that Seok et al. [2009] employed. We also used weighted average density, porosity, and tortuosity values for the entire snowpack as opposed to determining these values for each sampling height on the tower. Weights were the relative percentages that each layer in the profile contributed to the total depth.

Given the difficulties of estimating diffusion across an extremely porous and heterogeneous litter layer [Maier and Schack-Kirchner, 2014], we estimated the flux of CO$_2$ leaving the soil and entering the snowpack ($F_{\text{soil-snow}}$) as

$$F_{\text{soil-snow}} = \frac{z_{i+1}F_i - z_iF_{i+1}}{z_{i+1} - z_i}$$

where $F_{\text{soil-snow}}$ is the soil respiration in units of $\mu$mol m$^{-2}$ s$^{-1}$ and $F_i$ and $F_{i+1}$ are the CO$_2$ effluxes at depths $z_i$ and $z_{i+1}$ [e.g., Hirano et al., 2003; Vargas et al., 2010]. Where other studies extrapolate CO$_2$ efflux from the soil...
from two to three estimates of $F_{\text{soil}}$ within the soil profile [Maier and Schack-Kirchner, 2014], equation (8) interpolates this flux between $F_{\text{snow}} (F_i)$ and $F_{\text{soil}} (F_{i+1})$.

We calculated the total seasonal flux of $F_{\text{soil}}$, $F_{\text{soil-snow}}$, and $F_{\text{snow}}$ by determining daily average fluxes, scaling them to 24 h periods, and then adding them together for the duration of each sample year (2013 and 2014). Data gaps between daily fluxes were filled with linear interpolation. Uncertainty was estimated by performing the same calculations on the standard deviation of daily average fluxes.

### 2.5. Statistical Analysis

We used correlation analysis to examine pairwise relationships between climatic, soil, and CO2 variables and multiple regression to explore the sensitivity of $F_{\text{soil}}$, $F_{\text{snow}}$, and $F_{\text{soil-snow}}$ to simultaneous environmental fluctuations in temperature, moisture, and snowpack dynamics. All statistics were conducted in R 3.0.1 [R Core Team, 2015].

Correlation analysis examined pairwise relationships between climatic, soil, and CO2 variables. Data were snow depth; SWE; air temperature; snow temperature; soil temperature; $\theta$; snow and soil CO2 concentrations; and $F_{\text{soil}}, F_{\text{soil-snow}},$ and $F_{\text{snow}}$. We used snow temperatures at 0 cm as indicative of temperatures within the snowpack. For soil temperature and moisture, we evaluated measurements from $-5$, $-15$, and $-30$ cm, averaging by depth for the entire site. We calculated site averages of $F_{\text{soil}}$, site averages of $F_{\text{soil-snow}}$ and fluxes determined for the 0 to 20 cm depth increment for $F_{\text{snow}}$. Finally, we calculated daily averages of each variable sampled at subdaily time scales. This allowed us to integrate measurements made on a daily time step with more frequently sampled variables. It also reduced noise in the data set resulting from diel variation in CO2 dynamics and their environmental drivers.

We used multiple regression to better understand the sensitivity of $F_{\text{soil}}, F_{\text{soil-snow}}$, and $F_{\text{snow}}$ to simultaneous environmental fluctuations in temperature, moisture, and snowpack dynamics. Data were the same as for correlation analysis. Prior to performing the multiple regressions, the entire data set was examined for outliers, homogeneity of variance, normality, collinearity, potential interactions, and independence of observations [Zuur et al., 2010]. Using this protocol, we developed three multiple regression models:

$$F_{\text{soil}} = \beta + [k_{1} \times T_{\text{soil}}(-30 \text{ cm})] + [k_{2} \times \theta(-30 \text{ cm})] + (k_{3} \times \text{SWE})$$

(9)

$$F_{\text{soil-snow}} = \beta + [k_{1} \times T_{\text{soil}}(-15 \text{ cm})] + [k_{2} \times \theta(-15 \text{ cm})] + (k_{3} \times \text{SWE})$$

(10)

$$F_{\text{snow}} = \beta_{1} e^{T_{\text{soil}}(-5 \text{ cm})} + \beta_{2} e^{T_{\text{soil}}(-15 \text{ cm})} + (k_{3} \times \text{SWE})$$

(11)

where $\beta$ denotes the model intercept for equations (9) and (10); $\beta_{1}$ and $\beta_{2}$ indicate the intercepts for the exponential and linear portions of the model for equation (11); $k_{1}$–$k_{3}$ are the slopes associated with predictor variables $T_{\text{soil}}, \theta,$ and SWE, respectively; $T_{\text{soil}} (-5$, $-15$, or $-30$ cm) stands for soil temperatures at $-5$, $-15$, and $-30$ cm depths; $\theta (-5$, $-15$, or $-30$ cm) is the soil moisture at $-5$, $-15$, and $-30$ cm in the soil profile; and SWE denotes the snow water equivalent. Model terms were selected due to lack of collinearity with other independent variables, which was assessed by calculating the variance inflation factors of each variable relative to all of the other potential independent variables [Zuur et al., 2010]. Within each model, soil temperature and moisture variables also represented soil conditions below the layer in which the flux was calculated. Models 9 and 10 were fit using generalized least squares (gls) in the nlme package [Pinheiro et al., 2009], while model 11 was fit with nonlinear least squares (nls) to depict the exponential relationship between $T_{\text{soil}} (-5 \text{ cm})$ and $F_{\text{snow}}$ using the same approach as for equation (1). Significant effects were then determined with a backward selection procedure described by Zuur et al. [2009]. Model-level $p$ and $R^2$ values typically reported for regressions were not available for either gls or nls. Instead, these statistics were determined by fitting predicted versus observed $F_{\text{soil}}, F_{\text{soil-snow}},$ and $F_{\text{snow}}$ values. For models 9 and 10, the relative contribution of each independent variable in the final model to the whole model $R^2$ was determined with the lme function in the relaimpo package [Grömping, 2006; Berryman et al., 2015]. Obtaining such partial regression statistics for the nonlinear model was not possible. Thus, we also determined the relative contribution of each model term to overall model fit by omitting each independent variable in turn and comparing the full to the reduced model using Akaike information criterion [Burnham and Anderson, 2002]. Large increases in Akaike information criterion (AIC) in the reduced compared to the full model indicated that the dropped variable contributed substantially to model fit.
3. Results

3.1. Environmental Conditions

Environmental conditions (snow depth, SWE, air, and snow temperatures, and soil moisture) generally showed high temporal variability (Figure 1), and many environmental drivers were correlated with one another (Table S1 in the supporting information). Seasonal snow cover was dynamic in both winters, with snow depth and SWE increasing following snowfall and then rapidly declining with melt, sublimation, and evaporation.

Figure 1. (a) Snow water equivalent (SWE) and snow depth; (b) air temperature, thermocouple temperature at 0 cm on the snow tower, and soil temperatures at -5, -15, and -30 cm depths; (c) liquid soil water and ice content at -5 cm and liquid soil water content at -15 and -30 cm depths; (d) soil CO2 concentrations at -5 and -15 cm depth; (e) CO2 concentrations at 0, 20, and 40 cm on the snow tower; and (f) rates of $F_{\text{soil}}$, $F_{\text{soil-snow}}$, and $F_{\text{snow}}$. Data are daily average values, except Figure 1a, which shows daily total values.
settling, or other snowpack metamorphism (Figure 1a). Average snow depth over both years was 240 mm, with a maximum of 480 mm in 2014. Air temperatures varied between \(15^\circ\text{C}\) and \(7^\circ\text{C}\) throughout both winters, with a mean of \(3^\circ\text{C}\) (Figure 1b). Corrected temperatures recorded at 0 cm on the snow tower averaged \(7^\circ\text{C}\), with a minimum of \(-15^\circ\text{C}\) and a maximum of \(-3^\circ\text{C}\) (Figure 1b). Corrected snow temperatures were generally lower and more variable with increasing height on the snow tower and ranged between \(-23\) and \(0^\circ\text{C}\) (data not shown).

Soil temperatures at \(5\) cm depth typically stayed above freezing, averaging 0.2°C during both 2013 and 2014 (Figure 1b). Variations in soil temperature at \(5\) cm were strongly related to shifts in air temperatures and snow depth, such that warmer soils tended to occur with higher air temperatures and/or deeper snowpacks (Table S1).

On six separate instances throughout the study period, soil temperatures at \(5\) cm depth fell below 0°C when a period of snowpack decline was followed by cold air temperatures, resulting in soil freezing. During these periods of soil freezing, temperatures at \(5\) cm were as low as \(-3.2^\circ\text{C}\). Deeper in the soil profile at \(15\) and \(30\) cm, temperatures were higher, averaging 0.9 and 1.4°C, respectively. They were also less variable, gradually decreasing from the onset of the snowpack to the spring melt period (Figure 1b).

Unlike soil temperature, which only fluctuated at \(5\) cm, \(\theta\) was dynamic at all three depths (\(5\), \(15\), and \(30\) cm; Figure 1c). Although \(\theta\) was lowest at \(-5\) cm depth, shifts in surface moisture may have propagated through the soil profile to drive variations in water content at \(-15\) and \(-30\) cm; both of which were highly correlated with \(\theta\) at \(-5\) cm (\(r = 0.60\), \(p = 0.00\) for \(\theta\) at \(-15\) cm; \(r = 0.71\), \(p = 0.00\) for \(\theta\) at \(-30\) cm; Table S1).

Changes in \(\theta\) at \(-5\) cm were strongly nonlinear according to the fitted logistic regression (\(r^2 = 0.56\); equation (1)) and likely represented a phase change from ice to liquid water as temperatures cross the threshold from below to above 0°C (Figure 2). Soil ice content at \(-5\) cm was minimal over both 2013 and 2014, averaging only 0.007 \(\text{mm}^3\ \text{mm}^{-3}\) during the entire sampling period. Soil ice was most prominent in late January 2013 when relatively shallow snow (Figure 1a) and very low temperatures (Figure 1b) resulted in a soil ice content of 0.11 \(\text{mm}^3\ \text{mm}^{-3}\), which was equivalent to liquid water content at that time (Figure 1c).

Snow \(\theta\) was generally wetter with deeper snowpacks and higher atmospheric temperatures (Table S1).

### 3.2. Carbon Dioxide Concentrations

Snow and soil CO\(_2\) concentrations fluctuated over time and were correlated with environmental conditions (Table S1 and Figure 1). Soil CO\(_2\) levels in 2014 were higher than snow CO\(_2\) concentrations and increased with depth from \(-5\) to \(-15\) cm (Figure 1d). Soil CO\(_2\) concentrations were positively correlated with snow depth and were negatively correlated with soil temperature and soil moisture (Table S1). The negative correlations between moisture and soil CO\(_2\) content were particularly evident from 19 to 29 March 2014 when CO\(_2\) concentrations rapidly declined as \(\theta\) increased during the onset of spring snowmelt (Figures 1c and 1d).

Snow CO\(_2\) concentrations were highest and most variable at the snow-soil interface (0 cm), were substantially lower and less dynamic even 20 cm above the soil surface, and were as much as 10 times lower than CO\(_2\)
concentrations in the soil (Figure 1e). Although snow periodically covered the sample inlet at 40 cm, CO₂ concentrations at 40 cm were comparable to atmospheric values. Snow CO₂ followed a similar pattern as snow depth and SWE, increasing with greater snow depth and SWE and decreasing with snowpack disappearance (Table S1). An exception was on 30 January 2013 when snow CO₂ concentrations were high despite snowpack and SWE had not yet reached their seasonal maximum. Soil CO₂ at all depths (Table S1). The negative correlations between snow CO₂ at 0, 20, and 40 cm and soil temperatures were also lower, and soils were generally drier. Pairwise correlations illustrate as indicated by the strong, positive correlations between snow CO₂ at 0, 20, and 40 cm and soil temperatures increases were likely due to warmer conditions resulting in snowmelt and soil thaw; both of which increased θ at all depths (Table 1). The negative correlations between Fsoil and Fsoil snow, and surface soil temperatures were likely due to warmer conditions resulting in snowmelt and soil thaw; both of which increased θ throughout the profile. Backward selection of our initial multiple regression model (equation (9)) produced a final model with soil temperature at −30 cm (t = −4.63, p < 0.0001), soil θ at −30 cm (t = −13.92, p < 0.0001), and SWE (t = −5.34, p < 0.0001) as significant drivers of Fsoil (whole model r² = 0.81; Figure 3). Partitioning the relative contribution of each model term to the total explained variance indicated that θ at −30 cm exerted the strongest influence on Fsoil (r² = 0.66), followed by SWE (r² = 0.11), and finally by soil temperature at −30 cm (r² = 0.04; Table 2). Comparing the final model to reduced models in which each predictor was omitted in turn showed a similar pattern; AIC increased most when θ at −30 cm was dropped from the model, followed by SWE, and the smallest change when soil temperature at −30 cm was removed (Table 2).

### Table 1. Correlation Coefficients (r) and p Values Indicating the Significance of Correlations Between Fsoil, Fsoil-snow, and Fsnow and Environmental Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Fsoil</th>
<th></th>
<th>Fsoil-snow</th>
<th></th>
<th>FSnow</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>r</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>r</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>r</td>
<td>p</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Snow depth</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>−0.01</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SWE</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>−0.37</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>−0.27</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Air T</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>−0.30</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>−0.09</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Snow T (0 cm)</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>−0.33</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>−0.17</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soil T (−5 cm)</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>−0.21</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soil T (−15 cm)</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>−0.09</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soil T (−30 cm)</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>−0.11</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>−0.19</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>θliq (−5 cm)</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>−0.79</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>−0.63</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>θice (−5 cm)</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>−0.03</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>−0.14</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>−0.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>θtot (−5 cm)</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>−0.82</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>−0.73</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>θliq (−15 cm)</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>−0.91</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>−0.83</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>−0.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>θliq (−30 cm)</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>−0.83</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>−0.77</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>−0.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soil CO₂ (−5 cm)</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soil CO₂ (−15 cm)</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Snow CO₂ (0 cm)</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Snow CO₂ (20 cm)</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Snow CO₂ (40 cm)</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fsoil</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fsoil-snow</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fsnow</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The full matrix showing correlations and p values for each pair of environmental variables is located in Table S1 in the supporting information. Significant correlation coefficients are in bold type.
We calculated the efflux of CO$_2$ out of the soil ($F_{\text{soil-snow}}$) by interpolating between rates of $F_{\text{soil}}$ and $F_{\text{snow}}$ (Figure 1f). At 0.36 μmol CO$_2$ m$^{-2}$ s$^{-1}$, average seasonal values for $F_{\text{soil-snow}}$ were lower than those of $F_{\text{soil}}$. Soil-to-snow CO$_2$ flux followed a similar temporal trend as $F_{\text{soil}}$. Also like $F_{\text{soil}}$, $F_{\text{soil-snow}}$ was negatively correlated with SWE, air and snow temperatures, and soil liquid $\theta$ at all depths in the soil profile (Table 1). Multiple regression modeling (equation (10)) indicated that soil temperature at $-15$ cm ($t = -2.91$, $p = 0.006$) and $\theta$ at $-15$ cm ($t = -10.59$, $p < 0.0001$) were the best predictors for $F_{\text{soil-snow}}$ (whole model $r^2 = 0.73$; Figure 3). Post hoc testing of model terms indicated that $\theta$ at $-15$ cm depth accounted for 70% of the variation in the final model while soil temperature at $-15$ cm explained 3% (Table 2). Evaluation of model terms using AIC demonstrated a similar phenomenon. The AIC statistic increased substantially when $\theta$ at $-15$ cm was removed from the model, indicating the strong effect of this term on overall model fit. By contrast, AIC increased very little when soil temperature at $-15$ cm was removed.

We calculated snow CO$_2$ flux ($F_{\text{snow}}$) at three depth increments of snow CO$_2$ concentrations, starting above the soil surface and extending up into the snowpack: 0 to 20 cm, 20 to 40 cm, and across the entire snow depth profile (0 to 40 cm; Figure 1f). Fluxes were highest when calculated with CO$_2$ concentrations from the 0 to 20 cm increment, were lowest from the 20 to 40 cm depth increment, and in between when determined across the entire profile from 0 to 40 cm. Over both winters, average $F_{\text{snow}}$ values were 0.16, 0.02, and

![Figure 3. Scatterplots of the correlations between CO$_2$ efflux and environmental drivers that were identified as significant predictors of CO$_2$ flux in multiple regression modeling (equations (9)–(11)) and the overall fit of the multiple regression models as compared to observed values. Correlations include (a) $F_{\text{soil}}$ and soil temperature at $-30$ cm, (b) $F_{\text{soil-snow}}$ and soil temperature at $-15$ cm, (c) $F_{\text{snow}}$ and soil temperature at $-5$ cm, (d) $F_{\text{soil}}$ and volumetric water content (VWC) at $-30$ cm, (e) $F_{\text{soil-snow}}$ and VWC at $-15$ cm, (f) $F_{\text{snow}}$ and VWC at $-5$ cm, (g) $F_{\text{soil}}$ and snow water equivalent (SWE), and (h) $F_{\text{snow}}$ and SWE. There is no scatterplot showing the correlation between $F_{\text{soil-snow}}$ and SWE as this was not a significant model term in the multiple regression model (equation (10)). Regression fits include predicted versus observed values for (i) $F_{\text{soil}}$, (j) $F_{\text{soil-snow}}$, and (k) $F_{\text{snow}}$. The strength and significance of the correlations are shown in Table 1, while the results from the multiple regression models are in Table 2. Data are average daily values.
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0.11 μmol CO₂ m⁻² s⁻¹, respectively, for the 0 to 20, 20 to 40, and 0 to 40 cm increments. The gaps in flux data for 2014 resulted from power supply issues, lack of data from the 0 cm inlet on the snow tower, and gaps in snow measurements.

Across all snow CO₂ profile increments, Fsnow was on average higher and less variable in 2014 than during the preceding year. This may have resulted from the deeper snowpack in 2014, as Fsnow tended to increase with snow height and SWE (Table 1). In addition to snowpack dynamics, Fsnow was positively correlated with air temperature, soil temperature at all three depths, θt at −5 cm, and soil CO₂ concentrations. It was inversely related to ice content at −5 cm and liquid θt at −15 and −30 cm depths (Table 1). The multiple regression model that best explained variation in Fsnow across the entire data set (equation (11)) indicated that soil temperature at −5 cm (t = 6.28, p < 0.0001), soil θt at −5 cm (t = −7.02, p < 0.0001), and SWE (t = 2.77, p = 0.007) were all significant predictors (whole model r² = 0.60; Figure 3). Among model terms, soil temperatures at −5 cm depth exerted the greatest influence on Fsnow followed by θt at −5 cm, and finally by SWE as indicated by relative changes in AIC when comparing the full model to reduced models that dropped each of these predictors in turn (Table 2).

Total seasonal fluxes were highest for Fsoill followed by Fsoilsnow and then by Fsnow (Table 3). However, the combination of total winter fluxes for Fsoill and Fsnow, 38.8 g CO₂·C·m⁻²·winter⁻¹, was comparable to the total winter flux of Fsoill, 40.0 g CO₂·C·m⁻²·winter⁻¹. Calculated total Fsnow values were similar between 2013 and 2014 and were ~12.5 g CO₂·C·m⁻²·winter⁻¹.

4. Discussion

To our knowledge, this study is the first to simultaneously determine Fsoill, Fsoilsnow, and Fsnow and their environmental drivers using automated, continuous measurements. Our data indicate that surface soil temperature and subsurface soil moisture (θt) availability were the primary drivers of winter soil CO₂ dynamics. The relative importance of these drivers varied with depth, such that θt strongly influenced CO₂ flux from deeper in the soil profile while surface soil temperature primarily controlled CO₂ flux through the snowpack. The dominant role that θt played in inhibiting winter soil CO₂ flux departs from prior research showing that higher moisture generally...
increases winter soil C loss [Liptzin et al., 2009; Hirano, 2014; Schindlbacher et al., 2014] except during snowmelt when very wet to saturated conditions can inhibit CO2 flux [Liptzin et al., 2009; Brooks et al., 2011]. The differential response of soil respiration to θ versus temperature is also unique. Although previous studies have demonstrated that relative roles of soil moisture and temperature in driving CO2 flux across landscape gradients of moisture availability [Riveros-Iregui et al., 2012; Knowles et al., 2015; Stielstra et al., 2015], we report a similar phenomenon within single soil-to-snow profile. The relative roles that temperature and moisture played in regulating winter soil respiration are especially relevant given that they were mediated by changes in air temperature and snow depth—both of which are predicted to change in the future. Overall, our results carry important implications for understanding and modeling winter soil respiration given predicted changes in seasonal snow cover—and thus winter soil microclimate—both in temperate areas and globally.

We observed fluctuating surface soil temperatures that likely resulted from snowpack accumulation and ablation throughout the winter. These changes in surface soil temperatures—particularly above and below freezing—also resulted in nonlinear and dynamic shifts in soil θ at −5 cm depth (Figure 2). Variation in surface soil temperature and attendant changes in liquid water availability may partially explain the strong relationship we observed between surface soil temperature and snow CO2 flux, assuming that this flux represents near-surface soil microbial processes. Other researchers have reported bursts of respiration during thaw cycles, such as the one we noted on 30 January 2013, and have cited a combination of high-temperature sensitivity, a flush of labile C, and removal of water limitations as soils crossed a threshold from under to over 0°C [Bubier et al., 2002; Aanderud et al., 2013]. By contrast, the lower rates of $F_{\text{snow}}$ we observed at below freezing temperatures may have arisen from a slowing of biological activity, microbial cell lysis, and/or a shortage of liquid water.

Table 3. Cumulative Winter Fluxes of $F_{\text{soil}}$, $F_{\text{soil-snow}}$, and $F_{\text{snow}}$ (g CO2-C m−2 winter−1) in 2013 and 2014

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>$F_{\text{soil}}$</th>
<th>$F_{\text{soil-snow}}$</th>
<th>$F_{\text{snow}}$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>12.5 ± 2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>40.0 ± 1.6</td>
<td>26.0 ± 1.8</td>
<td>12.8 ± 3.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note that fluxes were determined for 85 and 71 days of continuous sampling for winters of 2013 and 2014, respectively. The plus-minus sign indicates 1 standard deviation.

Although soil temperature explained significant variation in $F_{\text{snow}}$, it did not exert strong control on CO2 fluxes within the soil profile. This may have been related to the fact that soil temperatures at −15 and −30 cm depth did not vary enough to alter CO2 flux rates. In 2014, the year in which we measured $F_{\text{soil}}$ and $F_{\text{soil-snow}}$, the range of soil temperatures at depth spanned only 1°C, from 0.5 to 1.5°C. However, while soil temperatures at −15 and −30 cm were fairly constant, soil moisture at these depths was not. Changes in surface θ, whether from infiltration of meltwater and/or thawing of frozen surface soils, propagated through the soil profile all the way to −30 cm depth, creating very dynamic moisture conditions that may be characteristic of future soil θ conditions in seasonally snow-covered areas given climate change. These fluctuations in θ at −15 and −30 cm were chiefly responsible for driving $F_{\text{soil}}$ and $F_{\text{soil-snow}}$ rates such that higher θ led to lower rates of $F_{\text{soil}}$ and $F_{\text{soil-snow}}$.

Our finding that θ negatively impacts soil CO2 flux differs from previously reported relationships between soil moisture and winter soil respiration dynamics. Both Hirano [2014] and Schindlbacher et al. [2014] cited positive relationships between θ and winter soil respiration in cool temperate forests, and both suggested that snowmelt flushed labile C into soil, relieving water and substrate limitations and thereby boosting respiration rates. Reports from high alpine and subalpine areas have also demonstrated higher winter soil respiration with increasing θ prior to the main snowmelt season [Liptzin et al., 2009]. However, moisture can also diminish respiration if water-filled pore spaces reduce oxygen availability and slow CO2 diffusion [Davidson et al., 1998; Moldrup et al., 2000; Aanderud et al., 2013]. This can result across a complex terrain with well-drained and poorly drained soils [Riveros-Iregui et al., 2012] or within a single, topographically diverse meadow [Knowles et al., 2015]. Our study suggests a similar phenomenon within a single soil-to-snow profile in which higher moisture stimulates respiration near the soil surface even as it suppresses respiration at depth within the soil profile. During both of the winters we sampled, θ levels at −15 and −30 cm were 2 to 3 times higher than what we have observed at the same site during the growing season, suggesting that high volumetric water content in these soils during winter does inhibit microbial CO2 efflux. Such high wintertime moisture
In addition to exerting a negative control on soil CO₂ flux, the dominance of θ in regulating both F_soil and F_soil-snow is a novel finding in the sense that soil temperature—not moisture—is typically considered a primary driver of both winter and growing season soil respiration in humid temperate forests such as our study site [Mo et al., 2005; Maier et al., 2011; Wang et al., 2013]. In fact, the annual rate of soil C loss both for empirical and Earth system models is typically determined by exponential temperature-respiration functions with moisture playing a secondary role [Davidson et al., 2006a; Todd-Brown et al., 2014]. Consequently, the magnitude of moisture-related changes in the annual ecosystem or global soil C budgets is highly uncertain [Falloon et al., 2011; Moyano et al., 2013], with even greater ambiguity in winter soil moisture and soil respiration dynamics due to a paucity of measurements and data-model integration. The nonlinear, logistic relationship we observed between soil temperature and moisture around 0°C suggests an interactive relationship between temperature, θ, and soil respiration that would not be addressed in empirical, process-based, and/or Earth system models [Davidson et al., 1998; Falloon et al., 2011; Moyano et al., 2013].

Snow depth may be an important variable in driving this interactive relationship; it has been long understood to be a key determinant of soil temperature, moisture, and CO₂ efflux during winter [Sommerfeld et al., 1993; Brooks et al., 1997; Fahnestock et al., 1998; Groffman et al., 2006; Muhr et al., 2009; Aanderud et al., 2013; Wang et al., 2013]. Indeed, our data show that F_snow was highest when snow was deepest in the middle part of the winter of 2014. This deep snow likely promoted high enough temperatures and liquid water availability at the soil surface to stimulate microbial respiration that was able to quickly diffuse into the overlying snowpack due to the absence of the very wet conditions that occurred deeper in the profile. However, the snowpack was not always deep but rather frequently decreased in depth and SWE with higher air temperatures. This dynamic snowpack likely created meltwater that infiltrated into the soil throughout the winter, creating equally dynamic and very moist conditions at −15 and −30 cm that either suppressed CO₂ efflux, slowed diffusion, or both [Orchard and Cook, 1983]. In this way, respiration at the soil surface and through the snowpack may have been promoted even as CO₂ production and efflux from deeper in the soil was suppressed. Such complex, bidirectional relationships among environmental drivers and CO₂ dynamics are neither represented in empirical, temperature-driven depictions of annual soil respiration [Davidson et al., 2006a] nor are they fully articulated in process-based models of soil C efflux [Blagodatsky and Smith, 2012].

The dynamic interchange we observed among snow depth, soil temperature, and soil moisture across the soil-to-snow profile may depart from previous studies of winter soil respiration due to climatic differences among study sites. Most previous work on winter CO₂ flux has occurred in drier and/or colder areas where soils do not exhibit high soil moisture until snowmelt due to deeper and more persistent snowpacks [e.g., Sommerfeld et al., 1996; Brooks et al., 1997; McDowell et al., 2000; Suzuki et al., 2006; Bowling et al., 2009; Liptzin et al., 2009; Seok et al., 2009, 2014; Björkman et al., 2010; Moyes and Bowling, 2013; Hirano, 2014; Schindlbacher et al., 2014; Stielstra et al., 2015]. By contrast, our study site is one where episodic midwinter melt and rain-on-snow events do occur, leading to a very wet soil environment throughout the winter similar to conditions during the main snowmelt period. Thus, our understanding of the relative controls of temperature and moisture on winter CO₂ flux may be biased by conceptual models more appropriate for colder and drier areas, where soil microclimate is more stable until spring melt. For example, according to the conceptual representations put forth by Liptzin et al. [2009] and Brooks et al. [2011] illustrating how snow depth determines winter soil microbial activity, our study site should fall within “Zone I,” such that shallow, intermittent snow cover drives winter respiration rates, primarily through episodic release of CO₂ during free-thaw. However, our site also exhibits characteristics of Zone II (temperature dominated) and Zone III (substrate and moisture dominated). Knowles et al. [2016] likewise suggested that temperature and moisture limitations can affect winter soil respiration in Zone I areas. In the case of Knowles et al. [2016], these were attributed to edaphic properties that impacted soil temperature and water-holding capacity, while our research highlights the role of snowmelt events that drive soil microclimate. Both scenarios suggest that winter soil CO₂ loss in
Zone I areas may be more variable than current models predict. It may be that near-surface soils can experience conditions akin to those in Zones I and II, while soils at depth, which are more insulated from the atmosphere, exhibit characteristics akin to Zones II and III. To our knowledge, we are the first study to examine winter soil respiration across a soil-to-snow profile and one of few studies continuously quantifying winter CO₂ fluxes in a cool, humid, temperate forest. It is not clear the extent to which other humid, temperate forests or other soil-to-snow gradients in montane, alpine, or arctic ecosystems might exhibit these characteristics. Yet accurate portrayals of winter soil C production and loss are essential to modeling the future terrestrial C cycle, particularly given predictions of reduced seasonal snow cover both in temperate areas and globally [Dye, 2002; Déry and Brown, 2007; Lawrence and Slater, 2010; Mudryk et al., 2014].

Higher winter air temperatures, increased winter precipitation, and decreased snow cover are all expected to occur over northern North America, northern Europe, and northern Asia over the 21st century [Christensen et al., 2013]. These climatic trends may increase the frequency of episodic snowmelt and rain events that replenish θ during the winter months [Kellomäki et al., 2010], creating the dynamic and very moist conditions we observed in our study. Thus, the considerable variation in snowpack and soil microclimate that we documented at our research site is likely to occur over broad areas during the coming century, suggesting that soil moisture may play a greater role in controlling winter soil C losses than it has historically.

Although our study features a novel and dynamic interplay of snow depth, soil temperature, and soil moisture in influencing winter CO₂ flux from soils and the snowpack, we encountered several issues that may have impacted our results. First, we used empirical models of diffusion instead of in situ measurements [Maijer and Schack-Kirchner, 2014]. The choice of empirical model can strongly influence calculated CO₂ flux rates [Pingintha et al., 2010], particularly in heterogeneous soils with high rock content, such as at our study site [Davidson et al., 2006b]. We used the Moldrup et al. [1997] soil tortuosity model because it produced more realistic estimates of diffusion than other empirical models, and we also applied a correction factor for the coarse rock fraction [e.g., Davidson et al., 2006b]. Nevertheless, we recognize that these measures may have been insufficient to generate accurate estimates of diffusion. While we cannot verify our diffusion estimates with measured values, our average diffusion coefficients for snow (0.08 cm² s⁻¹) and soil (0.005 cm² s⁻¹) were well within the range of other studies [Solomon and Cerling, 1987; Davidson et al., 2006b]. In addition to potential issues with calculating diffusion, our rates of Fₘₐₛₗ₉ may have been overestimated since continuous operation of solid state CO₂ sensors can result in soil warming that stimulates microbial activity [Jassal et al., 2005]. Likewise, rates of Fₘₐₛₗ₉ may have been underestimated in high wind conditions when advection can pump CO₂ out of the snowpack [Seok et al., 2009; Bowling and Massman, 2011]. Unfortunately, the lack of significant correlations between either snow CO₂ concentrations or fluxes (Fₘₐₛₗ₉) and winds measured in a nearby, open pasture meant that we could not determine the impact of advection on our flux estimates. Further, we acknowledge that active gas sampling of CO₂ from snow can alter the concentration gradient within the snowpack, thereby underestimating the actual flux [Albert and Shultz, 2002; Seok et al., 2009, 2014; Maijer and Schack-Kirchner, 2014]. Sampling each inlet for 10 min likely exacerbated this problem, as the 11.6 cm radius of the sphere of gas we sampled would overlap between inlets placed 20 cm apart. Any of the possible biases in determining Fₘₐₛₗ₉ and Fₘₐₛₗ₈ may have impacted our calculation of Fₘₐₛₗ₉-snow, as we interpolated between Fₘₐₛ₉ and Fₘₐₛₗ₉-snow to estimate the flux of CO₂ from soils to the overlying snowpack. Despite these potential pitfalls, we believe that we have reasonably captured Fₘₐₛ₉ Fₘₐₛₗ₉-snow and Fₘₐₛ₉ and their drivers during the winters of 2013 and 2014 at our study site. Our calculations of Fₘₐₛ₉ Fₘₐₛₗ₉-snow and Fₘₐₛ₉ fell within the range of values reported for previous research on winter soil respiration [Schindlbacher et al., 2007; Seok et al., 2009; Hirano, 2014; Schindlbacher et al., 2014]. Cumulative fluxes of Fₘₐₛ₉ and the combination of Fₘₐₛₗ₉-snow and Fₘₐₛ₉ also agreed with other estimates of total seasonal flux [e.g., Contosta et al., 2011; Schindlbacher et al., 2014; Stielstra et al., 2015], suggesting that measuring CO₂ at different depths in the soil and the overlying snowpack may produce reliable estimates of winter C loss.

Future work will address the issues outlined above, including in situ measurements of diffusion, intermittent instead of continuous operation of CO₂ sensors, and quantification of wind speeds beneath the forest canopy at 1.5 m above the forest floor. Additional years of data collection across multiple sites capturing a range of environmental conditions should also elucidate whether the patterns we observed in Fₘₐₛ₉, Fₘₐₛₗ₉-snow and Fₘₐₛ₉ and their environmental drivers are representative of winter soil CO₂ dynamics in humid temperate
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