# **Variability in Above and Belowground Carbon Stocks in a Siberian Larch Watershed**

## Elizabeth E. Webb

Woods Hole Research Center, 149 Woods Hole Road, Falmouth, MA, 02540

#### Kathryn Heard

Western Washington University, 516 High Street, Bellingham, WA 98225 Bellingham, Washington

## Susan M. Natali\*

Woods Hole Research Center, 149 Woods Hole Road, Falmouth, MA, 02540

#### Andrew G. Bunn

Department of Environmental Science, Western Washington University, 516 High Street, Bellingham, WA 98225

# Heather D. Alexander

Department of Forestry, Forest and Wildlife Research Center, Mississippi State University, MS 39762

#### Logan T. Berner

School of Informatics, Computing, and Cyber Systems, Northern Arizona University, Flagstaff, AZ 86011

#### Alexander Kholodov

University of Alaska, 903 Koyukuk Dr., Fairbanks, AK, 99775 Institute of Physical-Chemical and Biological Problems of Soil Science RAS, 2 Institutskaya str., Pushchino, Russia.

## Michael M. Loranty

Department of Geography, Colgate University, 13 Oak Dr, Hamilton, New York 13346

#### John D. Schade

Woods Hole Research Center, 149 Woods Hole Road, Falmouth, MA, 02540

#### Valentin Spektor,

Melnikov Permafrost Institute, Siberian Branch of the Russian Academy of Sciences, Yakutsk, Siberia

#### Nikita Zimov

Northeast Science Station, Cherskiy, Russia

### \*Corresponding author. Please direct correspondence to snatali@whrc.org

# **ABSTRACT**

 Permafrost soils store between 1,330-1,580 Pg carbon (C), which is three times the amount of C in global vegetation, almost twice the amount of C in the atmosphere, and half of the global soil organic C pool. Despite the massive amount of C in permafrost, estimates of soil C storage in the high latitude permafrost region are highly uncertain, primarily due to under sampling at all spatial scales; circumpolar soil C estimates lack sufficient continental spatial diversity, regional intensity, and replication at the field-site level. Siberian forests are particularly under sampled, yet the larch forests that dominate this region may store more than twice as much soil C as all other boreal forest types in the continuous permafrost zone combined. Here we present above and belowground C stocks from twenty sites representing a gradient of stand age and structure in a larch watershed of the Kolyma River, near Cherskiy, Sakha Republic, Russia. We found that the majority of C stored in the top 1 m of the watershed was stored belowground (92%), with 19% in the top 10 cm of soil and 40% in the top 30 cm. Carbon 14 was more variable in surface soils (10 cm; coefficient of variation (CV) = 0.35 between stands) 15 than in the top 30 cm (CV=0.14) or soil profile to 1 m (CV=0.20). Combined active layer and 16 deep frozen deposits (surface - 15 m) contained 205 kg C m<sup>-2</sup> (yedoma, non-ice wedge) and 331 17 kg C m<sup>-2</sup> (alas), which, even when accounting for landscape-level ice content, is an order of magnitude more C than that stored in the top meter of soil and two orders of magnitude more C than in aboveground biomass. Aboveground biomass was composed of primarily larch (53%) but also included understory vegetation (30%), woody debris (11%) and snag (6%) biomass. While aboveground biomass contained relatively little (8%) of the C stocks in the watershed, aboveground processes were linked to thaw depth and belowground C storage. Thaw depth was negatively related to stand age, and soil C density (top 10 cm) was positively related to soil

- moisture and negatively related to moss and lichen cover. These results suggest that as the
- climate warms, changes in stand age and structure may be as important as direct climate effects
- on belowground environmental conditions and permafrost C vulnerability.

# **1 INTRODUCTION**

 Boreal forests cover roughly 22% of the earth's terrestrial landscape (Chapin et al., 2000) and account for approximately 9% of the global vegetation carbon (C) stock (Carvalhais et al., 2014). Most of the C in boreal forests, however, is stored in the soil (Pan et al., 2011), where cold and wet conditions have limited microbial decomposition, and as a result, C has accumulated over the past several millennia (Hobbie et al., 2000; Trumbore and Harden, 1997). Recent estimates suggest that continuous and discontinuous permafrost in the boreal region store around 137 Pg, or 40% of near surface permafrost (< 1 m) C (Loranty et al., 2016). Despite the massive amount of C present in the boreal region, the quantity of C stored here and the magnitude of the change in C stocks that will result from climate change is one of the least understood carbon-climate feedbacks (Schuur et al., 2015). Over the past fifty years, air temperatures in the Arctic have risen nearly twice the global average as a result of climate change (Christensen et al., 2013), and this accelerated rate of warming means that the vast amount of C stored in high latitude systems is vulnerable to loss to the atmosphere (Koven et al., 2015; Schuur et al., 2015). The amount of C released as a result of thaw will be highly dependent on concurrent changes in topography and hydrology (Liljedahl et al., 2016; Schneider Von Deimling et al., 2015), vegetation (Guay et al., 2014; Sturm et al., 2005) fire regimes (Berner et al., 2012; Kasischke and Turetsky, 2006; Rogers et al., 2015; Soja et al., 2007), nutrient availability (Mack et al., 2004; Salmon et al., 2016), and as soil organic C lability (Harden et al., 2012; Schädel et al., 2014). Yet despite the vulnerability of permafrost soils to increased thaw and C release due to climate change, there is a lack of data quantifying 49 the C stocks in northern latitudes compared to other regions.



 difficult, leading to high uncertainty in estimates of soil C pools in yedoma deposits (Strauss et al., 2013; Walter Anthony et al., 2014).

 While vegetation stores a relatively small portion of the C pool in boreal forests (approximately 20%; Pan et al., 2011), it plays a crucial role in local and global C cycling, and many future changes in C fluxes in this biome will likely occur as a result of changes in vegetation (Elmendorf et al., 2012; Euskirchen et al., 2009; Myers-Smith et al., 2015; Swann et al., 2010). With increased temperatures, boreal forests are susceptible to insect invasions (Berg et al., 2006; Kurz et al., 2008), moisture stress (Beck et al., 2011; Trahan and Schubert, 2016; Walker et al., 2015), tree line advance and retrogression (Lloyd, 2005; Pearson et al., 2013), and more frequent forest fires (Kasischke and Turetsky, 2006; Rogers et al., 2015; Soja et al., 2007), which all have the potential to alter C cycling significantly in the region. Importantly, climate- change driven alterations in forest cover, composition, and structure will influence regional energy balance through impacts on surface albedo, evapotranspiration, and ground insulation, which will in turn affect ground thaw and soil C cycling (Chapin et al., 2005; Euskirchen et al., 2009; Fisher et al., 2016; Jean and Payette, 2014; Loranty et al., 2014).

 However, the aboveground processes that regulate C dynamics are not homogenous throughout the boreal biome (Goetz et al., 2007). For example, the fire regimes of larch (*Larix spp.*) and pine (*Pinus sylvestris)* forests in Siberia are typically dominated by low to medium intensity fires whereas dark coniferous forests common in Alaska and Canada are characterized by higher intensity and severity fires (Rogers et al., 2015; Soja et al., 2006, 2007; Tautenhahn et al., 2016). The dynamics of larch forests are particularly important, as they store more than twice the amount of SOC of all other boreal forest types in the continuous permafrost zone combined (Loranty et al., 2016). Despite this, larch forests in Siberia are notably under studied;

 indeed, the estimate of C stored in Russian forests is the least well constrained of all forest systems globally (Shuman et al., 2013).

 In this study, we aim to reduce the uncertainty of regional C estimates by providing a comprehensive assessment of vegetation, active layer, and permafrost C stocks in the Kolyma River watershed in Northeast Siberia, Russia. We present aboveground and belowground (to 1 m) C stocks from data collected from 20 sites across the watershed along with deep permafrost C pools to 15 m depth from a yedoma deposit and an alas (thermokarst depression). We compare variation in soil C pools at meter to kilometer scales in order to quantify the variability of permafrost C at small spatial scales. Additionally, we examine the drivers of thaw depth and C density of active layer soils to understand environmental controls over these variables across the watershed. Together, these analyses allow us to estimate C pools and controls over changes in these pools that will likely occur with climate change.

#### **2 METHODS**

### **2.1 Site description**

110 Our study area was a watershed ('Y4 watershed',  $\sim$ 3 km<sup>2</sup>; Figure 1) located within the 111 Kolyma River basin, which is the largest river basin  $(650,000 \text{ km}^2)$  completely underlain by continuous permafrost (Holmes et al., 2012). The Y4 watershed is located near Cherskiy, Sakha Republic, Russia approximately 130 km south of the Arctic Ocean and is underlain by yedoma, which is widespread across the region (Grosse et al., 2013). The climate is continental with short, 115 warm summers (Jul avg: 12 °C) and long, cold winters (Jan avg: -33 °C). Annual precipitation is low (~230 mm) and often occurs during summer (Cherskiy Meteorological Station; S. Davydov,

117 unpub data). Mean summer temperatures in this region increased by 1<sup>o</sup>C from 1938 to 2009 (Berner et al., 2013).

 There are two main types of cryogenic deposits within the watershed. Upland areas are Late Pleistocene syngenetic ice rich deposits of yedoma. Drained thaw lake depressions are underlain by alas consisting of lacustrine-wetland sediments in the upper pedon and taberal (i.e. yedoma that thawed in a talik) deposits in the lower part of the profile. Permafrost temperatures at 15 m vary from -2.8°C at the hilltops with relatively thin organic layers to -4°C in thermokarst depressions with thick (up to 20 cm) moss and peat layers (A. Kholodov, unpub data). Forests in the watershed are composed of a single larch species, *Larix cajanderi*, with a well-developed understory of deciduous shrubs (primarily *Betula nana*, *Salix* spp., and *Vaccinium uliginosum*), evergreen shrubs (e.g. *Vaccinium vitis-idaea, Empetrum nigrum, Rhododendron subarcticum*), forbs (e.g., *Equisetum scirpoides, Pyrola* spp., and *Valeriana capitate*), graminoids (*Calamagrostis* spp.), moss (e.g. *Aulacomnium palustre, Dicranum* spp., and *Polytrichum* spp ), and lichen (e.g. *Cladonia* spp, *Peltigera aphthosa,* and *Flavocetraria cucullata*).

**2.2 Site selection and sampling design**

 We selected 20 stands (i.e. 'sites') in the Y4 watershed that spanned a range of tree aboveground biomass, as inferred from tree shadows mapped using high-resolution (50 cm) WorldView-1 satellite imagery (Berner et al., 2012; Figure 1). All sites were located in forested stands except for one in a *Salix*-dominated riparian zone (Site 17) and another in a *Sphagnum*- dominated alas (Site 18; Table 1). Within each site, we established three 20 m long by 2 m wide plots, each of which was separated by 8 m and ran parallel to slope contours (Figure S1). In the

 absence of a discernable slope, transects were aligned north-south. All sampling was conducted in July 2012 and 2013 except stand age, which was sampled in 2016.

### **2.3 Stand Age**

 To determine stand age, we collected a wood slab or core from the base (~ 30 cm above the organic layer) of 5-10 trees sampled randomly within each stand. Wood samples were dried 146 at 60  $\degree$ C and then sanded sequentially with finer grit sizes to obtain a smooth surface. Each sample was then scanned and the annual growth rings were counted using WinDendro (Regent Instruments, Inc., Ontario).

## **2.4 Solar Insolation and Slope**

 Slope and aspect at each site were determined from a 4-m-resolution digital elevation model of the watershed created by the Polar Geospatial Center (http://www.pgc.umn.edu/) using stereo-pairs of World ViewX imagery. Solar insolation was estimated using the Solar Radiation analyses toolset in ArcGIS version 10 (ESRI , Redlands, CA). The toolset used variability in the orientation (slope and aspect) to calculate direct and diffuse radiation for each pixel of the elevation model in the Y4 watershed using viewshed algorithms (Fu and Rich, 2002; Rich et al., 1994). We report total insolation on the summer solstice for each pixel.

#### **2.5 Aboveground biomass**

160 We measured diameter at breast height (DBH; 1.4 m height) or basal diameter (BD; < 1.4

161 m height) of all trees and snags (i.e., dead trees standing  $\geq 45^{\circ}$  to the forest floor) within each 40-

162  $m^2$  plot (n= 3/site). Live and dead aboveground tree biomass were determined based on

 allometric equations developed from *L. cajanderi* trees harvested near Cherskiy (Alexander et al., 2012). Tree biomass was converted to C mass using a C concentration of 46% C for foliage (live trees only), 47% C for stemwood/bark and snag, and 48% C for branches (Alexander et al., 2012).

167 We estimated understory percent cover in six  $1-m^2$  subplots at each site; subplots were placed at both ends of each of the three plots (at 0 and 20 m; Figure S1). Understory vegetation was sorted into functional types, which included shrub (evergreen and deciduous), herbs (forb and graminoids), moss, lichen, and other (litter, woody debris and bare ground). In each site, 171 understory vascular plant biomass was determined in three  $0.25 \text{ m}^2$  quadrats, each of which was located within one of the percent cover plots. We measured basal diameter of tall deciduous shrubs (*Alnus* spp., *B. nana*, and *Salix* spp.) and used published allometric relationships to derive 174 biomass (Berner et al., 2015). All remaining vascular plants were harvested and dried at 60 °C for 48 hours for dry mass determination. We converted live understory biomass values to C pools by multiplying biomass by 48% C content. Following the line-intercept method for measuring woody debris (Brown, 1974), we set a

 20-m transect along the middle of each plot, and counted the number of times woody debris intercepted the transect for Class I fine woody debris (FWD; 0.0-0.49 cm diameter) and Class II 180 FWD (0.5-0.99 cm) along the first 2 m, Class III FWD (1.0 – 2.99cm) along the first 10 m, and classes IV FWD (3.0-4.99 cm), V FWD (5.0-6.99 cm), and downed coarse woody debris (CWD; 182 > 7 cm diameter) along the entire 20 m length. We calculated the mass of woody debris according to Alexander et al. (2012) using previously published multipliers for softwood boreal trees from the Northwest Territories of Canada for FWD (Nalder et al., 1997) and decay class and density values for softwood boreal tree species within Ontario, Canada for CWD (Ter-



196 clumping (Chen et al., 1997). Hemispherical photographs were taken ~1 m off the ground using

N-S reflector was used for N orientation, and photographs were taken using automatic settings at

a Sigma SD 15 digital reflex camera with Sigma 4.5 mm F2.8 EX DC circular fisheye lens. A

the center of each of the three transects at each site. The hemispherical photographs were

analyzed using Hemiview software.

**2.7 Thaw depth/organic layer depth**

 We measured thaw depth using a metal thaw probe every meter along a 20 m transect placed along the center of each plot (measured from 9 July through 3 August; does not represent maximum thaw). Organic layer depth (OLD) was measured at 5 m intervals along each transect by cutting through the active layer soil with a serrated knife and visually identifying and measuring the depth to the organic-mineral boundary.

# **2.8 Soil sampling and analysis**

 Active layer soils were collected from all sites. Surface permafrost soils (approximately the top 60 cm of frozen soil, which contained some frozen active layer soil) were sampled at seven sites (3 cores per site), and deep permafrost (15 m depth) was sampled at two sites (Sites 18 and 19). We collected six active layer samples from each site, one at each end of the 20-m- long plots. We used a serrated knife to collect an 8 cm x 8 cm sample from the organic layer, and a 2 cm diameter manual corer to collect the top 10 cm of mineral soil. When less than 5 cm of mineral soil was thawed at the time of sampling, the mineral soil sample was excluded from analysis (n=5). At the seven sites where surface permafrost was sampled, we collected mineral soil to frozen ground (average 28 cm thawed mineral soil depth) using a manual corer, and sampled approximately 60 cm depth of frozen soil with a Soil Ice and Permafrost Research Experiment (SIPRE) auger (7.62 cm diameter). We collected two deep permafrost cores with a 221 rotary drill rig (UKB-12/25, Drilling Technology Factory); one deep core was collected from a site underlain by yedoma and the other from an alas. Carbon pools presented for deep permafrost include C in the active layer sampled at the drilling location. Carbon pools reported for 1 m depth were calculated using the seven surface permafrost samples as well as the top 1 m of the deep core from the yedoma site. All permafrost samples were kept frozen until analyzed as described below.

 Surface permafrost cores were sectioned into 10 cm increments. Coarse-roots (> 2 mm) were removed from all active layer and surface permafrost soils, and fine roots and organic soils 229 were dried at 60 °C for 48 hours while mineral soils were dried at 105 °C for at least 48 hours. 230 Gravimetric water content (GWC) was determined as the ratio of soil water mass to soil dry 231 mass, and was reported as a percentage (i.e., GWC x 100). Organic matter content was



242 Bulk density (BD) was determined as the mass of dry soil per unit volume  $(g \text{ cm}^{-3})$ . Volume of active layer soil samples was determined by measuring the ground area and depth from where the soil sample was removed. Volume of permafrost samples was quantified by water displacement. Ice volume was determined based on soil water content and assuming an ice 246 density of 0.9167 g cm<sup>-3</sup>.

247 Soil C stocks in each depth increment were calculated as the product of %C, BD and soil 248 depth. For the deep permafrost samples, sub-samples used for %C, %OM, and BD measurements were collected from adjacent depth increments; therefore, for the %C-%OM regression and C pool calculations, we used adjacent depth increments or interpolated values between two adjacent depths.

**2.9 Statistical analysis**

 To compare the variance in soil C among sites and studies, we used the coefficient of 255 variation (CV), which is the ratio of the standard deviation to the mean. The CV is independent of the unit or magnitude and can be used to compare intra-site variation (how variable the data are relative to the mean value) among sites even if the mean of the sites is vastly different. We also used percent variation, which was calculated by subtracting the minimum value from the maximum value and dividing by the maximum value.

 We used a linear model to determine the relationship between canopy cover and LAI and larch biomass and the relationship between the different components of AGB. To determine 262 potential environmental drivers of thaw depth and soil C, we fit a mixed effects linear model using the nlme package in R (Pinherio et al., 2013), using average plot-level data (3/site) as a replicate for each site. The fixed effects were the environmental variables, and the random effect was the nested study design (plots within sites). Both thaw depth and soil C were log- transformed to meet the assumption of normality. After collinear explanatory variables were removed from analysis using a variance inflation factor of three (as suggested by Zuur et al. (2009)), we considered densiometry, organic layer depth, stand age, live shrub biomass, woody debris, tree density, snag density, summer insolation, percent herbaceous cover, percent moss cover, percent lichen cover, percent other cover, soil C, BD, and root C, as explanatory variables for the thaw depth model. For the soil C model the environmental variables considered were: slope, summer insolation, snag biomass, live tree biomass, live shrub biomass, woody debris, tree density, percent herbaceous cover, percent moss cover, percent lichen cover, percent other cover, thaw depth, organic layer depth, root carbon, and moisture. The best model for each analysis was selected using backwards stepwise reduction of variables to obtain the lowest



299 Larch aboveground biomass was also highly variable across the watershed, with some 300 sites as low as 0 or 1.7 g C m<sup>-2</sup> and others as high as 1,340 and 1,362 g C m<sup>-2</sup>. Of the three 301 techniques used for estimating canopy cover, LAI values from hemispherical photography (Table 302 2) showed the highest correlation with larch biomass ( $R^2$  = 0.69, p <0.001), but larch biomass 303 was also significantly associated with canopy density ( $R^2 = 0.5$ ,  $p < 0.001$ ). There was no 304 relationship between larch biomass and understory biomass ( $p = 0.4$ ); however, the percent cover 305 of tall shrubs was negatively related to both moss ( $R^2=0.2$ , p<0.001) and lichen cover ( $R^2=0.2$ , 306 p<0.001).

# 307 **3.3 Surface soils**

308 Average C content of the organic horizon was  $37.6 \ (\pm 0.8)$  %C, whereas C content of the 309 thawed mineral horizon (0-10 cm) was 4.6 ( $\pm$  0.48) %C. There were 2.24 ( $\pm$  1.22) kg C m<sup>-2</sup> 310 stored in the organic layer (average organic layer depth= $11.2 \pm 0.2$  cm) and  $1.96 \pm 0.07$ ) kg C 311  $\text{m}^2$  in the top 10 cm of the mineral layer (Table 4).

 There was large variation in BD, soil moisture (GWC), soil C content and thaw depth among sites (Table 5). Carbon content and GWC were more variable in mineral soils than in 314 organic (CV<sub>mineral</sub> = 0.55 for %C and 0.48 for GWC; CV<sub>organic</sub> = 0.15 for %C and 0.36 for GWC), 315 while BD was more variable in organic soils  $(CV_{\text{organic}} = 0.51; CV_{\text{mineral}} = 0.3)$ . While the CV of thaw depth was not particularly high (0.28), the difference between the sites with the highest and lowest thaw depth measured was still 65%, underscoring the heterogeneity of soil properties across the watershed. Variation in thaw depth was primarily due to stand age (Figure 3; Table 319 S2).

320 Soil C density in the top 10 cm of the ground surface (i.e., 0-10 cm soil depth, which may 321 have contained both organic and mineral soils) varied up to 93% across the watershed (range:

322 0.51-7.14 kg C m<sup>-2</sup>; Table 4; Table S2), but the coefficient of variation (CV) was larger within sites (0.32) than it was between sites (0.26), indicating that soil C is more variable at the meter scale than it is at the kilometer scale. The distribution of soil C density in the top 10 cm was best explained by soil moisture, percent moss, and percent lichen cover (Table S2); soil C density was positively related to soil moisture and negatively related to percent moss and lichen cover (Figure 4).

Soil in the top 30 cm of the profile contained on average  $4.8 \pm 0.3$  kg C m<sup>-2</sup>, but soil C density in the top 30 cm varied by 56% across the watershed as a whole. The average CV within a site was 0.16 whereas the CV among sites was 0.22, indicating C density at 30 cm is similar or 331 more variable across the watershed than at the meter scale. The top 1 m of soil contained  $10.9 \pm 1$ 332 0.8 kg C m<sup>-2</sup>(13.8  $\pm$  3.0 kg C m<sup>-2</sup> with alas site; Table S4). Soil C in the top 1 m varied by 63% across the watershed and by 44% among sites. The average CV within a site was 0.15 whereas among sites the CV was 0.20, indicating soil C to 1 m is similarly variable at the meter and 335 kilometer scales. Ice content in the top 1 m was on average  $68 \pm 2\%$  by volume, with a range of between 51% and 80%.

#### **3.5 Deep permafrost soils**

338 Deep permafrost soils (includes surface active layer to 15 m) contained 205 kg C m<sup>-2</sup> (site 19; yedoma deposit, non-ice wedge) and 331 kg C  $m<sup>-2</sup>$  (site 18; alas). Carbon density at each 1 340 m interval ranged from 7.87-21.63 kg C m<sup>-3</sup> in the yedoma deposit and 6.9-14.5 kg C m<sup>-3</sup> in the deeper portion of the alas (Figure 5; Table S5). The top 2 m of the alas were characterized by 342 particularly high C density  $({\sim}30 \text{ kg m}^{-3})$ .

 Highlighting the variability of C in deep permafrost, the total soil C density in the two cores varied by 38%. The alas site had higher GWC than the yedoma site in the first 2 m (GWC:

345 385  $\pm$  81% and 41  $\pm$  8%, respectively). Throughout the entire profile, GWC was 46  $\pm$  2% in the 346 yedoma core and  $100 \pm 23\%$  in the alas core. Overall, BD was similar between the two cores, and most of the variation in BD occurred in the top 5 m (Figure 5).

#### **4 DISCUSSION**

**4.1 Aboveground biomass**

 Aboveground C pools within the Y4 watershed represented only a small fraction (8%) of 352 total C pools, likely due to low tree density at most sites  $(< 0.09$  trees m<sup>-2</sup> in all but one site) and/or young stand ages at a few sites. Low-density, mature (> 75 years old) stands with no recent fire activity are common in this region (Berner et al. 2012); however, wildfires can 355 produce stands of considerably higher density ( $>$  3 trees m<sup>-2</sup>), which can substantially increase AGB and contribution to total C pools as stands mature (Alexander et al. 2012). Aboveground C pools were similar to those reported by Alexander et al. (2012) for 17 nearby stands of similar 358 age and density, but C in larch AGB was lower ( $\sim$ 23%) than a landscape-level estimate ( $\sim$  600 g  $\text{G m}^2$  across the Kolyma River basin (Berner et al. 2012). Our estimate for C stored in larch 360 AGB was also four times lower than that of a mature (155-yr old), mid-density (0.19 trees  $m<sup>-2</sup>$ ) 361 stand near Cherskiy and two times lower than a mature, low-density  $(0.08 \text{ trees m}^{-2})$  stand near Oymyakon, south of Cherskiy (Kajimoto et al., 2006). In addition, our larch AGB estimates fell 363 within the low range of larch stands across other high-latitude ( $> 64^{\circ}$  N) regions and were generally 3-10 times lower than other stands (Kajimoto et al., 2010). Our considerably lower estimates reflect both the sparse, open grown structure of our stands (Osawa and Kajimoto, 2010) and the poor soil environment (e.g., shallow rooting zone, low soil temperature, low N availability) found in stands near latitudinal and altitudinal treeline (Kajimoto et al. 2010).

 Despite the small contribution of AGB to total C pools across our stands, aboveground vegetation composition and structure were important factors related to soil C pools and permafrost thaw (see below). In addition, characteristics of aboveground vegetation are major determinants of land-atmosphere C fluxes (Bradshaw and Warkentin, 2015) and thus remain essential components of C dynamics even when pools are relatively low.

# **4.2 Variability of soil C pools**

 Soil C density is controlled by numerous biogeophysical factors such as climate, local geomorphology, soil parent material, time since last disturbance, and vegetation type, all of which lead to high variability in soil C pools at the regional and local scale. Our soil C pool estimates for a Siberian larch forest watershed fall within the range of published assessments that characterize this area (Alexander et al. 2012; Broderick et al. 2015), but are at the low end of other studies (Alexeyev and Birdsey, 1998; Hugelius et al., 2014; Matsuura et al., 2005; Palmtag 380 et al., 2015; Stolbovoi, 2006). For example, our mean estimate of  $4.8 \pm 1$  kg C m<sup>-2</sup> in the top 30 cm of soil is less than half of a published assessment of C stored in soils across Russian larch 382 forests (10.2 kg C m<sup>-2</sup>; Stolbovoi, 2006), and less than one third of the mean estimate for Turbel 383 soils across the permafrost region (14.7 kg C m<sup>-2</sup>; Hugelius et al., 2014); however, variation in 384 the permafrost region Turbel soil C pool is high  $(CV = 0.85$ ; Hugelius et al., 2014), and our mean estimate falls within one standard deviation of this regional mean.

 Within larch forests, there is substantial variation in soil C pools at regional scales, driven by variation in soil parent material and climate. For example, larch forests in Northeastern 388 Siberia store significantly more C (16 kg C m<sup>-2</sup>) in the active layer and have more variable soil C 389 pool estimates than larch forests in Central Siberia (6.3 kg C m<sup>-2</sup>) (Matsuura and Hirobe, 2010). There is also considerable variation in soil C pools within larch forests at smaller spatial scales.

 Indeed, the active layer in larch forests located within 50 km from our study site contained twice 392 as much C as found in our study  $(4.8 \pm 0.3 \text{ kg C m}^{-2} \text{ to } 30 \text{ cm})$ ; there was 8.3 kg C m<sup>-2</sup> in the active layer (38 cm) of a larch forest 44 km from the Y4 watershed (Matsuura et al., 2005) and  $9.5 \pm 2.9$  (SD) kg C m<sup>-2</sup> in the top 30 cm of soils from a forest 3 km away (Palmtag et al., 2015). This variation in soil C pools points to the extreme variability in soil C throughout the landscape, even at the kilometer scale. It also highlights the importance of sampling replication at small scales; with 21 total soil cores at seven sites, our CV (0.13) was less than half of other studies with lower site-level replication (Palmtag et al., 2015).

 As the climate warms, C in surface permafrost is becoming increasingly vulnerable to thawing and subsequent decomposition and loss to the atmosphere. As such, estimating variation in C pool size is critical for understanding permafrost climate feedbacks. The C stored 402 in the top 1 m of Y4 soils (10.9  $\pm$  0.8 kg C m<sup>-2</sup>) was similar to the average 1-m C pool reported 403 for the Yakutia region, which comprises a range of ecosystem types  $(8.1 \text{ kg C m}^2)$ . Alexeyev and Birdsey, 1998) but 37% lower than the 1 m soil C pool reported in a forest only 3 km away (17.3  $\pm 5.7$  kg C m<sup>-2</sup>; Palmtag et al., 2015). However, the percent difference between our estimate and 406 the nearby study (37%) was similar to the percent difference found between sites in the Y4 watershed (44%; Table 4), suggesting that these differences among studies are likely due to natural variation in the landscape.

 Carbon pool estimates from deep permafrost (>3 m) are limited across the Arctic (Hugelius et al., 2014; Schuur et al., 2015; Tarnocai et al., 2009), yet these data are critical for assessing variation in and controls on C density of yedoma, as these soils have particularly high C density at depth (Strauss et al., 2013; Zimov et al., 2006). The average carbon density of deep 413 permafrost from yedoma deposits in the Y4 watershed (13.5 kg C m<sup>-3</sup>) was similar to values



### **4.3 Micro-scale variation in soil carbon and thaw depth**

 In addition to the effects of parent material and climate on soil C storage, soil carbon pools are determined by the balance between biological inputs and losses due to microbial decomposition and lateral transport. These biological processes are, in turn, also heavily influenced by climate on regional and local scales. We found that soil samples with higher moisture content also had higher C density, which is likely due to both the effects of soil moisture on microbial activity and indirect effects of soil moisture on C inputs to soils through effects on plant productivity. In wetter soils, oxygen diffusion is limited, resulting in anaerobic 436 conditions where microbial decomposition is slower, and C can accumulate at a higher rate than

 in more well-drained, well-aerated soils (Schädel et al., 2016). However, this positive association between moisture and C density may also be a result of increased C inputs and plant productivity associated with higher soil moisture (Berner et al. 2013) or the lateral movement of dissolved organic C into the wetter sites. It is likely that environmental controls on both C inputs and losses are driving the patterns of C accumulation across the watershed.

 Plant species composition may also play an important role in soil C storage in boreal forests (Hollingsworth et al., 2008) through the quality and quantity of litter inputs and through vegetation effects on environmental controls such as soil moisture and temperature. Lichens and mosses are sometimes thought to encourage soil C storage through their promotion of low soil temperatures, higher moisture, and a relatively acidic environment (Bonan and Shugar, 1989). However, at our sites, increasing abundance of lichen and moss was associated with lower soil C storage, which may have been due to lower rates of C fixation (Turetsky et al., 2010), higher rates of decomposition of vascular plant litter in moss and lichen patches (Wardle et al., 2003), or impacts of vegetation functional types on soil moisture and soil temperatures. Because the interactions between soil processes and vegetation are bidirectional, the processes driving these observed patterns are unclear and further experimental work is needed to identify the mechanisms.

 Increasing thaw depth may result in increased C loss from boreal ecosystems; as more soil is thawed, more organic matter is available for decomposition. We found that thaw depth was negatively related to stand age; the deeper thaw depth observed in the younger sites could be a result of more recent burning events, which tend to increase thaw depth (O'Donnell et al., 2011; Yoshikawa et al., 2002).

**5 CONCLUSIONS**

 We found that the overwhelming majority of C in the Y4 watershed was stored belowground, but that the amount of C within any given pool was highly variable throughout the landscape; C storage in AGB varied up to 95% among sites, and there was 69% variation in the top 10 cm of soil, 36% in the top 30 cm, and 28% in the top 1 m. This variability among sites in our study was similar to the variability between our sites and others that were 3 to 50 km away (Matsuura et al., 2005; Palmtag et al., 2015), indicating a high level of natural variability at the meter and kilometer scales. Our results also indicate higher soil C variability in surface soils when compared to deeper soils, indicating that recent, on-going processes significantly contribute to soil C variability. Specifically, our results show that soil moisture, aboveground biomass, and vegetation community structure are influential in explaining near-surface 471 belowground C storage. These linkages between above and belowground processes, such as the negative relationship between stand age and thaw depth, have important implications for soil C vulnerability as tree lines shift and biomass and stand structure are increasingly impacted by fire, climate, and direct human disturbances.

**DATA AVAILABILITY**

 All data are available as supplemental material and through the Arctic Data Center through the following citation: Kathryn Heard, Susan Natali, Andrew Bunn, and Heather D. Alexander. 2015. Northeast Siberia Plant and Soil Data: Plant Composition and Cover, Plant and Soil Carbon Pools, and Thaw Depth. NSF Arctic Data Center. doi:10.5065/D6NG4NP0. 

#### **AUTHOR CONTRIBUTION**



 Succession in Cajander Larch (*Larix cajanderi*) Forests of Siberia, Ecosystems, 15(7), 1065–1082, doi:10.1007/s10021-012-9567-6, 2012.

- Alexeyev, V. A. and Birdsey, R. A.: Carbon Storage in Forests and Peatlands of Russia, Radnor, PA., 1998.
- Beck, P. S. A., Juday, G. P., Alix, C., Barber, V. A., Winslow, S. E., Sousa, E. E., Heiser, P., Herriges, J. D. and Goetz, S. J.: Changes in forest productivity across Alaska consistent with biome shift, Ecol. Lett., 14, 373–379, doi:10.1111/j.1461-0248.2011.01598.x, 2011.
- Beer, C.: Permafrost Sub-grid Heterogeneity of Soil Properties Key for 3-D Soil Processes and Future Climate Projections, Front. Earth Sci., 4(August), 1–7, doi:10.3389/feart.2016.00081, 2016.
- Berg, E. E., Henry, J. D., Fastie, C. L., Volder, A. D. De and Matsuoka, S. M.: Spruce beetle outbreaks on the Kenai Peninsula , Alaska , and Kluane National Park and Reserve , Yukon Territory : Relationship to summer temperatures and regional differences in disturbance regimes, For. Ecol. Manage., 227, 219–232, doi:10.1016/j.foreco.2006.02.038, 2006.
- Berner, L. T., Beck, P. S. A., Loranty, M. M., Alexander, H. D., MacK, M. C. and Goetz, S. J.: Cajander larch (Larix cajanderi) biomass distribution, fire regime and post-fire recovery in northeastern Siberia, Biogeosciences, 9(10), 3943–3959, doi:10.5194/bg-9-3943-2012, 2012.
- Berner, L. T., Beck, P. S. A., Bunn, A. G. and Goetz, S. J.: Plant response to climate change along the forest-tundra ecotone in northeastern Siberia, Glob. Chang. Biol., 19(11), 3449–3462, doi:10.1111/gcb.12304, 2013.
- Berner, L. T., Alexander, H. D., Loranty, M. M., Ganzlin, P., Mack, M. C., Davydov, S. P. and Goetz, S. J.: Biomass allometry for alder, dwarf birch, and willow in boreal forest and tundra ecosystems of far northeastern Siberia and north-central Alaska, For. Ecol. Manage., 337, 110–118, doi:10.1016/j.foreco.2014.10.027, 2015.
- Bonan, G. B. . and Shugar, H. H. .: Environmental Factors and Ecological Processes in Boreal Forests, Annu. Rev. Ecol. Syst., 20, 1–28, 1989.
- Bradshaw, C. and Warkentin, I. G.: Global estimates of boreal forest carbon stocks and flux, Glob. Planet. Change, 128(February), 24–30, doi:10.1016/j.gloplacha.2015.02.004, 2015.
- Brown, J. K.: Handbook for Inventorying Downed Woody Material, Ogden, Utah., 1974.
- Burnham, K. P. and Anderson, D. R.: Model Selection and Multimodel Inference: A Practical Information-Theoretic Approach, 2nd ed., Springer, New York., 2002.
- Carvalhais, N., Forkel, M., Khomik, M., Bellarby, J., Jung, M., Migliavacca, M., Mu, M., Saatchi, S., Santoro, M., Thurner, M., Weber, U., Ahrens, B., Beer, C., Cescatti, A., Randerson, J. T., Reichstein, M., Μu, M., Saatchi, S., Santoro, M., Thurner, M., Weber, U., Ahrens, B., Beer, C., Cescatti, A., Randerson, J. T., Reichstein, M., Mu, M., Saatchi, S., Santoro, M., Thurner, M., Weber, U., Ahrens, B., Beer, C., Cescatti, A., Randerson, J.
- T. and Reichstein, M.: Global covariation of carbon turnover times with climate in
- terrestrial ecosystems, Nature, 514(7521), 213–217, doi:10.1038/nature13731, 2014.
- Chapin, F. S., McGuire, A. D., Randerson, J., Pielske, R., Baldocchi, D., Hobbie, S. E., Roulet,
- N., Eugster, W., Kasischke, E. S., Rastetter, E. B., Zimov, S. A. and Running, S. W.: Arctic and boreal ecosystmes of western North America as components of the climate system, Glob. Chang. Biol., 6, 211–223, 2000.
- Chapin, F. S., Euskirchen, E. S., Tape, K. D., Thompson, C. D. C., Walker, D. A., McGuire, A. D., Rupp, T. S., Hinzman, L. D., Sturm, M., Serreze, M. C., McFadden, J. P., Key, J. R., Lloyd, A. H., Lynch, A. H., Beringer, J., Schimel, J. P., Chapman, W. L., Epstein, H. E., Jia, G., Ping, C.-L. L., Welker, J. M., McGuire, A. D., Rupp, T. S., Lynch, A. H.,

 Schimel, J. P., Beringer, J., Chapman, W. L., Epstein, H. E., Euskirchen, E. S., Hinzman, L. D., Jia, G., Ping, C.-L. L., Tape, K. D., Thompson, C. D. C., Walker, D. A. and Welker, J. M.: Role of land-surface changes in arctic summer warming, Science (80-. )., 310(5748), 657, doi:10.1126/science.1117368, 2005. Chen, J. M., Rich, P. M., Gower, S. T., Norman, J. M. and Plummer, S.: Leaf area index of boreal forests: Theory, techniques, and measurements, J. Geophys. Res., 102(D24), 429– 443, doi:10.1029/97JD01107, 1997. Chen, J. M., Menges, C. H. and Leblanc, S. G.: Global mapping of foliage clumping index using multi-angular satellite data, Remote Sens. Environ., 97(4), 447–457, doi:10.1016/j.rse.2005.05.003, 2005. Christensen, J. H., Kumar, K. K., Aldrian, E., An, S.-I., Cavalcanti, I. F. A., Castro, M. de, Dong, W., Goswami, P., Hall, A., Kanyanga, J. K., Kitoh, A., Kossin, J., Lau, N.-C., Renwick, J., Stephenson, D. B., Xie, S.-P. and Zhou, T.: Climate Phenomena and their Relevance for Future Regional Climate Change., in Climate Change 2013: The Physical Science Basis. Contribution of Working Group 1 to the fifth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, edited by T. . Stocker, D. Qin, G.-K. Plattner, M. Tignor, S. K. Allen, J. Boschung, A. Nauels, Y. Xia, V. Bex, and P. M. Midgley, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, United Kingdom and New York, NY, USA., 2013. Elmendorf, S. C., Henry, G. H. R., Hollister, R. D., Björk, R. G., Boulanger-Lapointe, N., Cooper, E. J., Cornelissen, J. H. C., Day, T. A., Dorrepaal, E., Elumeeva, T. G., Gill, M., Gould, W. A., Harte, J., Hik, D. S., Hofgaard, A., Johnson, D. R., Johnstone, J. F., Jónsdóttir, I. S., Jorgenson, J. C., Klanderud, K., Klein, J. A., Koh, S., Kudo, G., Lara, M., Lévesque, E., Magnússon, B., May, J. L., Mercado-Dı´az, J. A., Michelsen, A., Molau, U., Myers-Smith, I. H., Oberbauer, S. F., Onipchenko, V. G., Rixen, C., Schmidt, N. M., Shaver, G. R., Spasojevic, M. J., Þórhallsdóttir, Þ. E., Tolvanen, A., Troxler, T., Tweedie, C. E., Villareal, S., Wahren, C.-H., Walker, X., Webber, P. J., Welker, J. M. and Wipf, S.: Plot-scale evidence of tundra vegetation change and links to recent summer warming, Nat. Clim. Chang., 2(6), 453–457, doi:10.1038/nclimate1465, 2012. Euskirchen, E. S., Mcguire, a D., Chapin, F. S., Yi, S., Thompson, C. C. and Thompson3, C. C.: Changes in Vegetation in Northern Alaska under Scenarios of Climate Change, 2003– 2100: Implications for Climate Feedbacks Changes in vegetation in northern Alaska under scenarios of climate change, 2003-2100: implications for climate feedbacks, Ecol. Appl., 19(194), 1022–1043, doi:10.1890/08-0806.1, 2009. Fisher, J. P., Estop-Aragones, C., Thierry, A., Charman, D. J., Wolfe, S. A., Hartley, I. P., Murton, J. B., Williams, M. and Phoenix, G. K.: The influence of vegetation and soil characteristics on active-layer thickness of permafrost soils in boreal forest, Glob. Chang. Biol., 22(9), 3127–3140, doi:10.1111/gcb.13248, 2016. Fu, P. and Rich, P.: A geometric solar radiation model with applications in agriculture and forestry, Comput. Electron. Agric., 37(1–3), 25–35, doi:10.1016/S0168-1699(02)00115- 1, 2002. Goetz, S. J., Mack, M. C., Gurney, K. R., Randerson, J. T. and Houghton, R. A.: Ecosystem responses to recent climate change and fire disturbance at northern high latitudes: observations and model results contrasting northern Eurasia and North America, Environ. Res. Lett., 2(4), 45031, doi:10.1088/1748-9326/2/4/045031, 2007. Grosse, G., Robinson, J., Bryant, R., Taylor, M. D., Harper, W., DeMasi, A., Kyker-Snowman,

- E. Veremeeva, A., Schirrmeister, L. and Harden, J.: Distribution of late Pleistocene ice- rich syngenetic permafrost of the Yedoma Suite in east and central Siberia, Russia, Geol. Surv. Open File Rep. 2013-1078, 37pp [online] Available from: http://epic.awi.de/33878/, 2013. Guay, K. C., Beck, P. S. A., Berner, L. T., Goetz, S. J., Baccini, A. and Buermann, W.: Vegetation productivity patterns at high northern latitudes: A multi-sensor satellite data assessment, Glob. Chang. Biol., 20(10), 3147–3158, doi:10.1111/gcb.12647, 2014. Harden, J. W., Koven, C. D., Ping, C.-L., Hugelius, G., David McGuire, a., Camill, P., Jorgenson, T., Kuhry, P., Michaelson, G. J., O'Donnell, J. a., Schuur, E. a. G., Tarnocai, C., Johnson, K. and Grosse, G.: Field information links permafrost carbon to physical vulnerabilities of thawing, Geophys. Res. Lett., 39(15), 1–6, doi:10.1029/2012GL051958, 2012. Hobbie, S. E., Schimel, J. P., Trumbore, S. E. and Randerson, J. R.: Controls over carbon storage and turnover in high-latitude soils, Glob. Chang. Biol., 6(S1), 196–210, doi:10.1046/j.1365-2486.2000.06021.x, 2000. Hollingsworth, T. N., Schuur, E. A. G., Chapin, F. S. and Walker, M. D.: Plant community composition as a predictor of regional soil carbon storage in Alaskan boreal black spruce ecosystems, Ecosystems, 11(4), 629–642, doi:10.1007/s10021-008-9147-y, 2008. Holmes, R. M., McClelland, J. W., Peterson, B. J., Tank, S. E., Bulygina, E., Eglinton, T. I., Gordeev, V. V., Gurtovaya, T. Y., Raymond, P. A., Repeta, D. J., Staples, R., Striegl, R. G., Zhulidov, A. V. and Zimov, S. A.: Seasonal and Annual Fluxes of Nutrients and Organic Matter from Large Rivers to the Arctic Ocean and Surrounding Seas, Estuaries and Coasts, 35(2), 369–382, doi:10.1007/s12237-011-9386-6, 2012. Hugelius, G., Strauss, J., Zubrzycki, S., Harden, J. W., Schuur, E. A. G., Ping, C. L., Schirrmeister, L., Grosse, G., Michaelson, G. J., Koven, C. D., O'Donnell, J. A., Elberling, B., Mishra, U., Camill, P., Yu, Z., Palmtag, J. and Kuhry, P.: Estimated stocks of circumpolar permafrost carbon with quantified uncertainty ranges and identified data gaps, Biogeosciences, 11(23), 6573–6593, doi:10.5194/bg-11-6573-2014, 2014. Jean, M. and Payette, S.: Effect of vegetation cover on the ground thermal regime of wooded and non-wooded palsas, Permafr. Periglac. Process., 25(4), 281–294, doi:10.1002/ppp.1817, 2014. Johnson, K. D., Harden, J., McGuire, A. D., Bliss, N. B., Bockheim, J. G., Clark, M., Nettleton- Hollingsworth, T., Jorgenson, M. T., Kane, E. S., Mack, M., O'Donnell, J., Ping, C. L., Schuur, E. A. G., Turetsky, M. R. and Valentine, D. W.: Soil carbon distribution in Alaska in relation to soil-forming factors, Geoderma, 167–168, 71–84, doi:10.1016/j.geoderma.2011.10.006, 2011. Kajimoto, T., Matsuura, Y., Osawa, A., Abaimov, A. P., Zyryanova, O. A., Isaev, A. P. and Yefremov, D. P.: Size – mass allometry and biomass allocation of two larch species growing on the continuous permafrost region in Siberia, For. Ecol. Manage., 222, 314– 325, doi:10.1016/j.foreco.2005.10.031, 2006. Kajimoto, T., Osawa, A., Usoltsev, V. A. and Abaimov, A. P.: Biomass and Productivity of Siberian Larch Forest Ecosystems, in Permafrost Ecosystems: Siberian Larch Forests, vol. 209, edited by A. Osawa, O. Zyryanova, Y. Matsuura, T. Kajimoto, and R. Wein, pp. 99–120, Springer., 2010. Kasischke, E. S. and Turetsky, M. R.: Recent changes in the fire regime across the North
	- American boreal region Spatial and temporal patterns of burning across Canada and





- 641–52, doi:10.1111/gcb.12417, 2014. Schädel, C., Bader, M. K.-F., Schuur, E. A. G., Biasi, C., Bracho, R., Čapek, P., De Baets, S., Diáková, K., Ernakovich, J., Estop-Aragones, C., Graham, D. E., Hartley, I. P., Iversen, C. M., Kane, E., Knoblauch, C., Lupascu, M., Martikainen, P. J., Natali, S. M., Norby, R. J., O'Donnell, J. A., Chowdhury, T. R., Šantrůčková, H., Shaver, G., Sloan, V. L., Treat, C. C., Turetsky, M. R., Waldrop, M. P. and Wickland, K. P.: Potential carbon emissions dominated by carbon dioxide from thawed permafrost soils, Nat. Clim. Chang., 6(June), 1–5, doi:10.1038/nclimate3054, 2016. Schirrmeister, L., Grosse, G., Wetterich, S., Overduin, P. P., Strauss, J., Schuur, E. A. G. and Hubberten, H. W.: Fossil organic matter characteristics in permafrost deposits of the northeast Siberian Arctic, J. Geophys. Res. Biogeosciences, 116(3), doi:10.1029/2011JG001647, 2011. Schneider Von Deimling, T., Grosse, G., Strauss, J., Schirrmeister, L., Morgenstern, A., Schaphoff, S., Meinshausen, M. and Boike, J.: Observation-based modelling of permafrost carbon fluxes with accounting for deep carbon deposits and thermokarst activity, Biogeosciences, 12(11), 3469–3488, doi:10.5194/bg-12-3469-2015, 2015. Schuur, E. A. G., McGuire, A. D., Grosse, G., Harden, J. W., Hayes, D. J., Hugelius, G., Koven, C. D. and Kuhry, P.: Climate change and the permafrost carbon feedback, Nature, 520(January 2016), 171–179, doi:10.1038/nature14338, 2015. Shmelev, D., Veremeeva, A., Kraev, G., Kholodov, A., Spencer, R. G. M. and Walker, W. S.: Estimation and Sensitivity of Carbon Storage in Permafrost of North-Eastern Yakutia, Permafr. Periglac. Process., (August 2016), doi:10.1002/ppp.1933, 2017. Shuman, J. K., Shugart, H. H. and Krankina, O. N.: Assessment of carbon stores in tree biomass for two management scenarios in Russia, Environ. Res. Lett., 8(4), 1–9, doi:10.1088/1748-9326/8/4/045019, 2013. Siewert, M. B., Hanisch, J., Weiss, N., Kuhry, P., Maximov, T.C. and Hugelius G. (2015), Comparing carbon storage of Siberian tundra and taiga permafrost ecosystems at very high spatial resolution, J. Geophys. Res. Biogeosci., 120, 1973–1994, doi:10.1002/2015JG002999. Soja, A. J., Shugart, H. H., Sukhinin, A., Conard, S. and Stackhouse, P. W.: Satelliet-Derived Mean Fire Return Intervals As Indicators of Change in Siberia ( 1995 – 2002 ), Mitig. Adapt. Strateg. Glob. Chang., 75–96, 2006. Soja, A. J., Tchebakova, N. M., French, N. H. F., Flannigan, M. D., Shugart, H. H., Stocks, B. J., Sukhinin, A. I., Parfenova, E. I., Chapin, F. S. and Stackhouse, P. W.: Climate-induced boreal forest change: Predictions versus current observations, Glob. Planet. Change, 56(3–4), 274–296, doi:10.1016/j.gloplacha.2006.07.028, 2007. Stolbovoi, V.: Soil carbon in the forests of Russia, Mitig. Adapt. Strateg. Glob. Chang., 11(1), 203–222, doi:10.1007/s11027-006-1021-7, 2006. Strauss, J., Schirrmeister, L., Grosse, G., Wetterich, S., Ulrich, M., Herzschuh, U. and Hubberten, H. W.: The deep permafrost carbon pool of the Yedoma region in Siberia and Alaska, Geophys. Res. Lett., 40(23), 6165–6170, doi:10.1002/2013GL058088, 2013. Sturm, M., Schimel, J., Michaelson, G., Welker, J. M., Oberbauer, S. F., Liston, G. E., Fahnestock, J. and Romanovsky, V. E.: Winter Biological Processes Could Help Convert Arctic Tundra to Shrubland, Bioscience, 55(1), 17, doi:10.1641/0006- 3568(2005)055[0017:WBPCHC]2.0.CO;2, 2005. Swann, A. L., Fung, I. Y., Levis, S., Bonan, G. B. and Doney, S. C.: Changes in Arctic
	-

 vegetation amplify high-latitude warming through the greenhouse effect, Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci., 107(4), 1295–1300, doi:10.1073/pnas.0913846107, 2010. Tarnocai, C., Canadell, J. G., Schuur, E. a. G., Kuhry, P., Mazhitova, G. and Zimov, S.: Soil organic carbon pools in the northern circumpolar permafrost region, Global Biogeochem. Cycles, 23(2), doi:10.1029/2008GB003327, 2009. Tautenhahn, S., Lichstein, J. W., Jung, M., Kattge, J., Bohlman, S. A., Heilmeier, H., Prokushkin, A., Kahl, A. and Wirth, C.: Dispersal limitation drives successional pathways in Central Siberian forests under current and intensified fire regimes, Glob. Chang. Biol., 22(6), 2178–2197, doi:10.1111/gcb.13181, 2016. Ter-Mikaelian, M. T., Colombo, S. J. and Chen, J.: Amount of downed woody debris and its prediction using stand characteristics in boreal and mixedwood forests of Ontario, Canada, Can. J. For. Res., 38(8), 2189–2197, doi:10.1139/X08-067, 2008. Trahan, M. W. and Schubert, B. A.: Temperature-induced water stress in high-latitude forests in response to natural and anthropogenic warming, Glob. Chang. Biol., 22(2), 782–791, doi:10.1111/gcb.13121, 2016. Trumbore, S. E. and Harden, J. W.: Accumulation and turnover of carbon in organic and mineral soils of the BOREAS northern study area, J. Geophys. Res., 102(D24), 817–28, 1997. 801 Turetsky, M. R., Mack, M. C., Hollingsworth, T. N. and Harden, J. W.: The role of mosses in ecosystem succession and function in Alaska's boreal forest, Can. J. For. Res., 40(7), 1288–1301, doi:10.1139/X10-081, 2010. Ulrich, M., Grosse, G., Strauss, J. and Schirrmeister, L.: Quantifying Wedge-Ice Volumes in Yedoma and Thermokarst Basin Deposits, Permafr. Periglac. Process., 25, 151–161, doi:10.1002/ppp.1810, 2014. Vitharana, U. W. A., Mishra, U., Jastrow, J. D., Matamala, R. and Fan, Z.: Observational needs for estimating Alaskan soil carbon stocks under current and future climate, J. Geophys. Res. Biogeosci., 122, 415–429, doi:10.1002/2016JG003421, 2017.. Walker, X. J., Mack, M. C. and Johnstone, J. F.: Stable carbon isotope analysis reveals widespread drought stress in boreal black spruce forests, Glob. Chang. Biol., 21(8), 3102–3113, doi:10.1111/gcb.12893, 2015. Walter Anthony, K. M., Zimov, S. a., Grosse, G., Jones, M. C., Anthony, P. M., Iii, F. S. C., Finlay, J. C., Mack, M. C., Davydov, S., Frenzel, P. and Frolking, S.: A shift of thermokarst lakes from carbon sources to sinks during the Holocene epoch, Nature, 511(7510), 452–456, doi:10.1038/nature13560, 2014. Wardle, D. A., Nilsson, M. C., Zackrisson, O. and Gallet, C.: Determinants of litter mixing effects in a Swedish boreal forest, Soil Biol. Biochem., 35(6), 827–835, doi:10.1016/S0038-0717(03)00118-4, 2003. Yoshikawa, K., Bolton, W. R., Romanovsky, V. E., Fukuda, M. and Hinzman, L. D.: Impacts of wildfire on the permafrost in the boreal forests of Interior Alaska, J. Geophys. Res., 108(D1), 16–17, doi:10.1029/2001JD000438, 2002. Zimov, S. A., Davydov, S. P., Zimova, G. M., Davydova, A. I., Schuur, E. A. G., Dutta, K. and Chapin, I. S.: Permafrost carbon: Stock and decomposability of a globally significant carbon pool, Geophys. Res. Lett., 33(20), 1–5, doi:10.1029/2006GL027484, 2006. Zuur, A. F., Ieno, E. N., Walker, N. J., Saveliev, A. A. and Smith, G. M.: Mixed Effects Models and Extensions in Ecology with R., 2009. 

# **FIGURE DESCRIPTIONS**

 **Figure 1.** Location of the Y4 watershed in relation to Russia (inset) and location of the sampling sites within the Y4 catchment.

- 
- **Figure 2.** Average carbon density of all sites in the Y4 watershed (top: above and
- belowground to 1 m; bottom: aboveground only). Bars indicate standard error.
- 
- **Figure 3.** Relationship between thaw depth and stand age. Each point represents the
- 839 average thaw depth measurement taken along a transect (three transects/site) and the stand age
- of the entire site. Thaw depths were measured in July/August of 2012 and 2013.
- 
- **Figure 4.** Relationship between SOC in the top 10 cm of soil and moisture, moss cover, and
- 843 lichen cover. Each point represents the average SOC measured at each transect (three
- transects/site) and its corresponding moisture content or the average moss or lichen cover
- measured at that transect.
- 
- **Figure 5.** Bulk density, carbon density, and ice content of the two deep (15 m) permafrost soil cores.

# 849 **TABLES**

Site	Latitude	Longitude	Slope	Aspect	<b>Summer Insolation</b>	Stand Age
Number	(Degrees North)	(Degrees East)	(Degrees)	(Degrees)	$(WH m^{-2})$	(yrs)
1	68.74747	161.38988	5	160	4507	155
$\overline{2}$	68.74529	161.38908	10	8	3950	167
3	68.74472	161.41486	14	249	4399	203
$\overline{4}$	68.74164	161.41562	9	245	4409	23
5	68.74834	161.41350	10	357	3954	218
6	68.74939	161.41759	8	225	4509	205
7	68.74915	161.39000	5	57	4239	155
8	68.74932	161.38820	7	36	4132	208
9	68.75267	161.38544	8	340	4038	202
10	68.75352	161.39455	16	72	4008	211
11	68.74869	161.40834	10	222	4533	123
12	68.74837	161.40237	10	63	4121	71
13	68.74660	161.40433	17	61	3856	179
14	68.74513	161.40063	$\mathbf{1}$	103	4361	40
15	68.75188	161.39095	3	237	4410	221
16	68.75519	161.40013	3	294	4307	200
17	68.74152	161.41411	8	225	4479	
18	68.74632	161.38776	3	84	4314	
19	68.74479	161.38410	6	61	4231	26
20	68.74333	161.40688	5	124	4429	

**Table 1:** Site Characteristics. All sites were in forested areas except #17 (riparian); Site #18 (alas) had few scattered trees located along one end of the sampling transects.

Site Number	LAI (Hemispherical Photography)	LAI $(LAI-$ 2000)	Larch Density (trees/m <sup>2</sup> )	Snag Density (snags/m <sup>2</sup> )	Canopy Cover $(\%)$	Understory Shrub Cover $(\% )$	Herbaceous cover $(\% )$	Moss Cover $(\%)$	Lichen Cover $(\% )$	Other Cover $(\%)$
$\mathbf{I}$	0.03(0.00)	0.13	0.09(0.05)	0.00	22.4(3.2)	45.2(2.7)	3.5 $(1.7)$	22.0(3.4)	15.6(4.9)	12.4(3.4)
$\overline{2}$	0.22(0.02)	0.13	0.04(0.00)	0.00	16.0 $(4.0)$	49.4 (5.4)	4.8 $(2.4)$	25.0(4.4)	6.9 $(2.9)$	13.8 $(6.0)$
3	0.53(0.03)	0.68	0.08(0.03)	0.00	43.2 $(7.4)$	60.3(9.0)	0.7(0.3)	31.3(9.4)	3.4(2.6)	4.3 $(0.6)$
4	0.02(0.01)	0.00	0.08(0.07)	0.00	2.6(2.6)	72.3(7.9)	2.5(1.6)	7.4(2.4)	3.4 $(2.1)$	14.3 $(5.7)$
5	0.37(0.05)	1.35	0.08(0.02)	0.03(0.01)	32.3 $(7.6)$	51.5 $(4.9)$	4.2 $(1.4)$	14.4(2.9)	16.9 $(4.1)$	13.1(2.4)
6	0.38(0.03)	0.47	0.06(0.01)	0.03(0.01)	26.0(4.6)	57.9 (7.2)	8.4(5.9)	17.4(5.2)	3.6 $(1.3)$	12.1(3.8)
	0.15(0.08)	0.00	0.05(0.02)	0.00	17.6(8.4)	34.8(3.5)	3.4 $(0.8)$	34.0 $(7.1)$	22.8(6.4)	4.8 $(1.9)$
8	0.06(0.04)	0.29	0.02(0.00)	0.00	7.0(2.1)	34.8 $(4.5)$	3.8 $(1.8)$	32.5(7.9)	24.8 $(9.5)$	4.0 $(2.3)$
9	0.07(0.02)	0.00	0.01(0.00)	0.00	9.4 $(1.6)$	44.2 $(5.5)$	$0.0\,$	33.5(5.0)	16.7 $(7.6)$	5.6 $(1.6)$
10	0.30(0.09)	1.41	0.08(0.04)	0.04(0.02)	24.3(6.2)	49.2 $(10.6)$	8.6(2.9)	29.8(8.8)	5.3 $(1.4)$	7.1 $(2.5)$
11	0.05(0.03)	0.22	0.02(0.01)	0.00	4.7 $(1.5)$	33.6 $(6.9)$	5.8 $(3.0)$	15.3(4.5)	30.6 $(8.0)$	15.0(5.9)
12	0.01(0.00)	0.00	0.02(0.01)	0.00	0.0(0.0)	47.1(7.4)	7.5 $(4.0)$	20.2(3.7)	19.0(5.3)	6.9(3.2)
13	0.23(0.07)	0.82	0.07(0.01)	0.02(0.01)	18.9 $(3.0)$	47.4 $(8.1)$	4.2 $(2.6)$	25.6(8.2)	13.6 $(6.2)$	9.1(0.8)
14	0.00(0.00)	0.00	0.03(0.02)	0.00	0.8(0.8)	47.2 (12.0)	5.8 $(3.7)$	11.3(3.8)	33.5 (13.9)	2.3(1.1)
15	0.03(0.01)	0.00	0.02(0.01)	0.00	3.8 $(1.0)$	41.3 $(3.9)$	3.8 $(1.7)$	22.4(4.5)	21.9(4.6)	10.4(5.5)
16	0.31(0.13)	0.88	0.05(0.01)	0.00	18.5(7.7)	35.6(7.6)	2.2(0.6)	32.2(11.6)	25.9(9.0)	4.1 $(1.5)$
17			0.0	0.00	13.9(13.9)	65.8 $(15.1)$	11.1 $(4.4)$	0.1(0.1)	0.1(0.1)	23.4 (11.5)
18			0.01(0.01)	0.00	5.2	51.9 $(6.5)$	12.5(4.1)	32.0 $(5.0)$	0.2(0.2)	3.3 $(1.9)$
19		2.03	0.43(0.28)	0.00	16.2(2.2)					
20			0.06(0.03)	0.04(0.02)	6.1 $(1.3)$					

**Table 2:** Leaf area index (LAI), tree and snag density, and percent cover of the 20 plots in the Y4 watershed. Values in parenthesis are standard error of the mean. Other cover includes woody debris and bare ground.

Table 3: Aboveground biomass (g C m<sup>-2</sup>) at each site in the Y4 watershed. Total aboveground biomass is the sum of the larch, understory vascular, standing dead tree, and woody debris biomass. Understory vascular biomass does not include lichen and moss. Values in parenthesis are standard error of the mean.

<b>Site</b>	Larch	<b>Understory</b>	<b>Shrub</b>	<b>Standing</b>	<b>Woody</b>	<b>Total live</b>	<b>Total dead</b>	<b>Total</b>
<b>Number</b>		vascular		dead tree	debris			Aboveground
	392 (313)	112(41)	52 (52)	0(0)	322 (87)	504 (304)	322 (87)	826 (389)
$\overline{2}$	603 (244)	140(50)	75 (40)	0(0)	76(7)	744 (213)	76(7)	820 (217)
3	743 (125)	320 (106)	209 (146)	0(0)	86 (15)	1063(230)	86 (15)	1149 (235)
4	67 (66)	611 (166)	529 (176)	0(0)	59 (17)	679 (153)	59 (17)	737 (167)
5	1362 (516)	193 (27)	96 (32)	219 (96)	122(28)	1555 (490)	341 (105)	1896 (579)
6	1340 (635)	257 (81)	146 (69)	386 (236)	131 (50)	1597 (560)	517 (218)	2114 (361)
	263(65)	271 (86)	209(73)	0(0)	24(8)	533 (45)	24(8)	557 (52)
8	471 (303)	170 (115)	124 (108)	27(27)	10(3)	641 (294)	37(29)	678 (319)
9	122(68)	176 (93)	64 (35)	0(0)	37(11)	298 (60)	37(11)	335 $(65)$
10	697 (405)	183 (64)	51 (51)	262 (140)	106(16)	880 (400)	368 (153)	1248 (501)
11	227 (201)	185 (87)	95 (95)	0(0)	62 (17)	413 (285)	62 $(17)$	475 (278)
12	6(6)	116 (39)	22(13)	0(0)	18(4)	122(45)	18(4)	140 $(45)$
13	698 (124)	139 (25)	32(18)	93 (69)	306 (189)	837 (126)	399 (146)	1236 (217)
14	5(4)	253 (184)	169 (152)	0(0)	16(2)	259 (183)	16(2)	275 (181)
15	142 (85)	180(41)	82 (48)	0(0)	71 (63)	322 (59)	71(63)	393(6)
16	984 (491)	470 (256)	417 (261)	0(0)	56 (21)	1454 (628)	56 (21)	1510 (633)
17	0(0)	2657 (2575)	2621 (2588)	0(0)	118 (72)	2657 (2575)	118 (72)	2775 (2642)
18	2(2)	263 (46)	245 (42)	0(0)	16(5)	265 (47)	16(5)	281 (50)
19	35(21)	465 (172)	382 (177)	0(0)	116 $(45)$	500 (159)	116 $(45)$	615 (196)
20	585 (217)	321 (163)	156 (105)	47 (26)	158 (140)	906 (173)	205 (118)	1111 (244)





			vanies in parenthesis are standard error Organic					
Site	Thaw		Bulk Density $(g \text{ cm}^{-3})$		Gravimetric Water Content (%)		Carbon Content $(\% )$	
	depth	Layer						
Number	(cm)	Depth						
		(cm)	Organic	Mineral	Organic	Mineral	Organic	Mineral
	23(1)	13(1)	0.078(0.021)	0.52(0.16)	198.9 (34.4)	64.7 (17.4)	37.6(3.5)	6.9 $(2.5)$
$\overline{2}$	22(1)	11(1)	0.040(0.011)	0.64(0.05)	203.8(28.0)	33.9(5.8)	38.3 $(4.1)$	2.4(0.5)
3	24(1)	14(1)	0.062(0.011)	0.70(0.11)	103.3(16.2)	29.1(4.4)	30.4(2.2)	2.3(0.6)
4	41 $(2)$	10(1)	0.148(0.063)	0.54(0.14)	107.3(28.9)	61.0 $(15.6)$	26.6(4.0)	8.7(3.0)
5	23(1)	8(1)	0.120(0.032)	1.02(0.08)	220.2(23.1)	25.6(2.1)	39.2(3.2)	1.6 $(0.3)$
6	21(2)	9(1)	0.113(0.039)	0.63(0.05)	182.0(19.8)	34.2 $(6.1)$	39.0 $(3.0)$	3.8 $(1.0)$
7	21(1)	12(1)	$0.026$ $(0.005)$	0.76(0.18)	348.5 (48.4)	43.6 $(10.2)$	44.4 $(2.0)$	3.9 $(1.2)$
8	16(1)	11(1)	0.027(0.002)	0.68(0.10)	304.9(32.1)	46.4 $(10.3)$	46.7 $(0.6)$	4.4 $(1.1)$
9	26(2)	13(1)	0.082(0.010)	0.64(0.12)	171.3(29.5)	46.5(11.2)	30.9 $(4.4)$	5.5(2.1)
10	23 (1)	11(1)	$0.048$ $(0.007)$	0.89(0.05)	272.6 (15.2)	26.5(1.7)	43.6 $(1.9)$	1.6(0.2)
11	35(2)	10(1)	0.060(0.023)	0.84(0.12)	142.8(17.8)	39.4 $(6.9)$	30.5(3.3)	3.6 $(1.6)$
12	29(2)	10(1)	0.053(0.020)	0.67(0.10)	247.7 (17.5)	58.3 (10.7)	43.5 $(1.8)$	5.0(1.0)
13	29(1)	12(1)	0.042(0.008)	0.71(0.11)	194.1(15.4)	48.6 (12.6)	40.0 $(1.4)$	4.0 $(1.0)$
14	42 $(2)$	8(1)	0.103(0.016)	0.82(0.10)	165.8(14.7)	31.0(7.2)	32.4(3.8)	3.0 $(1.6)$
15	28(2)	12(1)	0.150(0.099)	0.92(0.10)	419.1 (105.4)	39.9 $(10.6)$	38.3(3.5)	2.6(0.9)
16	24(1)	12(1)	0.042(0.009)	0.76(0.18)	256.3(38.8)	49.5 (15.8)	40.2 $(2.1)$	5.9 $(3.4)$
17	45 $(2)$	9(2)		0.46(0.11)		50.9 $(7.6)$	$\blacksquare$	8.7(2.8)
18	26(1)	18(1)	0.059(0.012)	0.39(0.20)	346.8 (45.4)	123.2(31.2)	39.9(3.3)	8.7(2.6)
19	36(2)	14(2)	$0.078$ $(0.022)$	1.40(0.09)	204.9 (52.3)	22.8(0.4)	33.5(3.4)	1.0(0.1)
20	(1) 29	9(1)	0.118(0.001)	0.65(0.31)	252.9 (76.6)	76.1 (28.4)	29.9(4.4)	8.6(4.9)

**Table 5:** Properties of thawed soil in the Y4 watershed. The mineral layer was collected to approximately 10 cm below the organic layer (see methods). No relationship existed between sample date and thaw depth or sample date and water content. Values in parenthesis are standard error.

 $\overline{4}$ 





 $\overline{0}$ 



 $\overline{4}$ 





 $\label{eq:8} 8$ 

