#### Ecosystem Functions and Ecosystem Services – Ecosystem Services of Riparian Ecosystems



Frank M. THOMAS, Birgit KLEINSCHMIT





Geobotany, University of Trier



University of Trier, TU Berlin

# Ecosystem Functions and Ecosystem Services – Definitions

Reiss et al. (2009), Trends in Ecology and Evolution 24: 505-514:

#### Ecosystem functions (ESF) = ecosystem processes:

"Changes in energy and matter over time and space through biological activity ... governed by the interplay of abiotic factors, [mediated] by organisms."

"Ecosystem functioning: the joint effects of all processes that sustain an ecosystem."

#### Key ecosystem processes:

- Primary productivity;
- Resource consumption;
- Trophic interactions;
- Respiration;
- Decomposition.

#### ESF studied in riparian forests:

- Production of above-ground tree biomass;
- Water use.



#### Ecosystem Services – Definition

Millenium Ecosystem Assessment (Hassan et al. 2005, vol. 1):

"Ecosystem services are benefits people obtain from ecosystems."

#### Ecosystem services (ESS) comprise:

- Provisioning services (PS): e.g., production/storage of food, water, fiber, fuel;
- Supporting services (SS): e.g., biomass production, nutrient cycling, soil formation;
- Regulating services (RS): e.g., mitigation of disturbances and catastrophic events;
- Cultural services (CS): e.g., recreation, education, spiritual benefits.

#### ESS studied in riparian forests:

- PS, SS: Production of above-ground tree biomass;
- RS: Shelter from sand drift.

## Populus euphratica is a phreatophyte ..

... "a plant that habitually obtains its water supply from the zone of saturation, either directly or through the capillary fringe."

(Meinzer 1923, U.S. Geological Survey Water-Supply Paper 494).



- ① Establishment of seedlings (generative phase);
- Shoots partly covered with sand (or decrease in the groundwater level) (onset of vegetative phase);
  Dune formation.

Rapid root growth of *P. euphratica* 

(M. Manegold)

University of Trier, TU Berlin

## In *Populus euphratica*, O root suckers can form extensive clones



Clone size of *Populus euphratica*: up to 121 ha (Vonlanthen et al. 2010, *Am J Bot*)

→ Vegetative regeneration gains importance (but is increasingly hampered) with increasing distance to the groundwater.

University of Trier, TU Berlin



*Populus euphratica* stands growing at larger distances to the groundwater ...

... are older and sparser,

... have a lower capability of regeneration;

 $\rightarrow$  will eventually die off.

University of Trier, TU Berlin





- MODIS time series NDVI, 250m, 16-days
- *Tamarix* 1km from Tarim (near Korghan)
- strong positive trend after first water diversion
  - followed by a trend break in Sept 2002
  - steady state since then



**River regulation** 

#### ESF and ESS of riparian ecosystems

#### Trends in post-disturbance recovery rates of Tugai forest

- **Two time periods** under investigation (1984-1999 & 2000-'15) with Landsat Sensor
- More than 1/2 of poplar & grass area has negative trend before water diversion (middle section)
- Upper & Middle section have highest trend increase after water diversion





## Riparian Populus euphratica forests: study sites



Hyper-arid climate:

Annual precipitation: 33 – 104 mm;

Annual mean temperature: 11 °C;

Annual potential evaporation: ca. 2600 mm.

Projects: Xayar: SuMaRiO (2011 – 2015) Cele: EU INCO-DC, 1998 – 2001

University of Trier, TU Berlin

## Structure of the Populus euphratica stands

X = Xayar; Y = Yingbazar, A = Arghan;  $1 \rightarrow 3$ : decrease in water supply

Site and plot	Y1	X1	A1	A2	A3	Y2	Y3
			(+ tEW <sup>1</sup> )				Ν
Distance to groundwater (m)	2.0	2.0	≈ 5.0	≈ 5.0	6.6	7.5	12,0
Tree age (years; 3-year average)	26	30	46	37	52	28	77
Stand density (trees ha <sup>-1</sup> )	467	121	166	257	59	378	67
Tree cover (%)	81	20	31	29	5	35	6
Basal area (m² ha-1)	18.7	5.9	15.9	16.4	5.8	15.7	13.3
Total above-ground tree biomass (t ha-1)	55.6	13.9	28.0	25.6	6.9	31.3	15.6

<sup>1</sup> temporary "ecological water"

 $\rightarrow$  Larger groundwater distance  $\rightarrow$  older, sparser stands; lower biomass.

## Above-ground wood production of poplar stands in the last 3 years of analyses



Wood production calculated using tree-ring analyses and allometric regressions adopted from Chen & Li (1984), *For. Sci. Technol. Xinjiang* **3**: 8-16

- Productivity within the range of typical woody desert vegetation ( $\leq 2.6$  t ha<sup>-1</sup> a<sup>-1</sup>),
- but lower than in young (20-yr-old) coppice stands ( $\leq 6.1$  t ha<sup>-1</sup> a<sup>-1</sup>; Qira site);

 $\rightarrow$  Significant relationships with tree age and stand density via groundwater distance.

### Groundwater distances: long-term BAI increment



 $\rightarrow$  Trees at small groundwater distance  $\rightarrow$  potentially larger basal area increment.

University of Trier, TU Berlin

## Changes in the course of the Tarim River

#### **Middle reaches**



University of Trier, TU Berlin

## Study site Yingbazar: basal area increment related to river run-off

Populus euphratica stand at a <u>close distance</u> to the groundwater (Y1; 2.0 m); 1971 – 2005; river run-off of the preceding years:





to the groundwater.

(Data from Diploma Thesis J. Ahlborn and from Thevs et al. 2008, Phytocoenologia 38: 65-84)

University of Trier, TU Berlin

## Study site Xayar: Effects of use intensity (wood harvest by pollarding)



No pollarding (tree height: 11.9 m) Moderate pollarding (tree height: 7.3 m)

Intense pollarding (tree height: 6.4 m)

University of Trier, TU Berlin

## Study site Xayar: Use intensity and basal area increment



(From: Lang et al. 2015, For. Ecol. Manage. 353: 87–96)

## A word on biodiversity ...

3-5 relevés per plot, 400 m<sup>2</sup>; T = tree layer, S = shrub layer, H = herb layer

Plant species	Coverage (%)					
	Y1	Y2	Y3	A1	A2	A3
Populus euphratica, T	18	15	3	11	13	2
Populus euphratica, S	1	2		0.3	0.3	
Tamarix ramosissima, S	1	0.2		4		< 0.1
Halimodendron halodendron, S	0.5					
Lycium ruthenicum, S		0.2			< 0.1	
Cynanchum sibiricum, S	0.1					
Populus euphratica, H	0.1			< 0.1		
Tamarix ramosissima, H				< 0.1		
Phragmites australis, H	25					
Glycyrrhiza inflata, H	0.8					
Cirsium cv. arvense, H	< 0.1					
Heteropappus altaicus (?), H	< 0.1		Ν			N
Mean number of species	6.7	2		1.6	1.2	0.8

#### $\rightarrow$ Riparian forests are species-poor, but can harbor important medicinal plants.

#### Conclusions

Supplementary water from river run-off fosters recovery of vegetation and enhances stem increment growth (up to a distance of  $\approx$  5 m above GW level?).

With increasing distance to the groundwater level ...:

- ... Poplar trees are older and lose their capability of generative (and vegetative) regeneration;
- ... Poplar stands are sparser, genetically less diverse, display a reduced tree cover and produce less wood;
- ... Tree growth becomes decoupled from water supply by the river;
  - → Redirection of water from stands close to the groundwater towards stands with larger distances to the groundwater might reduce growth in stands close to groundwater.
- Poplar trees can tolerate moderate intensities of wood harvesting by pollarding
   → moderate pollarding should be permitted to make use of this renewable resource.

SuMaRiO Final Conference, Munich, 10.-11.12.2015

#### Acknowledgements: BMBF, Sustainable Land Management, SuMaRiO, 01LL0918K

### Thank you for your attention!



## Recovery from pollarding

#### Index of resilience I<sub>R</sub>:

ratio of the three-year averages of the annual BAI after and before the pollarding event;

 $I_R \ge 1$ : full recovery or increase in growth;  $I_R < 1$ : decline in growth after pollarding

Pollarding intensity	$I_R$ (means ± 1 standard deviation)	Significantly different from 0?
Moderate	0.79 ± 0.36 <b>a</b>	No
High	0.91 ± 0.40 <b>a</b>	No

 $\rightarrow$  Even intensely pollarded poplars are able to recover from pollarding.