



PERGAMON



Atmospheric Environment 35 (2001) 3341–3352

ATMOSPHERIC  
ENVIRONMENT

www.elsevier.com/locate/atmosenv

## Isoprene emission capacity for US tree species

Chris Geron<sup>a,\*</sup>, Peter Harley<sup>b</sup>, Alex Guenther<sup>b</sup>

<sup>a</sup>National Risk Management Research Laboratory, US Environmental Protection Agency, Research Triangle Park, NC 27711, USA

<sup>b</sup>National Center for Atmospheric Research, Boulder, CO 80303, USA

Received 24 March 2000; accepted 1 August 2000

### Abstract

Isoprene emission capacity measurements are presented from 18 North American oak (*Quercus*) species and species from six other genera previously found to emit significant quantities of isoprene. Sampling was conducted at physiographically diverse locations in North Carolina, Central California, and Northern Oregon. Emissions from several sun leaves of each species were measured at or near standard conditions (leaf temperature of 30°C and photosynthetically active radiation of 1000  $\mu\text{mol m}^{-2} \text{s}^{-1}$ ) using environmentally controlled cuvette systems and gas chromatography with reduction gas detectors. Species mean emission capacity ranged from 39 to 158  $\mu\text{g C g}^{-1} \text{h}^{-1}$  (mean of 86), or 22 to 79  $\text{nmol m}^{-2} \text{s}^{-1}$  (mean of 44). These rates are 2–28 times higher than those previously reported from the same species, which were summarized in a recent study where isoprene emission rates were assigned based on published data and taxonomy. These discrepancies were attributed to differences in leaf environment during development, measurement technique (branch or plant enclosure versus leaf enclosure), and lack of environmental measurements associated with some of the earlier branch enclosure measurements. Mass-based emission capacities for 15 of 18 oak species, sweetgum (*Liquidambar styraciflua*), and poplars (*Populus trichocarpa* and *P. deltoides*) were within ranges used in current biogenic volatile organic compound (BVOC) emission models, while measured rates for the remaining three oak species, *Nyssa sylvatica*, *Platanus occidentalis*, *Robinia pseudoacacia*, *Salix nigra*, and *Populus* hybrids (*Populus trichocarpa*  $\times$  *P. deltoides*) were considerably higher. In addition, mean specific leaf mass of the oak species was 30% higher than assumed in current emission models. Emission rates reported here and in other recent studies support recent conclusions that isoprene emission capacities for sun leaves of high emitting species may be better represented by a value of  $100 \pm 50 \mu\text{g C g}^{-1} \text{h}^{-1}$  during hot summer conditions. We also find that intermediate isoprene emission rates previously suggested for some tree species may not represent their true emission capacities, and that broadleaf plant species may have either low ( $< 1.0 \mu\text{g C g}^{-1} \text{h}^{-1}$ ) or very high ( $\sim 100 \mu\text{g C g}^{-1} \text{h}^{-1}$ ) genetic capacity to emit isoprene when mature foliage is exposed to a high ambient temperature and light environment. Published by Elsevier Science Ltd.

**Keywords:** *Liquidambar*; *Nyssa*; *Populus*; *Quercus*; *Robinia*; *Salix*; Oak; Emission factor; Isoprene capacity; Leaf temperature; Photosynthetically active radiation

### 1. Introduction

Global annual isoprene emissions are thought to equal or exceed the global methane flux on a carbon mass basis (Guenther et al., 1995). It is estimated that over 90% of global isoprene production is from vegetation (Guenther et al., 1995). In the contiguous United States, annual

isoprene emissions are estimated to range from 15 to 20 million metric tons  $\text{yr}^{-1}$  (Pierce and Dudek, 1996), comparable to total annual non-methane volatile organic compound (VOC) emissions from US anthropogenic sources. Isoprene is very reactive with the hydroxyl ( $\text{OH}\cdot$ ) radical, much more so than most atmospheric hydrocarbons, such that even at relatively low concentrations it can control regional photochemistry. In regions with high tropospheric nitrogen oxide ( $\text{NO}_x$ ) concentrations, it has been demonstrated that isoprene can react to form high levels of ozone ( $\text{O}_3$ ) (Williams et al., 1997), and can affect oxidant control strategies in rural (Trainer

\* Corresponding author. Tel: +1-919-541-4639; fax: +1-919-541-7885.

E-mail address: [geron.chris@epa.gov](mailto:geron.chris@epa.gov) (C. Geron).

et al., 1987) and even urban (Chameides et al., 1988) environments.

Regional to global isoprene emission estimates are typically based on an emission capacity [EC, in units of  $\mu\text{g C g}^{-1}$  (leaf dry weight)  $\text{h}^{-1}$ ] at standard conditions [in this paper, leaf temperature of  $30^\circ\text{C}$  and photosynthetically active radiation (PAR) of  $1000 \mu\text{mol m}^{-2} \text{s}^{-1}$ ]. These ECs are applied to forest inventory data and adjusted for canopy position, incident light, and leaf temperature effects (Geron et al., 1994; Guenther et al., 1995). To assign ECs to plant species for which no emission rate data exist, taxonomic relations with species for which rates have been determined are used (Guenther et al., 1994; Geron et al., 1994; Benjamin et al., 1996). Unfortunately, in the case of many plant species for which enclosure measurements of isoprene emission have been made, light and/or leaf temperature values during measurement were not recorded (Khalil and Rasmussen, 1992; Lamb et al., 1986, 1985, 1984) or are difficult to interpret. In addition, branch or whole plant enclosures were typically employed, leading to varying degrees of self-shading. Where static chambers were used, photosynthesis and isoprene emission could potentially be affected by carbon dioxide ( $\text{CO}_2$ ) reduction, water vapor condensation, thermal stress, etc. (Csiky and Seufert, 1999). Measurements from foliage on cut branches or otherwise perturbed environments have also been reported (Klinger et al., 1998; Helmig et al., 1999), although the effects of such treatments have not been well characterized. Isoprene emission capacity increases with growth light intensity in both laboratory (Grinspoon et al., 1991; Harley et al. 1994; Litvak et al., 1996) and field (Harley et al., 1997; Sharkey et al., 1996) environments. EC data collected during greenhouse or laboratory experiments often feature developmental PAR regimes that are considerably lower than the ambient sunlight levels to which foliage is exposed at the top of forest canopies. Similarly, field settings where access to upper canopy levels is limited often necessitate sampling of at least partially shade-adapted foliage. Lerda and Throop (1999) found that shaded foliage of three tree species in Panama emitted no detectable isoprene, even though sun leaves of the same species emitted at high rates. Similarly, Guenther et al. (1999) found that shaded foliage of two Central African species emitted almost no isoprene upon initial enclosure, but were induced to emit steadily increasing amounts of isoprene after exposure to PAR of  $1000 \mu\text{mol m}^{-2} \text{s}^{-1}$  and leaf temperature of  $30^\circ\text{C}$  for periods from 15 min to 2 h. Such sampling bias would be expected to lead to underestimation of actual leaf isoprene emission capacity.

Isoprene flux estimates using the canopy model of Guenther et al. (1995) incorporating the short-term light dependency of Guenther et al. (1993) indicate that greater than 80% of canopy emissions are from the top one-third of the canopy. It is therefore critical to accurately model

isoprene emissions from the upper canopy. This cannot be accomplished unless the emission capacity of sunlit upper canopy leaves is appropriately measured and represented in isoprene emission models.

In recent studies, when species with previously reported low emission capacities (see summary of Benjamin et al., 1996) were re-examined in sunlit upper canopy positions during warm summer conditions, emission capacities were determined to be considerably greater (Harley et al., 1997; Sharkey et al., 1996). These higher rates have been found to be more accurately scaled to fluxes at mature tree, canopy, and landscape levels (Doskey and Gao, 1999; Fuentes et al., 1995, 1996, 1999; Fuentes and Wang, 1999; Guenther et al., 1996a–c; Geron et al., 1997; Goldstein et al., 1998; Lamb et al., 1996; Pier 1995; Pier and McDuffie, 1997; Pierce et al., 1998). The purpose of this study is to examine mid-to-late summer-isoprene emission capacities from fully exposed sun leaves of some common tree species, some of which have been previously reported to emit significant quantities of isoprene. Leaf gas exchange systems are used which allow more precise control over environmental conditions. These rates are compared with previously reported ranges applied in biogenic volatile organic compound (BVOC) emission models.

## 2. Methods

We studied isoprene emissions from 18 oak tree species (*Quercus spp.*) as well as *Liquidambar styraciflua*, *Nyssa sylvatica*, *Platanus occidentalis*, *Populus trichocarpa*, *P. deltoides*, (and *P. deltoides*  $\times$  *P. trichocarpa* hybrids), *Robinia pseudoacacia*, and *Salix nigra*. Using the methods of Geron et al. (1994) with additional forest inventory data for the western US, we estimate that these species account for 23.3 and 5.4% of the total projected tree crown area in the contiguous 37 eastern and 11 western US, respectively (see Table 1 for percentages by individual species). Regionally, these species can account for a much greater percentage of crown area. For instance, the western oak species account for over 23% of the crown area in California (*Q. chrysolepis* and *Q. kelloggii* each account for 8.2%). These species represent genera that account for approximately 98% of the forest isoprene source in the contiguous United States. Individually *Quercus* accounts for 63.7%, *Populus* 12.6%, *Liquidambar* 11.2%, *Nyssa* 6.9%, *Robinia* 1.4%, *Salix* 1.2%, and *Platanus* 0.9%. Spruce (*Picea Spp*) accounts for most (1.9%) of the remainder. The oak species examined here account for 82.7% of oak crown area in the US, with *Quercus alba* (17.6%), *Q. rubra* (16.2%), *Q. nigra* (10.0%), *Q. falcata* (8.5%), *Q. velutina* (8.2%), *Q. stellata* (7.0%), and *Q. prinus* (6.0%) dominating. Oaks are relatively less abundant in the westernmost 11 United States, but can be locally or regionally important. Considering only

Table 1

Summary of emission capacity data at leaf temperature of 30°C and PAR of 1000  $\mu\text{mol m}^{-2} \text{s}^{-1}$  from this study

Species	N <sup>a</sup>	SLM <sup>b</sup>	B96 <sup>c</sup>	DW <sup>d</sup>	SD <sup>e</sup>	Min <sup>e</sup>	Max <sup>e</sup>	LA <sup>f</sup>	%Crn <sup>g</sup>
<i>California</i>									
<i>Quercus agrifolia</i>	6	142	<b>31.1</b>	<b>77</b>	27	48	117	50	0.4
<i>Q. berberidifolia</i>	9	151	NA	<b>73</b>	7.4	62	81	51	< 0.1
<i>Q. chrysolepis</i>	10	179	<b>21.9<sup>h</sup></b>	<b>48</b>	11	32	71	39	1.9
<i>Q. douglasii</i>	15	124	<b>7.7</b>	<b>71</b>	13	44	96	41	0.6
<i>Q. engelmannii</i>	6	152	<b>21.9<sup>h</sup></b>	<b>39</b>	5.4	32	47	27	< 0.1
<i>Q. lobata</i>	14	97	<b>3.0</b>	<b>86</b>	14	52	103	39	< 0.1
<i>Q. kelloggii</i>	7	109	<b>21.9<sup>h</sup></b>	<b>78</b>	23	48	116	39	1.9
<i>Q. wislizenii</i>	52	150	<b>11.0</b>	<b>74</b>	14	38	114	50	0.3
<i>North Carolina</i>									
<i>Q. alba</i>	8	119	<b>6.9</b>	<b>92</b>	19	51	114	50	4.3
<i>Q. falcata</i>	13	113	<b>21.9<sup>h</sup></b>	<b>112</b>	40	35	159	57	1.6
<i>Q. laevis</i>	4	115	<b>21.4</b>	<b>151</b>	29	126	188	79	0.2
<i>Q. nigra</i>	12	124	<b>21.7</b>	<b>81</b>	27	39	118	46	1.7
<i>Q. phellos</i>	13	114	<b>28.4</b>	<b>93</b>	26	61	129	48	0.5
<i>Q. prinus</i>	11	112	<b>5.7</b>	<b>44</b>	14	28	77	23	1.8
<i>Q. rubra</i>	8	99	<b>13.1</b>	<b>67</b>	19	50	103	30	2.6
<i>Q. stellata</i>	12	147	NA	<b>73</b>	16	45	107	50	2.0
<i>Q. velutina</i>	5	97	<b>16.7</b>	<b>157</b>	25	126	181	72	2.2
<i>Q. virginiana</i>	9	186	<b>17.8</b>	<b>46</b>	11	34	71	40	0.2
<i>Liquidambar styraciflua</i>	11	115	<b>16.7</b>	<b>68</b>	26	36	113	37	4.1
<i>Nyssa sylvatica</i>	3	84	NA	<b>77</b>	9.7	66	84	30	1.4
<i>Platanus occidentalis</i>	14	66	<b>24.3</b>	<b>71</b>	26	28	111	22	0.3
<i>Robinia pseudoacacia</i>	8	64	<b>10.5</b>	<b>151</b>	23	118	192	45	0.5
<i>Salix nigra</i>	3	86	<b>22.2</b>	<b>93</b>	13	82	107	37	0.2
<i>Oregon</i>									
<i>Populus deltoides</i>	8	96	<b>37.0</b>	<b>97</b>	21	72	134	43	< 0.1
<i>P. trichocarpa</i>	8	97	<b>43.6<sup>h</sup></b>	<b>97</b>	29	69	144	44	< 0.1

<sup>a</sup> N denotes the number of leaves sampled.<sup>b</sup> SLM is specific leaf mass in  $\text{g m}^{-2}$ .<sup>c</sup> B96 is the mean emission capacity in  $\mu\text{g C g}^{-1} \text{h}^{-1}$  assigned by Benjamin et al. (1996).<sup>d</sup> DW is the emission factor in  $\mu\text{g C g}^{-1} \text{h}^{-1}$ .<sup>e</sup> SD, min, and max are the standard deviation, minimum, and maximum of measured ECs, respectively, in  $\mu\text{g C g}^{-1} \text{h}^{-1}$ .<sup>f</sup> LA is the emission factor in  $\text{nmol m}^{-2} \text{s}^{-1}$ .<sup>g</sup> %Crn is estimated percentage of total forest crown cover that each species accounts for in the western (California species and *Populus trichocarpa*) and eastern (North Carolina species and *Populus deltoides*) contiguous United States.<sup>h</sup> Indicates that EC is derived by phylogenetic classification instead of direct emission measurement.

western oak crown area, *Q. kelloggii* accounts for 32.7%, followed by *Q. chrysolepis* (24.8%), *Q. gambelii* (13.9%), *Q. garryana* (10.5%), *Q. douglasii* (5.0%), *Q. agrifolia* (4.5%), and *Q. wislizenii* (3.8%).

Sun leaves were randomly selected from the south-facing, upper portion of each tree crown, although in a few cases, leaves on north-facing portions of crowns or in partially shaded positions were measured as mentioned below. These measurements were excluded from the summary in Table 1. The leaves of large trees were accessed using fixed towers, articulating boom lift trucks, or elevated platforms. Isoprene emissions from eastern US species were measured at the Coweeta Hydrologic Laboratory in mountainous western North Carolina, the Duke University Forest and surrounding areas in the

east-central piedmont of North Carolina, and Emerald Isle in Coastal North Carolina from 6 July to 16 September 1997 and on 16 July 1998. Emissions from western *Quercus* species were measured at eight valley and plateau sites in central to southern California from 2 to 11 August 1995, and 16 to 22 May 1996. Isoprene ECs of *Populus* species and hybrids were measured in commercial plantations near Boardman, OR, in June 1995.

Gas exchange of the leaves was monitored using Li-Cor 6400 (Li-Cor, Inc., Lincoln, NE) photosynthesis systems with red or red/blue light-emitting diode (LED) light sources. These systems measure water ( $\text{H}_2\text{O}$ ) and  $\text{CO}_2$  exchange from leaf surfaces using infrared (IR) gas analyzers and allow control of PAR, leaf and air temperature, humidity,  $\text{CO}_2$  concentration, and air flow over

6 cm<sup>2</sup> of enclosed leaf area. Ambient purge air was drawn by the gas exchange systems from open areas 3–5 m away from the trees being studied. This air was passed through a 2 l plastic mixing vessel at a flow rate of 500 μmol s<sup>-1</sup> to help stabilize ambient concentrations of isoprene and CO<sub>2</sub>.

Cuvette exit air samples were either drawn from the exhaust outlet line using glass 10 ml locking gastight syringes with Teflon plungers (VICI Precision Sampling, Inc., Baton Rouge, LA) or injected directly into the gas chromatograph sample loop for analysis in the field. In some cases, incoming ambient air was scrubbed of isoprene using activated charcoal filters (Supelco Inc., Bellefonte, PA); otherwise ambient air samples for isoprene analysis were drawn from the line between the mixing vessel and the gas exchange system. All syringes were placed in an insulated unrefrigerated box and transported to the laboratory for analysis within 2–4 h. Experiments showed that isoprene loss from the syringes was less than 2% over 24 h, which was considered to be negligible.

Isoprene concentrations in the cuvette exhaust and ambient air were determined using the methods described previously (Greenberg et al., 1993; Harley et al., 1997). Samples collected in the syringes were injected into a 1.9 ml sample loop of an isothermal (130°C) gas chromatograph. Isoprene was separated on a stainless-steel column (1.3 m long × 2 mm i.d.) packed with Unibeads 3S, 60/80 mesh (Alltech Assoc., Deerfield, IL) and measured with a reduction gas detector (RGD2, Trace Analytical, Menlo Park, CA). Zero-grade air was used as the carrier gas instead of nitrogen to minimize baseline disturbance before the isoprene eluted. The carrier gas flow through the column was reversed after isoprene eluted to shorten analysis time. This column backflushing prevented later eluting compounds from interfering with subsequent analysis. After analysis was completed on a given day, the column oven temperature was raised to 170°C overnight to clear the column of less volatile materials. Peak heights were determined using a commercial integrator (Model 3396 Series III, Hewlett Packard, Inc., Avondale, PA). Peak height was determined to be a more consistent and linear indicator of isoprene concentration than peak area. The reduction gas detector system was calibrated daily against a standard cylinder containing 460 ± 2 ppb (v/v) isoprene in air (Scott Specialty Gases, Inc., Plumsteadville, PA). The standard was referenced to the flame ionization detection (FID) response of a gas chromatograph (Model HP5890, Hewlett Packard, Inc., Avondale, PA) which was calibrated to a National Institute of Standards and Technology propane standard (SRM 1660a, 3 ppm propane in air, Rochester, NY). Standard dilutions were performed using a dynamic gas calibration system (Model 146, Thermo Environmental Instruments, Inc., Franklin, MA). Peak height response curves of the RGD were

linear between 0.5 and 460 ppbv isoprene concentrations, in agreement with Greenberg et al. (1993). We estimate that analytical error was less than ± 2% as determined by making repeated measurements of the standard gas over this range of concentrations.

Leaf isoprene emission sampling was initiated after allowing leaf gas exchange (internal CO<sub>2</sub> concentration, photosynthesis, and stomatal conductance) to stabilize. This usually occurred within 2–10 min, but occasionally longer if ambient conditions departed significantly from standard light and temperature conditions. Cuvette CO<sub>2</sub> concentration and relative humidity were allowed to vary with leaf performance but were typically stable during the measurement periods. Samples were taken between 950 and 1900 h, and over 90% were taken between 1000 and 1600 h. Solar noon occurred at approximately 1300 h during the study. Three to five successive measurements at 2–4 min intervals were performed on each leaf. Ambient isoprene samples were drawn from the sample line downstream from the 2 l mixing vessel between leaf emission samples.

Leaf mass per unit area (i.e., specific leaf mass, SLM, in g m<sup>-2</sup>) was determined on the section of leaf enclosed in the cuvette. These sections were cut and dried at 80°C for 48 h and weighed. If the leaf did not fully cover the opening of the cuvette, the area of the enclosed section was cut and area determined using a portable leaf area meter (Li-3000A, Li-Cor, Inc., Lincoln, NE) prior to drying and weighing.

Isoprene emission rates  $E$  (nmol m<sup>-2</sup> s<sup>-1</sup>) were calculated as

$$E = f(C_o - C_i)a^{-1}, \quad (1)$$

where  $f$  is the flow rate (mol s<sup>-1</sup>) into the cuvette,  $C_o$  and  $C_i$  are the outlet (exhaust air) and inlet isoprene concentrations (nmol mol<sup>-1</sup>), respectively, and  $a$  is the enclosed leaf area, which was usually 0.0006 m<sup>2</sup> (6 cm<sup>2</sup>) in this study. Mass based  $E$  (μg C g<sup>-1</sup> h<sup>-1</sup>) could then be calculated by multiplying  $E$  from Eq. (1) above by the quantity (216/SLM).

Isoprene emission rates from the leaves were measured under standard conditions, although occasionally leaf temperature differed by as much as 0.5°C from the target of 30°C. In these cases, emission rates were adjusted to standard conditions using the leaf temperature algorithm of Guenther et al. (1993). The primary focus of this paper is on isoprene emission rates measured at a leaf temperature of 30 ± 0.5°C and PAR of 1000 μmol m<sup>-2</sup> s<sup>-1</sup>.

As each isoprene emission sample was drawn from the cuvette exhaust, leaf environmental and gas exchange data were logged with the photosynthesis system. A hand-held IR thermometer (Model 39800, Cole-Parmer Instrument Co., Vernon Hills, IL) was used to measure the leaf temperature of some leaves prior to isoprene emission measurement. Above-canopy

meteorological data (1 min measurements of PAR, air temperature, wind speed, and wind direction for 1997) were obtained from the Forest Atmosphere Carbon Transfer Scheme (FACTS1) site at Duke Forest in the North Carolina Piedmont. Hourly meteorological data were obtained from monitoring stations near the isoprene emission measurement sites within the Coweeta Hydrologic Laboratory Experimental Watershed and the Emerald Isle site for several days prior to and during emission measurements.

### 3. Results and discussion

Although the emission rates reported here are from fully exposed sun leaves, total tree height and height of foliage sample varied from 2 to over 30 m above ground level. To check for differences in ECs due to position on tree (leaf height), isoprene emissions from *Quercus alba* and *Q. falcata* were measured from three sun leaves at each of three levels (approximately 4, 12, and 19 m) on the south facing sides of fully exposed trees approximately 20 m tall. There were no significant differences between ECs with respect to height for either species. A recent study of emissions from *Eucalyptus globulus* (Street et al., 1997) found that saplings emitted substantially more isoprene than older trees. This was not the case in our data. Rates observed from small open-grown *Liquidambar styraciflua*, *Quercus velutina*, *Q. rubra*, and *Q. nigra* seedlings less than 5 years old were not significantly different than those from individuals of the same species which were over 80 years old and in excess of 20 m in height. Four leaves on a North Carolina *Quercus alba* specimen which exhibited chlorosis and root/stem fungal infection were examined during July 1997. Isoprene emission from the four leaves ranged from 16 to 90  $\mu\text{g C g}^{-1} \text{h}^{-1}$ , and was highly correlated with photosynthesis rates, which ranged from 0.5 to 7.0  $\text{mmol m}^{-2} \text{s}^{-1}$ . This tree died 2 months later, likely from root system stress and subsequent fungal infection induced by Hurricane Fran in September 1996. This was a common cause of tree mortality following the storm. These data were deleted from our analysis. In the oaks examined in North Carolina, a low but statistically significant positive correlation between EC and photosynthesis was observed.

The isoprene ECs from the 25 species are shown in Table 1. In addition, negligible ( $< 0.1 \mu\text{g C g}^{-1} \text{h}^{-1}$ ) isoprene emissions were found from *Carya tomentosa*, *Rhus copallina*, *Smilax rotundifolia*, and *Vitis labrusca* in North Carolina. Mean ECs for the 18 oak (*Quercus*) species ranged from 39 to 158  $\mu\text{g C g}^{-1} \text{h}^{-1}$  (22–79  $\text{nmol m}^{-2} \text{s}^{-1}$ ). Means for 15 of these fell within the high emitting class ( $70 \pm 35 \mu\text{g C g}^{-1} \text{h}^{-1}$ ) of Guenther et al. (1994). Leaves of *Quercus falcata* emitted at somewhat higher rates, while leaves from two *Q. laevis* trees and three *Q. velutina* trees emitted at mean rates in

excess of 150  $\mu\text{g C g}^{-1} \text{h}^{-1}$ . Three of the four lowest emitting oak species on a dry weight basis also had the highest SLM values (152–186  $\text{g m}^{-2}$ ) and area-based ECs similar to the other oaks. The other low isoprene emitting oak, *Q. prinus*, was also found to be the lowest emitting species among four studied by Harley et al. (1997). Time of day and growth environment may have also impacted EC estimates from *Q. prinus* (and possibly *Q. rubra* as well) in this study. Measurements were conducted at the cooler western NC site early and late in the day relative to measurements made on other oak species (discussed below). Current emission models such as BEIS2 (Geron et al., 1994; Pierce et al., 1998) assume lower upper canopy SLM values ( $\sim 100 \text{g m}^{-2}$ ) than were determined for most oaks (15 of 18 species) during this study. If the mass-based ECs measured here are normalized to a SLM of 100, ECs for 13 of the 18 oaks exceed 85  $\mu\text{g C g}^{-1} \text{h}^{-1}$ , and 10 of these exceed 100  $\mu\text{g C g}^{-1} \text{h}^{-1}$ . Recent scaling studies (Guenther et al., 1996b, c; Geron et al., 1997) suggest that a value of 100  $\mu\text{g C g}^{-1} \text{h}^{-1}$  may be more appropriate for regional oxidant modeling studies. Table 1 also lists mean emission factors for these species from Benjamin et al. (1996), which summarizes emission rates from branch or seedling enclosure data published prior to 1996 and assigns rates to unstudied species based on taxonomy. The rates measured here are 2 to 28 times higher than those from Benjamin et al. (1996). These differences are attributed not to analytical methods, but rather to differences in leaf developmental environment, phenology, enclosure type (branch or plant enclosure versus leaf enclosure), static versus dynamic flow, and/or lack of (or difficulty in interpreting) environmental measurements associated with some of the earlier branch enclosure measurements. ECs for *Liquidambar styraciflua* are in agreement with those of Guenther et al. (1996a, b). *Populus* values are at the upper end of the range reported for this genus by Guenther et al., 1994. The *Populus* hybrids are interesting in that their ECs are twice those of their parents, and second generation crosses have even greater ECs than the first-generation hybrids. Assimilation rates are similar between the hybrids and parent stock, suggesting that the higher isoprene emission rates of the hybrids represent a greater loss of fixed carbon.

Previous EC measurements for the species *Nyssa sylvatica*, *Platanus occidentalis*, *Robinia pseudoacacia*, and *Salix nigra* were lower than measured here. *Robinia pseudoacacia* and *Nyssa sylvatica* were assigned ECs of  $14 \pm 7 \mu\text{g C g}^{-1} \text{h}^{-1}$  in Guenther et al. (1994) based on previous measurements. In a later study, Guenther et al. (1996b) reported significantly higher rates from *Robinia pseudoacacia*. Here, ECs from eight fully exposed *Robinia pseudoacacia* leaves on three trees ranged from 118 to 192  $\mu\text{g C g}^{-1} \text{h}^{-1}$ . An initial measurement of a partially shaded mid-canopy leaf of *Nyssa sylvatica* yielded an emission rate of 14  $\mu\text{g C g}^{-1} \text{h}^{-1}$ , in agreement with

Guenther et al. (1996a) and used in emission models by Guenther et al. (1994). In a later study, a lower value was observed by Guenther et al. (1996b). However, when isoprene was measured from three south facing leaves on two fully exposed *Nyssa sylvatica* trees, much higher values ( $66\text{--}84\ \mu\text{g C g}^{-1}\text{ h}^{-1}$ ) were observed. This species is thought to be intermediate in shade tolerance early in its development, becoming less tolerant as it approaches canopy height. It is possible that earlier emission rates from this species were determined from more easily accessible partially shaded foliage which developed in a cooler and darker environment. Previous *Salix nigra* and *Platanus occidentalis* emission rates were determined from branch enclosure studies, where canopy position and self-shading within the enclosures could have induced lower emission rates. The higher leaf level values observed from *Salix nigra* are in good agreement with those measured from several *Salix* species by Isebrands et al. (1999). Xiaoshan et al. (2000) reported an emission factor of  $80.6\ \mu\text{g g}^{-1}\text{ h}^{-1}$  from *Platanus orientalis* in China during August using a static branch enclosure system. These authors also report emission capacities of  $22.6$  and  $19.2\ \mu\text{g g}^{-1}\text{ h}^{-1}$  from *Populus simonii* and *Salix matsudana*, respectively, during early May, and noted that a seasonality strongly affected emission capacity. For instance, *Pendula loud* had an emission capacity of  $7.1\ \mu\text{g g}^{-1}\text{ h}^{-1}$  on 10 May but increased to  $63.4\ \mu\text{g g}^{-1}\text{ h}^{-1}$  in August. It is interesting to note that, if the measurements reported here for *Nyssa sylvatica*, *Platanus occidentalis*, *Robinia pseudoacacia*, and *Salix nigra* actually do more closely reflect isoprene emission capacities for these species, then all North American broadleaf forest species summarized by Guenther et al. (1994) fall into either a high (e.g.,  $70 \pm 35\ \mu\text{g C g}^{-1}\text{ h}^{-1}$ ) or low (e.g.,  $<1.0\ \mu\text{g C g}^{-1}\text{ h}^{-1}$ ) basal isoprene emission rate class for midsummer fully exposed foliage. Collectively, these four species account for about 2.5% of US canopy cover (compared to over 30% for *Quercus*, *Populus*, and *Liquidambar*) and are not concentrated in any single area. Therefore an increase in ECs for these species is not likely to affect regional isoprene emission estimates substantially. However, as noted by Harley et al. (1999), *Platanus occidentalis*, *Populus spp.*, *Robinia pseudoacacia*, and *Salix nigra*, are included among several high-isoprene-emitting species that are increasingly planted globally as short rotation intensive culture biofuel and wood pulp stocks.

It has been suggested that the basal emission factor may vary with meteorology (temperature and solar radiation “dose”) over the previous 10 h to 2 weeks (Sharkey et al., 1999; Geron et al., 2000; Xiaoshan et al., 2000; Petron et al., in press). Diurnal patterns, where ECs peak shortly after solar noon, were also discussed in these studies and by Goldstein et al. (1998). In the North Carolina oak EC data we also see some evidence of a diurnal pattern, where maximum rates observed

seemed to peak around midday (data not shown). However, the lowest values observed early and late in the day were from *Quercus prinus*, and it is not clear if this is due to diurnal changes in emission potential, cooler seasonal growth environment, random variability, or possibly a lower genetic emission potential unique to this species. Although the diurnal pattern is difficult to interpret due to high variability within a given hour of the day, the maximum EC pattern we observe is similar to a diurnal pattern observed by Goldstein et al. (1998), where emission potential was derived from canopy level isoprene fluxes. Geron et al. (2000) also derive lower morning EC from eddy correlation isoprene fluxes of Guenther et al. (1998), but see no EC decline in the afternoon. Xiaoshan et al. (2000) report similar diurnal patterns. Further investigation into possible diurnal variation in EC appears to be warranted.

Table 2 shows other recent leaf and branch emission rate measurements published since 1995 (see also the review of Kesselmeier and Staudt, 1999). Except for a single *Nyssa sylvatica* measurement, all leaf level measurements fall within or exceed the highest emission class of  $70 \pm 35\ \mu\text{g C g}^{-1}\text{ h}^{-1}$  (roughly equivalent to  $32 \pm 16\ \text{nmol m}^{-2}\text{ s}^{-1}$  on a leaf area basis). Only three individual measurements from branch enclosure measurements (one each from *Liquidambar styraciflua*, *Nyssa sylvatica*, and *Populus trichocarpa*) fell below the corresponding shading-factor-adjusted class of  $40 \pm 20\ \mu\text{g C g}^{-1}\text{ h}^{-1}$  suggested by Guenther et al. (1994) for branch enclosure measurements, and it should be noted that these measurements were performed on cut branches (Helmig et al., 1999). Recent European studies (Table 3) can be summarized similarly, although a few measurements, possibly impacted by seasonality, fall into intermediate EC classes.

Recent isoprene emission studies in tropical forests indicate similar patterns. In Puerto Rico, 11 of 38 species screened using a leaf enclosure system emitted isoprene (Lerdau and Keller, 1997). Ten of these emitted at rates in excess of  $\sim 23\ \text{nmol m}^{-2}\text{ s}^{-1}$  under standard conditions, and eight yielded rates from 30 to  $100\ \text{nmol m}^{-2}\text{ s}^{-1}$  (Table 4). The remaining emitter (*Clusia rosea*) emitted at very low rates ( $\sim 1\ \text{nmol m}^{-2}\text{ s}^{-1}$ ) independent of light and possibly produced isoprene via a non-enzymatic (acid catalysis of dimethylallyl pyrophosphate) process. In Panama, 15 of 51 species studied emitted significant quantities of isoprene, and 14 emitted at rates from 15 to  $43\ \text{nmol m}^{-2}\text{ s}^{-1}$  (Keller and Lerdau, 1999). A canopy crane was used to access upper canopy foliage of 33 species at another lowland site in Panama, where the ECs of 11 of the 12 isoprene emitting species ranged from 11 to  $55\ \text{nmol m}^{-2}\text{ s}^{-1}$  (Lerdau and Throop, 1999). In that study, isoprene emission capacity scaled positively with photosynthesis capacity. Similarly, in South Africa 6 of 14 species tested using a branch enclosure system emitted at rates of  $32$  to  $110\ \mu\text{g C g}^{-1}\text{ h}^{-1}$ , while the remaining

Table 2

Summary of emission capacity data at a leaf temperature of 30°C and PAR of 1000  $\mu\text{mol m}^{-2}\text{s}^{-1}$  from other recent studies of North American isoprene-emitting vegetation

Species	Ref. <sup>a</sup>	SLM <sup>b</sup>	DW <sup>c</sup>	LA <sup>d</sup>	E <sup>e</sup>	S <sup>f</sup>	Comment
<i>Liquidambar styraciflua</i>	1		70 ± 5		L	N	Upper canopy sun leaves
	2		71		L	N	Upper canopy sun leaves
	2		45		B	N	Upper canopy sun leaves
	3		9.3		B	N	Cut branch
	4			30–70	L	C	Drought experiment
<i>Nyssa sylvatica</i>	2		13		L	N	
	3		4.3		B	N	Cut branch
<i>Populus euroamericana</i>	5		153 ± 10		L	N	Cut branch
<i>Populus balsamifera</i>	6		100 ± 46		B	N	So. British Columbia
<i>Populus fremontii</i>	7			74 ± 9	L	C	29°C
<i>Populus grandidentata</i>	8		95–114		B	N	Peak summer rates
	3		39		B	N	Cut branch
<i>Populus trichocarpa</i>	3		1.9		B	N	Cut branch
<i>Populus tremuloides</i>	9	77	165	59	L	C	Nitrogen/PAR study
	10			68	L	C	Control in CO <sub>2</sub> /PAR study
	5		78 ± 10		L	N	Cut branch
	8		92		B	N	Peak summer rates in S. Canada
	3		20		B	N	Cut branch
<i>Quercus alba</i>	9	80	78	28	L	C	Nitrogen/PAR study
	10			33	L	C	Control in CO <sub>2</sub> /PAR study
	7			48 ± 15	L	C	29°C
	11		60		P	N	Large tree enclosure
	12	112 ± 6	99 ± 5		L	N	Upper canopy sun leaves
	13	130	100–150	62–96	L	N	Upper canopy sun leaves
	3		77		B	N	Cut branch
<i>Quercus coccinea</i>	12	70–90	115 ± 5		L	N	Upper canopy sun leaves
<i>Quercus falcata</i>	3		29		B	N	Cut branch
<i>Quercus gambelii</i>	1		121 ± 4		L	N	Sun leaves
	14		132 ± 5		L	C	Harley UV-b study
	3		60		B	N	Cut branch
<i>Quercus laevis</i>	2		51		L	N	
	2		35		B	N	
<i>Quercus prinus</i>	12	100–135	71 ± 6		L	N	Upper canopy sun leaves
<i>Quercus rubra</i>	15			38	L	C	
	16	121	77 ± 11	43 ± 7	L	N	Cut branch
	17		> 60		P	N	Large tree enclosure
	5		112 ± 7		L	N	Cut branch
	3		140		B	N	Cut branch
	3		70		B	N	Cut branch
	3		84		L	N	
<i>Quercus stellata</i>	2		41		B	N	
	3		77		B	N	Cut branch
	18			20–40	L	N	Drought/nitrogen study
<i>Q. velutina</i>	12	70–90	97 ± 4		L	N	Upper canopy sun leaves
	3		67		B	N	Cut branch
<i>Salix discolor</i>	5		91 ± 3		L	N	Cut branch
<i>Salix humulis</i>	5		41 ± 1		L	N	Cut branch
<i>Salix nigra</i>	3		56		B	N	Cut branch
<i>Salix petiolaris</i>	5		102 ± 6		L	N	Cut branch
<i>Salix subsericea</i>	5		57 ± 10		L	N	Cut branch

<sup>a</sup>References (1) Guenther et al. (1996b); (2) Guenther et al. (1996a); (3) Helmig et al. (1999); (4) Fang et al. (1996) (5) Isebrands et al. (1999); (6) Drewitt et al. (1998); (7) Fall and Monson (1992); (8) Fuentes et al. (1995); (9) Litvak et al. (1996); (10) Sharkey et al. (1991); (11) Pier and McDuffie (1997); (12) Harley et al. (1997); (13) Geron et al. (1997); (14) Harley et al. (1996); (15) Loreto and Sharkey (1990); (16) Sharkey et al. (1996); (17) Pier (1995); and (18) Harley et al. (1999).

<sup>b</sup>SLM is specific leaf mass in  $\text{g m}^{-2}$ .

<sup>c</sup>DW is the emission capacity in  $\mu\text{g C g}^{-1}$  (dry weight)  $\text{h}^{-1}$  ( $\pm$  standard error when available).

<sup>d</sup>LA is the emission capacity in  $\text{nmol}^{-2}\text{s}^{-1}$  ( $\pm$  standard error when available).

<sup>e</sup>E is the enclosure type (B = branch, L = leaf, P = whole plant enclosure).

<sup>f</sup>S is the experimental setting (C = controlled study in laboratory or greenhouse, N = natural).

Table 3

Summary of emission capacity data at a leaf temperature of 30°C and PAR of 1000  $\mu\text{mol m}^{-2} \text{s}^{-1}$  from recent European field studies where branch enclosures were used

Species	Ref. <sup>a</sup>	DW <sup>b</sup>	LA <sup>c</sup>	Comment
<i>Arundo donax</i>	1	140 ± 70		Spain in early June
<i>Buxus sempervirens</i>	1	20 ± 4.8		France in late June
<i>Cytisus sp.</i>	2	27 ± 24		Italy in June
<i>Erica arborea</i>	2	18 ± 6.2		Italy in June
<i>Erica arborea</i>	3	5.6		Italy in May
<i>Erica multiflora</i>	2	2.0 ± 1.0		Italy in May, October
<i>Erica multiflora</i>	1	2.0		Spain in September
<i>Genista scorpius</i>	1	11 ± 4		France in early October
<i>Myrtus communis</i>	2	137 ± 104		Italy in June
<i>Myrtus communis</i>	3	22 ± 5		Italy in May
<i>Populus nigra</i>	1	63 ± 28		Spain in early June
<i>Populus tremula</i>	4	45		Finland in mid-June
<i>Quercus frainetto</i>	5	118	27	Italy in May
<i>Quercus pubescens</i>	5	80	15	Italy in May
<i>Quercus pubescens</i>	1	78		France in late June, early October
<i>Rhamnus lycoides</i>	1	22 ± 20		Spain in early June
<i>Salix phylicifolia</i>	4	50		Finland in August
<i>Salix spp</i>	1	27 ± 30		Spain in early June
<i>Spartium junceum</i>	2	6.4 ± 0.6		Italy in May
<i>Uvex parvifolia</i>	1	22 ± 20		Spain in early June

<sup>a</sup>References (1) Owen et al. (1998); (2) Owen et al. (1997); (3) Hansen et al. (1997); (4) Hakola et al. (1998); and (5) Steinbrecher et al. (1997).

<sup>b</sup>DW is the emission capacity in  $\mu\text{g C g}^{-1} \text{h}^{-1}$  (dry weight)  $\text{h}^{-1}$  ( $\pm$  standard deviation when available).

<sup>c</sup>LA is the emission factor in  $\text{nmol m}^{-2} \text{s}^{-1}$ .

8 species all emitted at rates of less than  $0.5 \mu\text{g C g}^{-1} \text{h}^{-1}$  (Guenther et al., 1996d). Guenther et al. (1999) re-examined the Central African isoprene emission rate data of Klinger et al. (1998) and estimated that the ECs of those species were more than a factor of 3–10 times higher than previously reported. This was attributed to the same factors that resulted in underestimated ECs for temperate species, and it was noted that accurate characterization of tropical tree isoprene EC is particularly challenging due to difficulties in obtaining appropriate leaf material. He et al. (2000) surveyed 15 common Australian *Eucalyptus* species using a branch enclosure technique. Twelve of these species emitted at rates within or very near the high emitter category ( $40 \pm 20 \mu\text{g C g}^{-1} \text{h}^{-1}$ ) of Guenther et al. (1994). Plants examined in this study were grown in a greenhouse, and measurements were taken during the southern hemisphere winter season, with PAR and temperature similar to an autumn environment within the greenhouse. The plants had both young expanding and mature leaves. It is interesting to note that the ECs (adjusted to standard conditions using the algorithms of Guenther et al., 1993) reported show a negative correlation with temperature across species.

Our data and results from other recent studies suggest that perhaps true genetic isoprene emission capacities for

broad leaf tree species fall into two categories: (1) less than  $1.0 \mu\text{g C g}^{-1} \text{h}^{-1}$ , representing species where limited amounts of isoprene are produced, possibly via the pathways mentioned by Lerda and Keller (1997) and Silver and Fall (1991); and (2)  $100 \pm 50 \mu\text{g C g}^{-1} \text{h}^{-1}$  normalized to a SLM of  $100 \text{g m}^{-2}$ . Category 2 corresponds to a leaf-level area-based rate of about  $46 \pm 23 \text{nmol m}^{-2} \text{s}^{-1}$  and a branch-level rate of approximately  $56 \pm 28 \mu\text{g C g}^{-1} \text{h}^{-1}$ . The uncertainty range of  $\pm 50\%$  associated with these ECs is influenced by a variety of growth environment and developmental factors. This variability is likely large enough to obscure most interspecies differences in isoprene emission factors within current databases. This may be further complicated by short-term (hours to days) meteorologically induced temporal variability in basal isoprene ECs from single leaves. The EC variability between *Populus* hybrids indicates that genetic factors within a genus or species could have influence on EC variability similar to that of environmental factors.

Members of the coniferous spruce (*Picea*) genus are also assigned a basal emission rate of  $14 \pm 7 \mu\text{g C g}^{-1} \text{h}^{-1}$  (Guenther et al., 1994). However, like the oaks in this study which had low mass-based emission factors, their SLM also is very high ( $> 200 \text{g m}^{-2}$ ). Furthermore,



Table 4  
Summary of emission capacity data at a leaf temperature of 30°C and PAR of 1000  $\mu\text{mol m}^{-2} \text{s}^{-1}$  from recent tropical field studies

Species		
Panama (Keller and Lerdau, 1999)	LA <sup>a</sup>	E <sup>b</sup>
<i>Acrocomia vinifera</i>	20	L
<i>Annona hayesii</i>	9	L
<i>Astroneum graveolens</i>	26	L
<i>Bonamia maripoides</i>	18	L
<i>Cissampelos pareira</i>	28	L
<i>Cnestidium rufescens</i>	26	L
<i>Dioclea guianensis</i>	43	L
<i>Doliocarpus major</i>	32	L
<i>Ficus insipida</i>	37	L
<i>Ficus</i> spp.	16	L
<i>Leuhea seemanii</i>	24	L
<i>Spondias mombin</i>	33	L
<i>Stigmaphyllon hypargyreum</i>	36	L
unknown	33	L
<i>Xylopia frutescens</i>	15	L
Puerto Rico	LA <sup>a</sup>	E <sup>b</sup>
(Lerdau and Keller, 1997)		
<i>Bursera simaruba</i>	32	L
<i>Capparis cyanophallophora</i>	25	L
<i>Capparis indica</i>	23	L
<i>Croton discolor</i>	100	L
<i>Eugenia xerophytical</i>	45	L
<i>Krugiodendron ferreum</i>	30	L
<i>Pictetia aculute</i>	50	L
<i>Pisonia albida</i>	30	L
<i>Reynosia guama</i>	100	L
<i>Thrinax morrisii</i>	35	L
South Africa	DW <sup>c</sup>	E <sup>b</sup>
(Guenther et al., 1996d)		
<i>Acacia nigrescens</i>	110	B
<i>Burkea africana</i>	36	B
<i>Ochna pulchra</i>	32	B
<i>Phragmites mauritianum</i>	35	B
<i>Rhus leptodictya</i>	54	B
<i>Securinea virosa</i>	81	B
Panama	LA <sup>a</sup>	E <sup>b</sup>
(Lerdau and Throop, 1999)		
<i>Brosimum utile</i>	10.7	L
<i>Calophyllum longifolium</i>	11.9	L
<i>Dussia munda</i>	30.7	L
<i>Ficus nymphifolia</i>	3.9	L
<i>Lonchocarpus longifolium</i>	53.0	L
<i>Marila laxiflora</i>	11.2	L
<i>Perebea xanthochyma</i>	14.7	L
<i>Protium panamense</i>	46.3	L
<i>Socratea exorrhiza</i>	14.5	L
<i>Symphonia globulifera</i>	16.8	L
<i>Trattinnickia aspera</i>	55.1	L
<i>Virola</i> spp.	13.0	L
Australia (He et al., 2000)	DW <sup>c</sup>	E <sup>b</sup>
<i>Eucalyptus botryoides</i>	4.7 ± 1.4	P
<i>E. camaldulensis</i>	14.6 ± 4.3	P

Table 4 (continued)

Species		
<i>E. citriodora</i>	48.9 ± 5.4	P
<i>E. cladocalyx</i>	6.1 ± 1.9	P
<i>E. forrestiana</i>	35.8 ± 10.8	P
<i>E. globulus</i>	60.4 ± 30.1	P
<i>E. gomphocephala</i>	15.1 ± 3.7	P
<i>E. grandis</i>	53.9 ± 16.6	P
<i>E. maculata</i>	37.9 ± 33.4	P
<i>E. marginata</i>	25.6 ± 7.4	P
<i>E. robusta</i>	44.0 ± 12.5	P
<i>E. rudis</i>	54.2 ± 15.9	P
<i>E. wandoo</i>	5.3 ± 1.1	P

<sup>a</sup>LA is the emission factor in  $\text{nmol}^{-2} \text{s}^{-1}$ .

<sup>b</sup>E is enclosure type (B = branch, L = leaf, P = whole plant enclosure).

<sup>c</sup>DW is the emission factor in  $\mu\text{g C g}^{-1}$  (dry weight)  $\text{h}^{-1}$ .

the “bottlebrush” type foliage display of spruce shoots results in much of the foliage’s being oriented away from the light source in enclosure measurements. If these factors are taken into account, then mean emission factors of  $24 \mu\text{g C g}^{-1} \text{h}^{-1}$  recently reported for *Picea glauca* (Isebrands et al., 1999) may also represent higher area-based emission factors. Since isoprene is produced in, and is suspected to protect (Sharkey and Singaas, 1995; Singaas et al., 1997) membranes in, chloroplasts, it may be that isoprene emission would be best expressed per unit of chlorophyll. This would account for much of the difference between broadleaf and *Picea* EC; e.g., Middleton et al. (1997) found that midsummer chlorophyll concentrations in *Populus tremuloides* were up to 3 times higher than those for *Picea mariana* and *P. glauca* on a dry weight basis. Such a relationship is also consistent with observed vertical (sun leaf vs shade leaf) patterns in ECs (Harley et al., 1997; Sharkey et al., 1996) and could be used in combination with recent remote sensing techniques which offer satellite-based estimates of chlorophyll density.

In a recent review, Kesselmeier and Staudt (1999) warned that using phylogenetic schemes to extrapolate emission factors from one species to another, even within a genus, could result in invalid rate assignments. This was the case in using North American *Quercus* ECs for non-isoprene-emitting European *Quercus* species. The results presented here and in other recent studies also indicate that emission rates from species derived from branch/plant enclosure data, with limited environmental data, or from plants grown in laboratory or shaded environments should be regarded cautiously when formulating regional BVOC emission estimates, especially when estimating emissions during hot summer conditions conducive to high photochemical activity. Use of such ECs may cause flux estimates to be biased low. This

could be the case for model estimates of isoprene for European and North American regions where such isoprene emission rates have been used in the past.

In future studies of isoprene emission capacity, we recommend that several steps be taken to ensure that isoprene emission potential of plants is appropriately assessed. Environments during leaf development, phenology, recent (past 24 h to 2 weeks) climate, leaf age, and measurement techniques should all be carefully evaluated before measurement or assignment of measured rates to plant species. If possible, foliage at the tops of mature crowns/canopies should be examined. Enclosures of individual leaves allow more precise environmental control and less complicated interpretation of emission rate data. Leaf plasticity indices (Isebrands et al., 1999) should also be considered when studying indeterminate species such as *Populus*, since leaf flushing and growth can occur on such plants throughout the growing season. Use of gas exchange systems which allow accurate estimates of photosynthesis and stomatal behavior provides physiological information useful in interpreting isoprene emission rates.

### Acknowledgements

We are grateful to: Andrew Palmiotti of the US DOE who provided the FACTS1 meteorological data; Jim Vose of the USDA Forest Service Coweeta Hydrologic Laboratory, who provided meteorological data and logistical support at that site; Jud Edeburn of the Duke University Nicholas School of the Environment, who provided information and logistical support at several sites in Duke Forest; Bob Arnts of the US EPA's National Exposure Research Laboratory, who provided valuable assistance with the reduction gas detection system used in the North Carolina measurements; and Bob Seila of the US EPA's National Exposure Research Laboratory, who provided the reduction gas detector and performed the NIST-referenced analysis of the isoprene standard. Two anonymous reviewers provided helpful comments on this paper.

### References

- Benjamin, M.T., Sudol, M., Bloch, L., Winer, A.M., 1996. Low-emitting urban forests: a taxonomic methodology for assigning isoprene and monoterpene emission rates. *Atmospheric Environment* 30, 1437–1452.
- Chameides, W.L., Lindsay, R.W., Richardson, J., Kiang, C.S., 1988. The role of biogenic hydrocarbons in urban photochemical smog: Atlanta as a case study. *Science* 241, 1473–1475.
- Csiky, O., Seufert, G., 1999. Terpenoid emissions of Mediterranean oaks and their relation to taxonomy. *Ecological Applications* 9, 1138–1146.
- Doskey, P.V., Gao, W., 1999. Vertical mixing and chemistry of isoprene in the atmospheric boundary layer: aircraft-based measurements and numerical modeling. *Journal of Geophysical Research* 104 (D17), 21263–21274.
- Drewitt, G.B., Curren, K., Steyn, D.G., Gillespie, T.J., Niki, H., 1998. Measurement of biogenic hydrocarbon emissions from vegetation in the lower Fraser Valley, British Columbia. *Atmospheric Environment* 32, 3457–3466.
- Fall, R., Monson, R.K., 1992. Isoprene emission rate and intercellular isoprene concentration as influenced by stomatal distribution and conductance. *Plant Physiology* 100, 987–992.
- Fang, C., Monson, R.K., Cowling, E.B., 1996. Isoprene emission, photosynthesis, and growth in sweetgum (*Liquidambar styraciflua*) seedlings exposed to short- and long-term drying cycles. *Tree Physiology* 16, 441–446.
- Fuentes, J.D., Wang, D., 1999. On the seasonality of isoprene emissions from a mixed temperate forest. *Ecological Applications* 9 (4), 1118–1131.
- Fuentes, J.D., Wang, D., Gu, L., 1999. Seasonal variations in isoprene emissions from a boreal aspen forest. *Journal of Applied Meteorology* 38, 855–869.
- Fuentes, J.D., Wang, D., Hartog, G.D., Neuman, H.H., Dann, T.F., Puckett, K.J., 1995. Modeled and field measurements of biogenic hydrocarbon emissions from a Canadian deciduous forest. *Atmospheric Environment* 29, 3003–3017.
- Fuentes, J.D., Wang, D., Neumann, H.H., Gillespie, T.J., Hartog, G.D., Dann, T.F., 1996. Ambient biogenic hydrocarbons and isoprene emissions from a mixed deciduous forest. *Journal of Atmospheric Chemistry* 25, 67–95.
- Geron, C., Nie, D., Arnts, R.R., Sharkey, T.D., Singsaas, E.L., Vanderveer, P.J., Guenther, A., Sickles II, J.E., Kleindienst, T.E., 1997. Biogenic isoprene emission: model evaluation in a southeastern United States bottomland deciduous forest. *Journal of Geophysical Research* 102 (D15), 18889–18901.
- Geron, C., Guenther, A., Pierce, T., 1994. An improved model for estimating emissions of volatile organic compounds from forests in the eastern United States. *Journal of Geophysical Research* 99 (D6), 12773–12791.
- Geron, C., Guenther, A., Sharkey, T.D., Arnts, R.R., 2000. Temporal variability in the basal isoprene emission factor. *Tree Physiology* 20 (12), 799–805.
- Goldstein, A.H., Goulden, M.L., Munger, J.W., Wofsy, S.C., Geron, C.D., 1998. Seasonal course of isoprene emissions from a midlatitude deciduous forest. *Journal of Geophysical Research* 103 (D23), 31045–31056.
- Greenberg, J.P., Zimmerman, P.R., Taylor, B.E., Silver, G.M., Fall, R., 1993. Sub-parts per billion detection of isoprene using a reduction gas detector with a portable gas chromatograph. *Atmospheric Environment* 27A, 2689–2692.
- Grinspoon, J., Bowman, W.D., Fall, R., 1991. Delayed onset of isoprene emission in developing velvet bean (*Mucuna* sp.) leaves. *Plant Physiology* 97, 170–174.
- Guenther, A., Baugh, B., Brasseur, G., Greenberg, J., Harley, P., Klinger, L., Serca, D., Vierling, L., 1999. Isoprene emission estimates and uncertainties for the Central African EXPRESSO study domain. *Journal of Geophysical Research* 104 (D23), 30625–30639.
- Guenther, A., Baugh, W., Davis, K., Hampton, G., Harley, P., Klinger, L., Vierling, L., Zimmerman, P.R., Allwine, E., Dilts, S., Lamb, B., Westberg, H., Geron, C., Pierce, T., 1996c.

- Isoprene fluxes measured by enclosure, relaxed eddy accumulation, surface layer gradient, mixed layer gradient, and mixed layer mass balance techniques. *Journal of Geophysical Research* 101 (D13), 18555–18567.
- Guenther, A., Greenberg, J.P., Harley, P., Helmig, D., Klinger, L., Vierling, L., Zimmerman, P.R., Geron, C., 1996b. Leaf, branch, stand and landscape scale measurements of volatile organic compound fluxes from US woodlands. *Tree Physiology* 16, 17–24.
- Guenther, A., Hewitt, C.N., Erickson, D., Fall, R., Geron, C., Graedel, T.E., Harley, P., Klinger, L., Lerdau, M., McKay, W.A., Pierce, T., Scholes, B., Steinbrecher, R., Tallamraju, R., Taylor, J., Zimmerman, P., 1995. A global model of natural volatile organic compound emissions. *Journal of Geophysical Research* 100, 8873–8892.
- Guenther, A., Hills, A., 1998. Eddy covariance measurement of isoprene fluxes. *Journal of Geophysical Research* 103, 13145–13152.
- Guenther, A., Otter, L., Zimmerman, P., Greenberg, J., Scholes, R., Scholes, M., 1996d. Biogenic hydrocarbon emissions from southern African savannas. *Journal of Geophysical Research* 101, 25859–25865.
- Guenther, A., Zimmerman, P.R., Harley, P., 1993. Isoprene and monoterpene emission rate variability: model evaluations and sensitivity analyses. *Journal of Geophysical Research* 98, 12609–12617.
- Guenther, A., Zimmerman, P.R., Klinger, L., Greenberg, J.P., Ennis, C., Davis, K., Pollock, W., Westberg, H., Allwine, G., Geron, C.D., 1996a. Estimates of regional natural volatile organic compound fluxes from enclosure and ambient measurements. *Journal of Geophysical Research* 101 (D1), 1345–1359.
- Guenther, A., Zimmerman, P.R., Wildermuth, M., 1994. Natural volatile organic compound emission rate estimates for U.S. woodland landscapes. *Atmospheric Environment* 28, 1197–1210.
- Hakola, H., Rinne, J., Laurila, T., 1998. The hydrocarbon emission rates of tea-leaved willow (*Salix phylicifolia*), silver birch (*Betula pendula*) and European aspen (*Populus tremula*). *Atmospheric Environment* 32, 1825–1833.
- Hansen, U., Van Eijk, J., Bertin, N., Staudt, M., Kotzias, D., Seufert, G., Fugit, J.L., Torres, L., Cecinato, A., Brancaleoni, E., Ciccioli, P., Bomboi, T., 1997. Biogenic emissions and CO<sub>2</sub> gas exchange investigated on four Mediterranean shrubs. *Atmospheric Environment* 31, 157–166.
- Harley, P., Deem, G., Flint, S., Caldwell, M., 1996. Effects of growth under elevated UV-B on photosynthesis and isoprene emission in *Quercus gambelii* and *Mucuna pruriens*. *Global Change in Biosphere* 2, 101–106.
- Harley, P., Guenther, A., Zimmerman, P., 1997. Environmental controls over isoprene emission in deciduous oak canopies. *Tree Physiology* 17, 705–714.
- Harley, P., Litvak, M.E., Sharkey, T.D., Monson, R.K., 1994. Isoprene emission from velvet bean leaves. *Plant Physiology* 105, 279–285.
- Harley, P.C., Monson, R.K., Lerdau, M., 1999. Ecological and evolutionary aspects of isoprene emission from plants. *Oecologia* 118, 109–123.
- He, C., Murray, F., Lyons, T., 2000. Monoterpene and isoprene emissions from 15 *Eucalyptus* species in Australia. *Atmospheric Environment* 34, 645–655.
- Helmig, D., Klinger, L.F., Guenther, A., Vierling, L., Geron, C., Zimmerman, P., 1999. Biogenic volatile organic compound emissions (BVOCs) I. Identifications from three continental sites in the U.S. *Chemosphere* 38, 2163–2187.
- Isebrands, J.G., Guenther, A.B., Harley, P., Helmig, D., Klinger, L., Vierling, L., Zimmerman, P., Geron, C., 1999. Volatile organic compound emission rates from mixed deciduous and coniferous forests in Northern Wisconsin, USA. *Atmospheric Environment* 33, 2527–2536.
- Keller, M., Lerdau, M., 1999. Isoprene emission from tropical forest canopy leaves. *Global Biochemical Cycles* 13, 19–29.
- Kesselmeier, J., Staudt, M., 1999. Biogenic Volatile Organic Compounds (VOC): an overview on emission, physiology and ecology. *Journal of Atmospheric Chemistry* 33, 23–88.
- Khalil, M.A., Rasmussen, R.A., 1992. Forest hydrocarbon emissions: Relationships between fluxes and ambient concentrations. *Journal of the Air and Waste Management Association* 42, 810–813.
- Klinger, L.F., Greenberg, J., Guenther, A., Tyndall, G., Zimmerman, P., M'Bangui, M., Moutsambote, J.-M., Kenfack, D., 1998. Patterns in volatile organic compound emissions along a savanna-rainforest gradient in central Africa. *Journal of Geophysical Research* 103, 1443–1454.
- Lamb, B., Pierce, T., Baldocchi, D., Allwine, G., Dilts, S., Westberg, H., Geron, C., Guenther, A., Klinger, L., Harley, P., Zimmerman, P.R., 1996. Evaluation of forest canopy models for estimating isoprene emissions. *Journal of Geophysical Research* 101 (D17), 22787–22797.
- Lamb, B., Westberg, H., Allwine, G., 1985. Biogenic hydrocarbon emissions from deciduous and coniferous trees in the United States. *Journal of Geophysical Research* 90, 2380–2390.
- Lamb, B., Westberg, H., Allwine, G., 1986. Isoprene emission fluxes determined by an atmospheric tracer technique. *Atmospheric Environment* 20, 1–8.
- Lamb, B., Westberg, H., Quarles, T., Flyckt, D.L., 1984. Natural hydrocarbon emission rate measurements from selected forest sites. *U. S. Environmental Protection Agency, Environmental Sciences Research Laboratory, Research Triangle Park, NC. EPA-600/3-84-001, NTIS PB84-124981.*
- Lerdau, M., Keller, M., 1997. Controls on isoprene emission from trees in a subtropical dry forest. *Plant, Cell and Environment* 20, 569–578.
- Lerdau, M., Throop, H., 1999. Isoprene emission and photosynthesis in a tropical forest canopy: implications for model development. *Ecological Applications* 9, 1109–1117.
- Litvak, M.E., Loreto, F., Harley, P., Sharkey, T.D., Monson, R.K., 1996. The response of isoprene emission rate and photosynthetic rate to photon flux and nitrogen supply in aspen and white oak trees. *Plant, Cell and Environment* 19, 1–12.
- Loreto, F., Sharkey, T.D., 1990. A gas-exchange study of photosynthesis and isoprene emission in *Quercus rubra* L. *Planta* 182, 523–531.
- Middleton, E.M., Sullivan, J.H., Bovard, B.D., Deluca, A.J., Chan, S.S., Cannon, T.A., 1997. Seasonal variability in foliar characteristics and physiology for boreal species at the five Saskatchewan tower sites during the 1994 Boreal Ecosystem – Atmosphere Study. *Journal of Geophysical Research* 102 (D24), 28831–28844.

- Owen, S.M., Boissard, C., Hagenlocher, B., Hewitt, C.N., 1998. Field studies of isoprene emissions from vegetation in the Northwest Mediterranean region. *Journal of Geophysical Research* 103, 25499–25511.
- Owen, S., Boissard, C., Street, R.A., Duckham, S.C., Csiky, O., Hewitt, C.N., 1997. Screening of 18 Mediterranean plant species for volatile organic compound emissions. *Atmospheric Environment* 31, 101–117.
- Petron, G., Harley, P., Guenther, A. Seasonal temperature variations influence isoprene emission. *Geophysical Research Letters*, in press.
- Pier, P.A., 1995. Isoprene emission rates from northern red oak using a whole-tree chamber. *Atmospheric Environment* 29, 1347–1353.
- Pier, P.A., McDuffie Jr., C., 1997. Seasonal isoprene emission rates and model comparisons using whole-tree emissions from white oak. *Journal of Geophysical Research* 102, 23963–23971.
- Pierce, T., Dudek, M., 1996. Biogenic emission estimates for 1995. Proceedings of the AWMA Emission Inventory Specialty Conference, 4–6 September 1996, New Orleans, Louisiana, pp. 309–326.
- Pierce, T., Geron, C., Bender, L., Dennis, R., Tonnesen, G., Guenther, A., 1998. Influence of increased isoprene emissions on regional ozone modeling. *Journal of Geophysical Research* 103 (D19), 25611–25629.
- Sharkey, T.D., Loreto, F., Delwiche, C.F., 1991. High carbon dioxide and sun/shade effects on isoprene emission from oak and aspen tree leaves. *Plant, Cell and Environment* 14, 333–338.
- Sharkey, T.D., Singaas, E.L., 1995. Why plants emit isoprene. *Nature* 374, 769.
- Sharkey, T.D., Singaas, E.L., Lerdau, M.T., Geron, C., 1999. Weather effects on isoprene emission capacity and applications in emissions algorithms. *Ecological Applications* 9 (4), 1132–1137.
- Sharkey, T.D., Singaas, E.L., Vanderveer, P.J., Geron, C., 1996. Field measurements of isoprene emission from trees in response to temperature and light. *Tree Physiology* 16, 649–654.
- Silver, G., Fall, R., 1991. Enzymatic synthesis of isoprene from dimethylallyl diphosphate in aspen leaf extracts. *Plant Physiology* 97, 1588–1591.
- Singaas, E.L., Lerdau, M., Winter, K., Sharkey, T.D., 1997. Isoprene increases thermotolerance of isoprene-emitting species. *Plant Physiology* 115, 1413–1420.
- Steinbrecher, R., Hauff, K., Rabong, R., Steinbrecher, J., 1997. Isoprenoid emission of oak species typical for the Mediterranean area: source strength and controlling variables. *Atmospheric Environment* 31, 79–88.
- Street, R.A., Hewitt, C.N., Mennicken, S., 1997. Isoprene and monoterpene emissions from a *Eucalyptus* plantation in Portugal. *Journal of Geophysical Research* 102, 15875–15887.
- Trainer, M., Williams, E.J., Parrish, D.D., Buhr, M.P., Allwine, E.J., Westberg, H.H., Fehsenfeld, F.C., Liu, S.C., 1987. Models and observations of the impact of natural hydrocarbons on rural ozone. *Nature* 329, 705–707.
- Williams, J., Roberts, J.M., Fehsenfeld, F.C., Bertman, S.B., Buhr, M.P., Goldan, P.D., Hubler, G., Kuster, W.C., Ryerson, T.B., Trainer, M., Young, V., 1997. Regional ozone from biogenic hydrocarbons deduced from airborne measurements of PAN, PPN, and MPAN. *Geophysical Research Letters* 24 (9), 1099–1102.
- Xiaoshan, Z., Yujing, M., Wenzhi, S., Yahui, Z., 2000. Seasonal variations of isoprene emissions from deciduous trees. *Atmospheric Environment* 34, 3027–3032.