

Soil Carbon and Nitrogen Responses to Nitrogen Fertilizer and Harvesting Rates in Switchgrass Cropping Systems

Zachary P. Valdez¹ · William C. Hockaday^{1,2} · Caroline A. Masiello³ · Morgan E. Gallagher³ · G. Philip Robertson⁴

© Springer Science+Business Media New York 2017

Abstract The environmental sustainability of bioenergy cropping systems depends upon multiple factors such as crop selection, agricultural practices, and the management of carbon (C), nitrogen (N), and water resources. Perennial grasses, such as switchgrass (*Panicum virgatum* L.), show potential as a sustainable bioenergy source due to high yields on marginal lands with low fertilizer inputs and an extensive root system that may increase sequestration of C and N in subsurface soil horizons. We quantified the C and N stocks in roots, free particulate, and mineral-associated soil organic matter pools in a 4-year-old switchgrass system following conversion from row crop agriculture at the W.K. Kellogg Biological Station in southwest Michigan. Crops were fertilized with nitrogen at either 0, 84, or 196 kg N ha⁻¹ and harvested either once or twice annually. Twice-annual harvesting caused a reduction of C and N stocks in the relatively labile roots and free-particulate organic matter pools. Nitrogen fertilizer significantly reduced total soil organic C and N stocks, particularly in the stable,

mineral-associated C and N pools at depths greater than 15 cm. The largest total belowground C stocks in biomass and soil occurred in unfertilized plots with annual harvesting. These findings suggest that fertilization in switchgrass agriculture moderates the sequestration potential of the soil C pool.

Keywords Switchgrass · *Panicum virgatum* · Carbon cycle · Nitrogen · Bioenergy · Biofuel · Soil organic matter · Biogeochemistry · Greenhouse gases

Introduction

Managing the soil carbon cycle could help the bioenergy industry to deliver environmental benefits and mitigate the pace of climatic change. In addition to direct fossil fuel offsets, bioenergy cropping systems provide biogeochemical services such as the biological sequestration of atmospheric CO₂ in soil carbon reservoirs and biophysical services such as reduced latent heating from evapotranspiration (Margaret S. [1–3]). Carbon sequestration occurs when soil organic carbon (SOC) accumulates more rapidly than it is respired (as CO₂ or CH₄) by soil heterotrophs. Deeply rooted perennial grasses offer high annual net primary productivity (NPP) and the potential to promote the accrual of SOC [4, 5].

Switchgrass is a perennial, warm-season C₄ bunchgrass that is native to North America and is a promising bioenergy feedstock due to large aboveground yields and hardiness across climate zones, soil types, and landscapes [6–8]. Switchgrass is also suitable for marginal lands with low soil quality [8]. The extensive rooting system of switchgrass and its C₄ photosystem efficiently use water and nutrients and reduce soil erosion [9, 10]. Switchgrass rooting depths >1 m may also promote the accrual of deep SOC pools in soils where SOC has been depleted by conventional row crop agriculture [11, 12].

Electronic supplementary material The online version of this article (doi:10.1007/s12155-016-9810-7) contains supplementary material, which is available to authorized users.

✉ Zachary P. Valdez
zack_valdez@baylor.edu

¹ Institute of Ecological, Earth, and Environmental Sciences, Baylor University, 1 Bear Place, Box #97205, Waco, TX 76798, USA

² Department of Geosciences, Baylor University, 1 Bear Place, Box #97354, Waco, TX 76798, USA

³ Department of Earth Science, Rice University, Mail Stop 126, 6100 Main St, Houston, TX 77005, USA

⁴ W.K. Kellogg Biological Station and Department of Plant, Soil and Microbial Sciences, Michigan State University, Hickory Corners, MI 49060, USA

The stability of SOC can be viewed as an ecosystem property with physical, chemical, and biological controls. For the purpose of estimating relative stability, SOC pools can be divided into protected and unprotected pools. Aggregate-protected and/or mineral-associated SOC can be isolated and quantified by size or density separation procedures ([13, 14]; von [15]; M. S. [16]). The unprotected or free-particulate organic matter in the low-density light fraction (LF, $<1.8 \text{ g cm}^{-3}$) predominantly contains plant necromass (leaf and root litter) with typical turnover times <10 years [17, 18]. The mineral-associated and aggregate-protected dense fraction (DF, $>1.8 \text{ g cm}^{-3}$) of SOC has mean residence times on the order of 10 to greater than 100 years ([19, 20]; von [21]).

Soil C storage in switchgrass plantations is a biogeochemical service that can be directly influenced through management practices, such as fertilization and harvesting rates. The responses of soil C and N pools to management practices are key indicators of the role that bioenergy landscapes can play in greenhouse gas abatement strategies [22]. Varied responses of SOC to switchgrass agriculture demonstrate the complexity in plant-soil interaction and the need to study mechanisms of SOC accrual and stability (Table 1). Both fertilizer application rate and harvesting frequency can affect the accrual and long-term stability of SOC by modifying the extent to which organic matter enters protected and unprotected C pools [23, 29]. In this study, we investigated soil C and N stocks in organic matter fractions of differing depth and stability (roots, LF, and DF) in response to two treatments: N fertilization rate and harvesting frequency, applied individually and in combination. We hypothesized that more frequent harvesting would reduce belowground C and N stocks due to preferential allocation of resources to aboveground biomass at the expense of root development, while applications of N fertilizer to the soil surface would reduce the growth of roots deep into the mineral soil profile and therefore attenuate the SOC and TN stocks in the unprotected and protected fractions (LF and DF).

Materials and Methods

Field Site

The experiment was established at the W.K. Kellogg Biological Station (KBS) Long-term Ecological Research (LTER) site in southwest Michigan, USA ($42^{\circ}249 \text{ N}$, $85^{\circ}249 \text{ W}$, elevation 288 m), as part of the Great Lakes Bioenergy Research Center (GLRBC). Mean annual temperature at KBS is $10.1 \text{ }^{\circ}\text{C}$; mean annual precipitation is 1027 mm [30]. The soil is the Kalamazoo soil series, a mixed, mesic-Typic Hapludalf developed on glacial outwash with a fine and coarse loamy texture comprising 85% sand and silt [31]. Cropping history included corn-soybean and alfalfa

rotations under conventional tillage prior to the planting of an upland switchgrass variety, “Cave-in-Rock,” on July 11, 2008, at a seeding rate of 7.84 kg/ha.

The experimental design was a randomized split-plot arrangement: four replicate blocks each containing eight plots measuring 4.6 m by 15.2 m. Each plot comprised one fertilization rate that was split into two harvest intensity treatments for a total of 64 plots, each with dimensions of 4.6 m by 7.6 m. Eight fertilization treatments were applied in 28 kg N/ha increments, from 0 to 196 kg N/ha once per year between 2009 and 2011. The recommended N application rates for warm season grass crops in this area are approximately 50–120 kg N/ha [32, 33]. Granular urea 46% N (w/w) was broadcast on June 17, 2009, 1 year after plant establishment. In subsequent years, liquid urea ammonium nitrate (40% NH_4NO_3 , 30% $\text{CO}(\text{NH}_2)_2$, 30% H_2O) was applied as a foliar spray at a concentration of 28% N (w/w) in May 2010 and 2011. The plots sampled for this study were those fertilized once annually at rates of 0, 84, and 196 kg N/ha. Harvest intensity treatments were once per year (in November, after a killing frost) or twice per year (July and November) (<http://lter.kbs.msu.edu/datatables/375>).

Sample Collection and Analysis

Soil samples for this study were collected in July and November of 2011, immediately following the biomass harvest. In 2011, the mean annual temperature and total annual precipitation were $9.6 \text{ }^{\circ}\text{C}$ and 1125 mm (<http://lter.kbs.msu.edu/datatables/7>). Two soil cores from each plot were collected by first removing the litter layer and then pushing a 5-cm steel tube (5 cm diameter with plastic liner) to a soil depth of 60 cm using a hydraulic GeoProbe™. A total of eight cores per treatment (two cores per each of four replicate blocks) were extracted and capped in the field. The liners were split on site, sectioned into four depth intervals (0–5, 5–15, 15–30, 30–60 cm), and sealed in separate plastic bags before being packed with ice in coolers and shipped to Baylor University where they were stored at $-20 \text{ }^{\circ}\text{C}$ until processed. Each soil sample bag was allowed to warm to room temperature and then weighed as an initial step before handling. Each depth interval for all bulk soil cores were individually homogenized before being processed and analyzed separately. An initial subsample (50–100 g) was oven dried at $50 \text{ }^{\circ}\text{C}$ for at least 24 h (to constant mass) to determine soil dry weight for bulk density calculations. A subset of the soils were also oven dried at $105 \text{ }^{\circ}\text{C}$ to quantify any potential bias in soil masses obtained at $50 \text{ }^{\circ}\text{C}$ (Table S6). Soil bulk density was calculated by dividing the oven-dried weight by the soil core volume for each depth interval after correcting for the mass of the gravel fraction ($>2 \text{ mm}$) (<http://lter.kbs.msu.edu/datatables/308>).

The remaining soil used to calculate SOC and TN stocks was air dried, picked for roots, and sieved to 2 mm. Roots

Table 1 Summary of literature on soil C pool responses to N fertilizer in switchgrass plantations

	Location	Stand age	Soil depth interval (cm)	N fertilization rate (kg N ha ⁻¹)	Soil C response to fertilization
[5]	Ten sites in NE, ND, SD	5 years	0–30	31 to 104	Linear increase ($p = 0.03$) ^a
			0–120	31 to 104	Linear increase ($p = 0.07$)
[9]	Three sites in OH	6 years	10–20	0, 50, 100, 200	Increase in SOC ($p = 0.05$) ^a
[23]	NE	9 years	0–30	0, 50, 100, 200	No change in SOC
			0–5	60	Increase in SOC ($p = 0.05$) ^a
[24]	NE	9 years	0–30	60, 120	Increase in SOC ($p < 0.01$) ^a
			0–15	60	Increase in SOC ($p = 0.10$)
[25]	IA	3 years	0–100	65	Increase in roots
			0–100	140	Increase in roots
			0–100	220	No change in roots
[26]	SD	4 years	0–60	112, 224	Increase in SOC
[27]	KBS, MI	3 years	0–100	0 to 196	No change in SOC
[28]	AL	4 years	0–225	112	No change in SOC
			0–225	224	No change in SOC

^a p values for significant treatment effects

were hand-picked with tweezers, lightly brushed of any adhered soil, and placed in an aluminum tray for drying. Roots and a subsample of the sieved soil were placed in the drying oven at 50 °C for at least 24 h, weighed, and stored for further analysis. Approximately 20 g of the soil subsample was placed in a 50-mL centrifuge tube with approximately 30 mL of sodium iodide (NaI) solution (density = 1.8 g/cm³). After shaking for 30 s by hand, the tubes were centrifuged at 82× g for 20 min. The solution was then allowed to settle before the floating LF was decanted onto glass fiber filters (Whatman, GFF) under vacuum. The LF was rinsed with deionized water to remove residual NaI then dried in the oven at 50 °C for 24 h before being transferred to a glass vial for storage until C and N elemental analysis. The DF (>1.8 g cm⁻³) remaining in the centrifuge tube was drained and rinsed of residual NaI solution, dried, and stored for future analysis.

The remaining subsample of root-free, oven-dried soil (<2 mm) was homogenized in a planetary ball mill before determining weight percent C and N. The roots were pulverized and homogenized using dry ice and a Scienceware™ Micro-Mill grinder. An initial group of soils treated with 10% hydrochloric acid (HCl) to remove inorganic C produced no detectable carbonate at any sampled depth interval. Therefore, HCl pretreatment was deemed unnecessary for the remaining samples. The soil, root, and LF samples were

weighed into tin capsules and combusted in a Thermo Scientific Flash EA 1112 Series NC Soil Analyzer to obtain total organic C and total N concentrations. SOC and TN stocks (kg m⁻²) were calculated from the elemental concentration, soil layer bulk density, and soil layer depth (stock = concentration (g/g) × soil density (g/cm³) × depth interval (cm)). The C and N stocks in the mineral-associated, dense fraction (C_{DF} and N_{DF}, respectively) were calculated as the difference between whole soil and the free light fraction (C_{LF} and N_{LF}, respectively) stocks: C_{DF} = (SOC - C_{LF}) and N_{DF} = (total N - N_{LF}).

The aboveground switchgrass C and N stocks were estimated as the product of biomass yield and C and N concentrations obtained from KBS LTER datatables (KBS LTER Datatables: Costech Elemental Combustion System CHNS-O, 2004; Total Soil Carbon and Nitrogen, 2009; Plant Carbon and Nitrogen, 2012). Total ecosystem carbon stocks were calculated from the sum of aboveground and belowground stocks as the following: Total ecosystem C stock = (total aboveground biomass C + standing root biomass C + soil C_{LF} + soil C_{DF}). For plots harvested twice annually, the total aboveground biomass C was calculated from the sum of the July and November biomass C yields.

Deep soil core samples were collected immediately prior to switchgrass establishment in June 2008 by KBS staff and sectioned at depth intervals of 0–10, 10–25, 25–50, and 50–100 cm.

These samples were passed through a 2-mm sieve, oven dried at 60 °C, and stored in air-tight glass jars at room temperature. Subsamples were sent to Baylor University in 2016 for C and N elemental analysis. Soil C and N stocks were calculated, as described above, using elemental concentration values measured at Baylor and KBS bulk soil density values from the GLBRC Sustainability Data Catalog (KBS LTER Datatables: Soil Bulk Density, 2013). The initial (pre-switchgrass) soil C and N stocks provide a meaningful baseline against which to evaluate the switchgrass treatment effects. However, differences in sampling depth intervals preclude direct quantitative comparisons of initial soil C and N stocks to those for switchgrass treatments using statistical analysis methods.

Statistical Analyses

To test for treatment effects on C and N stocks, we used a three-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) general linear model univariate. The fixed factors in this analysis were fertilization rate, harvest frequency, and depth intervals. Homoscedasticity of data was checked by Levene's test prior to ANOVA. The p value <0.05 was chosen as the significance level in testing for differences between experimental treatments. The 84 kg N/ha fertilization rate was omitted from the ANOVA due to a lack of data for the November sampling of the twice-annual harvest treatment. Analyses were performed with IBM SPSS statistics 21.0 software (SPSS Inc., Chicago, IL).

Results

Ecosystem Carbon and Nitrogen Stocks Were Highest in Unfertilized Switchgrass Treatments

Treatment plots with the combination of twice-annual harvesting and high rates of N fertilization generated the largest aboveground biomass C and N stocks; however, the root C stock in the annually harvested treatments were significantly larger than twice-annually harvested plots ($p = 0.018$) (Fig. 1, Table S1). The SOC and TN stocks were highest in unfertilized plots (Fig. 2). The SOC stocks were 13% higher in unfertilized plots than in plots fertilized at a rate of 196 kg N ha⁻¹ ($p = 0.004$, Fig. 2a), and 85% of the change in SOC stocks occurred below 15 cm between these treatments. The soil TN stocks were also higher in unfertilized plots both in annually harvested ($p = 0.006$, Fig. 2b) and twice-annually harvested treatments ($p = 0.055$).

In our accounting of the total ecosystem C stock, Fig. 3, the C_{DF} was the largest contributor to SOC stocks. Most notably, high N fertilization rates attenuated the total ecosystem C stocks (Fig. 3) due to smaller soil C_{DF} stocks.

Treatment Effects on Soil C and N Pools

Fertilization Reduced C and N in the Dense Fraction The addition of N fertilizer reduced C_{DF} ($p = 0.003$) and N_{DF} ($p = 0.005$) stocks by 14% relative to unfertilized controls through the 60-cm soil profile (Fig. 4). The fertilizer treatments did not significantly affect C_{LF} and N_{LF} stocks ($p = 0.725$ and $p = 0.261$, respectively) or the root C and N stocks ($p = 0.253$ and $p = 0.225$, respectively).

Twice-Annual Harvesting Increased C and N in the Dense Fraction Soil N_{DF} stocks were 12% larger in the twice-annually harvested plots ($p = 0.037$). The C_{LF} stocks were 32% larger, and N_{LF} stocks were 18% larger in twice-annually harvested plots ($p = 0.049$ and $p = 0.073$, respectively), compared to annually harvested plots (Fig. 5a, b). No major differences were observed between harvest treatments for overall LF mass. The C_{LF} and N_{LF} stocks declined significantly with depth in all treatments ($p \leq 0.01$), and on average, 70% of these stocks were located in the upper 15 cm (Fig. 5a, b). The root C and N stocks were considerably more variable between treatments than other C and N pools. Nevertheless, twice-annual harvesting significantly reduced standing root biomass and root C stocks through the 60-cm soil profile ($p = 0.026$, $p = 0.018$, respectively; Table S1; Fig. 5c).

Soil C and N Pools Changed Seasonally

The SOC and TN stocks declined by 9% from July to November, and SOC stocks were also significantly smaller with N fertilization for both seasons ($p = 0.025$, Table S3). The late season decline in SOC and TN was driven by a reduction in C_{DF} and N_{DF} stocks, which occurred between the July and November harvests (Table S4). The LF mass was 28% larger with N fertilizer application ($p = 0.043$, Table S3); however, the C_{LF} and N_{LF} stocks showed no significant seasonal changes between July and November harvest dates. Root N stocks increased from July to November ($p = 0.008$, Table S4), but no other significant changes were apparent between harvest dates and among fertilization treatments for root biomass, root C stocks, and root N stocks.

Discussion

A review of recent publications on switchgrass agriculture shows substantial variability in the response of SOC stocks to N fertilizer applications (Table 1). The complex interplay of substrate quality (plant residue chemistry), nutrient availability, soil redox gradients, microbial enzyme capacity/activity and community structure, soil mineralogy, and available surface area may contribute to disparate responses of SOC and





Fig. 1 Carbon (a) and nitrogen (b) stocks in total annual aboveground (twice annual: sum of 2011 July and November harvests) and belowground (root) biomass after three full growing seasons under



different harvesting and fertilizer treatments. Standing root biomass C and N were measured in November

the effects of N fertilization across switchgrass field trials. In this study, we found several important changes in soil C and N with harvesting and fertilizer treatments. The SOC and TN stocks were significantly larger in unfertilized switchgrass stands. Approximately half of the SOC and TN stocks are found at depths >15 cm (Fig. 2) and predominantly in the mineral-associated dense fraction (Figs. 3 and 4). Additionally, twice-annual harvesting caused a reduction in the root C and free-particulate C_{LF} stocks.

Changes in Soil Carbon and Nitrogen Stocks

The unfertilized SOC stocks to 60 cm depth measured 0.78 kg C m⁻² larger than the fertilized treatment over the course of the study (3.7 years), corresponding to steady-state change of 0.21 kg C m⁻² year⁻¹. The annualized rate of 0.21 kg

C m⁻² year⁻¹ to 60 cm depth is similar to those reviewed by [34], where the average SOC accrual was 0.1 kg C m⁻² year⁻¹ to 30 cm for fertilized sites. None of the perennial grass sites they reviewed were unfertilized. Follet et al. [24] also observed an accrual rate of 0.2 kg C m⁻² year⁻¹ to 150 cm, where half of the SOC accumulated at depths below 30 cm. These relative rates of SOC change are relatively modest, and we note that [27] found no significant changes in SOC at the KBS GLBRC site, but took fewer samples and did not fractionate nor include root biomass. Nevertheless, modest SOC accrual rates can lead to significant C sequestration if the accrual occurs within protected soil pools with potential for long-term stability. The N fertilizer treatment may be detrimental to long-term sequestration potential by affecting both the accrual depth and mineral association of C and N stocks [5, 35].




Fig. 2 Soil C (a) and TN (b) stocks (roots, LF, DF) at different fertilization rates (open symbols) in Fall 2011. Initial soil C and TN stocks (closed symbols, $n = 4$) were sampled adjacent to the experimental plots at time of switchgrass establishment. Plotted values

are averages across harvest treatments for 0 and 196 kg N/ha ($n = 8$) and the single annual harvest data for the 84 kg N/ha ($n = 4$) fertilization rate at each soil depth interval. Horizontal bars are standard error for replicated field plots




Fig. 3 Total ecosystem C stocks for switchgrass cropping systems after the 3rd full growing season under fertilizer and harvest intensity treatments. Total ecosystem C stock = (total aboveground biomass +

root C stock + soil C stock (light + dense fraction)). Uppercase letters represent significant differences ($p < 0.10$) between total ecosystem C stocks

Nitrogen Fertilizer Reduced Soil C_{DF} and N_{DF} Stocks

The N fertilizer treatment plots had significantly lower C_{DF} and N_{DF} stocks compared to the unfertilized control, mainly at depths >15 cm (Figs. 2 and 3). This result is important because deeper soil C pools have longer mean residence times, which can be attributed to lower O_2 availability and slower rates of decomposition and mineralization [3, 36, 37]. The residence time (radiocarbon age) and the thermodynamic stability of SOM typically increase with soil depth [38–40]. Radiocarbon dating and laboratory incubation studies indicate that SOM associated with soil minerals (both mineral-bound and aggregate-occluded) has greater stability against biodegradation than free-particulate SOM (Margaret S. [1–3]).

The causal mechanism for the rapid response of C_{DF} to N fertilizer remains unclear, but we consider two likely mechanisms. First, molecular level studies of grassland SOM suggest that roots and microbial biomass are the predominant sources of organic matter in the dense fraction (or

humins fractions) [41–43]. Our measurements at KBS indicate that root biomass C is $\sim 30\%$ lower in the fertilized plots (196 kg N ha^{-1}) than the unfertilized plots, though the effect was not statistically significant in the 2011 samples ($p = 0.25$, Table S1). Nevertheless, a reduction in root C inputs may have contributed to lower C_{DF} and N_{DF} over the 3.7-year duration of the study. Second, N fertilization may reduce SOM accrual in the dense fraction by indirect effects on SOM decomposition rates, caused by changes to SOM chemical composition and/or microbial activity. For instance, high rates of N fertilization can increase root decomposability through the reduction of root C/N ratios [44]. Furthermore, soil nutrient availability can affect microbial community structure and activity and promote or retard the decomposition of SOM [45, 46]. Chen et al. [45] demonstrate that N fertilizer added to soil in combination with fresh plant residues tends to accelerate the mineralization of organic matter. Acceleration of the decomposition rate may reduce the accrual of SOC and TN.

Fig. 4 Averaged densefraction C (a) and N (b) stocks by depth in 0 and 196 kg N/ha (open symbols) treatments sampled in November 2011 with harvest intensities of annual and bi-annual pooled by depth interval ($n = 8$). Initial stocks (closed symbols, $n = 4$) were sampled adjacent to the experimental plots at time of switchgrass establishment at different depth intervals. Horizontal bars are standard errors for replicated field plots





Fig. 5 End of season distribution of light fraction (a, b) and root (c, d) C and N stocks for annual (open triangles) and twice-annual (open diamonds) harvest frequencies with initial LF stocks shown where measured (closed circles). Horizontal bars are standard error for replicated field plots ($n = 8$, annual and twice-annual harvest; $n = 4$, time zero)



Twice-Annual Harvesting Reduced LF and Root C and N Stocks

Mechanisms for the reduction in C_{LF} and N_{LF} pools with twice-annual harvesting (Fig. 5a, b) could be due to a more efficient removal of aboveground biomass and therefore less incorporation into the soil C and N pools, or the increased exposure at the soil surface favoring increased erosion (physical transport) and aerobic (biotic) or photic (chemical) decomposition of surface residues and associated LF organic matter. In the present study, root C stocks below 15 cm represented 30–45% of total root C to 60 cm for all samples collected in November. The smaller root C and N stocks observed in the twice-annually harvested treatment (Fig. 5c, d; Table S1) may be from the mid-season harvesting disturbance which could modify resource allocation to aboveground biomass. The 12% reduction in root C stocks with fertilization at the deepest depth (30–60 cm) may be a function of nutrient availability at the surface. The reduced root C and N inputs may also have contributed to the lower C_{LF} and N_{LF} pools in the twice-annual harvesting treatments, as root biomass can be transformed into LF SOM [28].

Soil Dense Fraction C and N Declined Rapidly Between Summer and Fall Harvests

The rapid decline of the C_{DF} and N_{DF} pools over the intervening months between July and November harvests is

surprising, given the presumed stability of this fraction (Table S3 and S4). There are several mechanisms that might explain such a rapid reduction of C_{DF} and N_{DF} stocks between harvests. (1) Seasonal soil aggregate stability could diminish between seasons as a function of increased autumn precipitation and cooler temperatures [47, 48]. (2) The priming of microorganisms by surface residue additions during the mid-season harvesting and the soil disturbance associated with that harvest could accelerate the mineralization C_{DF} [49]. (3) Alternatively (or additionally), mid-season harvesting could cause a reallocation of photosynthate from root growth to shoot growth, leading to a decline in the substrates supporting mineral-associated microbial biomass, thus diminishing C_{DF} and N_{DF} between harvests (De [50]). The reduction in C_{DF} was larger in the unfertilized treatments between harvests; however, the unfertilized plots had significantly larger C_{DF} and N_{DF} stocks at both harvest dates. This implies that high rates of N fertilization and harvesting, which reduce the production of roots, C_{LF} , and N_{LF} stocks, may also affect inputs to the C_{DF} and N_{DF} pools [51].

Summary

Although a primary objective in bioenergy production is maximizing aboveground biomass for use as feedstock for energy and fuel, energy conservation and soil C storage are also valuable biogeochemical services [52] that can further reduce the

carbon intensity of bioenergy systems. Our results show that the largest total ecosystem C stocks (aboveground + belowground) were achieved with the least energy-intensive agricultural practices: no N fertilizer and a single postseason harvest. Harvest intensity and N fertilizer rates affected the magnitude of soil C and N storage, as well as the depth and relative stability of the C and N pools. The changes in SOC occurred primarily at depths greater than 15 cm and in the dense fraction of the SOC pool where organo-mineral associations provide a mechanism for long-term soil C storage. The N fertilizer treatments caused a reduction in soil C stocks, particularly in the mineral-associated fraction, while the combination of annual harvesting and N fertilization reduced soil N stocks in the mineral-associated fraction. The twice-annual harvest treatment reduced LF and root C pools. Unfertilized switchgrass plots contained 15% more SOC, on average, 4 years after planting than did plots under high fertilization rates. Ruan et al. [27] recently demonstrated the high carbon cost of fertilizing biomass crops such as switchgrass. Our findings demonstrate that management practices that minimized carbon emissions from N fertilization and mechanical harvesting also enhanced the magnitude and longevity of soil carbon storage.

Acknowledgements Support for WCH and ZPV was provided by USDA (AFRI-2011-67009-20074), the Glasscock Energy Research Scholarship, and NSF (DGE-1356113). The field station and switchgrass trials were supported by Great Lakes Bioenergy Research Center grants (Office of Science DE-FCO2-07ER64494 and Office of Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy DE-ACO5-76RL01830) and the NSF Long-term Ecological Research Program (DEB 1027253). The authors acknowledge the important contributions of S. Vanderwulp, P. Jasrotia, A. Corbin of the KBS, Baylor Professor J.D.W. White, and Baylor students J. Von Bargen, C. Meyers, N. Cestari, R. Davis, and G. Moreira.

References

- Paul EA, Collins HP, Leavitt SW (2001) Dynamics of resistant soil carbon of midwestern agricultural soils measured by naturally occurring ^{14}C abundance. *Geoderma* 104(3–4):239–256. doi:10.1016/S0016-7061(01)00083-0
- Tom MS, Trumbore SE, Chadwick OA, Vitousek PM, Hendricks DM (1997) Mineral control of soil organic carbon storage and turnover. *Nature* 389(6647):170–173. doi:10.1038/38260
- Trumbore, Susan. 2000. “Age of soil organic matter and soil respiration: radiocarbon constraints on belowground C dynamics.” *Ecological Applications*, April. <http://escholarship.org/uc/item/17c4p17f>.
- Lal R, Griffin M, Apt J, Lave L, Granger Morgan M (2004) Managing soil carbon. *Science* 304(5669):393–393. doi:10.1126/science.1093079
- Liebig, M. A., J. A. Morgan, J. D. Reeder, B. H. Ellert, H. T. Gollany, and G. E. Schuman. 2005. “Greenhouse gas contributions and mitigation potential of agricultural practices in northwestern USA and western Canada.” *Soil and Tillage Research, Greenhouse Gas Contributions and Mitigation Potential in Agricultural Regions of North America*, 83 (1): 25–52. doi:10.1016/j.still.2005.02.008.
- Bransby DL, McLaughlin SB, Parrish DJ (1998) A review of carbon and nitrogen balances in switchgrass grown for energy. *Biomass Bioenergy* 14(4):379–384. doi:10.1016/S0961-9534(97)10074-5
- Sanderson MA, Adler PR, Boateng AA, Casler MD, Sarath G (2006) Switchgrass as a biofuels feedstock in the USA. *Can J Plant Sci* 86(Special Issue):1315–1325. doi:10.4141/P06-136
- Wright L, Turhollow A (2010) Switchgrass selection as a ‘model’ bioenergy crop: a history of the process. *Biomass Bioenergy* 34(6): 851–868. doi:10.1016/j.biombioe.2010.01.030
- Jung JY, Lal R, Jastrow JD, Tyler DD (2011) Nitrogenous fertilizer effects on soil structural properties under switchgrass. *Agric Ecosyst Environ* 141(1–2):215–220. doi:10.1016/j.agee.2011.01.016
- Vogel KP, Brejda JJ, Walters DT, Buxton DR (2002) Switchgrass biomass production in the Midwest USA. *Agron J* 94(3):413–420. doi:10.2134/agronj2002.0413
- Frank AB, Berdahl JD, Hanson JD, Liebig MA, Johnson HA (2004) Biomass and carbon partitioning in switchgrass. *Crop Sci* 44(4):1391. doi:10.2135/cropsci2004.1391
- Garten CT, Wullschlegel SD (2000) Soil carbon dynamics beneath switchgrass as indicated by stable isotope analysis. *Journal of Environment Quality* 29(2):645. doi:10.2134/jeq2000.00472425002900020036x
- Baldock JA, Skjemstad JO (2000) Role of the soil matrix and minerals in protecting natural organic materials against biological attack. *Org Geochem* 31(7–8):697–710. doi:10.1016/S0146-6380(00)00049-8
- Kleber M, Mikutta R, Tom MS, Jahn R (2005) Poorly crystalline mineral phases protect organic matter in acid subsoil horizons. *Eur J Soil Sci* 56(6):717–725. doi:10.1111/j.1365-2389.2005.00706.x
- Lützw MV, Kögel-Knabner I, Ekschmitt K, Flessa H, Guggenberger G, Matzner E, Marschner B (2007) SOM fractionation methods: relevance to functional pools and to stabilization mechanisms. *Soil Biol Biochem* 39(9):2183–2207. doi:10.1016/j.soilbio.2007.03.007
- Tom MS, Kleber M, Zavaleta ES, Zhu B, Field CB, Trumbore SE (2013) A dual isotope approach to isolate soil carbon pools of different turnover times. *Biogeosciences* 10(12):8067–8081. doi:10.5194/bg-10-8067-2013
- Gregorich EG, Janzen HH (1996) Storage of soil carbon in the light fraction and macroorganic matter. In: Carter MR, Stewart BA (eds) *Structure and organic matter storage in agricultural soils*. CRC Press, Boca Raton, pp 167–185. <http://books.google.com/books?hl=en&lr=&id=aT0spD08OFIC&oi=fnd&pg=PA167&dq=Gregorich+and+Janzen,+1996+soil+carbon&ots=kV9z1SQ0e7&sig=KN-MdTYg7jHyc2DS0ncchPZFzOM#v=onepage&q&f=false>
- Six J, Elliott ET, Paustian K, Doran JW (1998) Aggregation and soil organic matter accumulation in cultivated and native grassland soils. *Soil Sci Soc Am J* 62(5):1367. doi:10.2136/sssaj1998.03615995006200050032x
- Baisden WT, Amundson R, Cook AC, Brenner DL (2002) Turnover and storage of C and N in five density fractions from California annual grassland surface soils. *Glob Biogeochem Cycles* 16(4):64–61
- Janzen HH, Campbell CA, Brandt SA, Townley-Smith (1992) Light-fraction organic matter in soils from long-term crop rotations. *Soil Sci Soc Am J* 56(6):1799–1806. doi:10.2136/sssaj1992.03615995005600060025x
- Lützw MV, Kögel-Knabner I, Ludwig B, Matzner E, Flessa H, Ekschmitt K, Guggenberger G, Marschner B, Kalbitz K (2008) Stabilization mechanisms of organic matter in four temperate soils: development and application of a conceptual model. *J Plant Nutr Soil Sci* 171(1):111–124. doi:10.1002/jpln.200700047

22. Philip Robertson G, Hamilton SK (2011) The biogeochemistry of bioenergy landscapes: carbon, nitrogen, and water considerations. *Ecological Applications* : A Publication of the Ecological Society of America 21(4):1055–1067. doi:10.2307/23022979
23. Stewart, Catherine E., Ronald F. Follett, Elizabeth G. Pruessner, Gary E. Varvel, Kenneth P. Vogel, and Robert B. Mitchell. 2014. “Nitrogen and harvest effects on soil properties under rainfed switchgrass and no-till corn over 9 years: implications for soil quality.” *GCB Bioenergy*, January, n/a-n/a. doi:10.1111/gcbb.12142.
24. Follett RF, Vogel KP, Varvel GE, Mitchell RB, Kimble J (2012) Soil carbon sequestration by switchgrass and no-till maize grown for bioenergy. *BioEnergy Research* 5(4):866–875. doi:10.1007/s12155-012-9198-y
25. Heggenstaller AH, Moore KJ, Liebman M, Anex RP (2009) Nitrogen influences biomass and nutrient partitioning by perennial, warm-season grasses. *Agron J* 101:1363. doi:10.2134/agronj2008.0225x
26. Lee DK, Owens VN, Doolittle JJ (2007) Switchgrass and soil carbon sequestration response to ammonium nitrate, manure, and harvest frequency on conservation reserve program land. *Agron J* 99:462. doi:10.2134/agronj2006.0152
27. Ruan L, Bhardwaj AK, Hamilton SK, Philip Robertson G (2016) Nitrogen fertilization challenges the climate benefit of cellulosic biofuels. *Environ Res Lett* 11(6):64007. doi:10.1088/1748-9326/11/6/064007
28. Ma Z, Wood CW, Bransby DI (2000) Soil management impacts on soil carbon sequestration by switchgrass. *Biomass Bioenergy* 18(6):469–477. doi:10.1016/S0961-9534(00)00013-1
29. Tiemann, Lisa K., and A. Stuart Grandy. 2014. “Mechanisms of soil carbon accrual and storage in bioenergy cropping systems.” *GCB Bioenergy*, n/a-n/a. doi:10.1111/gcbb.12126
30. Robertson GP, Hamilton SK (2015) Long-term ecological research at the Kellogg Biological Station LTER site. In: *The ecology of agricultural landscapes: long-term research on the path to sustainability*. Oxford University Press, New York, New York, USA, pp 1–32. <http://lter.kbs.msu.edu/wp-content/uploads/2015/04/Robertson-Hamilton-Ch1-Conceptual-and-experimental-framework-KBS-long-term-ecological-research-LTER-site-volume-synthesis-book-2015.pdf>
31. Crum, J.R., and H.P. Collins. 1995. “KBS soils [Online]. W.K. Kellogg Biological Station Long-Term Ecological Research Project, Michigan State University, Hickory Corners, MI.” http://lter.kbs.msu.edu/about/site_description/soils.php.
32. Brejda, John J. 2000. “Fertilization of native warm-season grasses.” *Native Warm-Season Grasses: Research Trends and Issues* cssaspecialpubl (nativewarmseaso): 177–200. doi:10.2135/cssaspecialpub30.c12.
33. Wamke D, Dahl J, Lee J (2009) Nutrient recommendations for field crops in Michigan. Michigan State University Extension Bulletin E2904. <http://www.soils.msu.edu/wp-content/uploads/2014/06/MSU-Nutrient-recomdns-field-crops-E-2904.pdf>
34. Anderson-Teixeira KJ, Davis SC, Masters MD, Delucia EH (2009) Changes in soil organic carbon under biofuel crops. *GCB Bioenergy* 1(1):75–96. doi:10.1111/j.1757-1707.2008.01001.x
35. Schrumpf M, Kaiser K, Guggenberger G, Kogel-Knabner I, Schulze E-D (2013) Storage and stability of organic carbon in soils as related to depth, occlusion within aggregates, and attachment to minerals. *Biogeosciences* 10(3):1675–1691
36. Gill RA, Burke IC (2002) Influence of soil depth on the decomposition of *Bouteloua gracilis* roots in the shortgrass steppe. *Plant Soil* 241(2):233–242. doi:10.1023/A:1016146805542
37. Rumpel C, Kögel-Knabner I (2010) Deep soil organic matter—a key but poorly understood component of terrestrial C cycle. *Plant Soil* 338(1–2):143–158. doi:10.1007/s11104-010-0391-5
38. Keiluweit M, Nico PS, Kleber M, Fendorf S (2016) Are oxygen limitations under recognized regulators of organic carbon turnover in upland soils? *Biogeochemistry* 127(2–3):157–171. doi:10.1007/s10533-015-0180-6
39. LaRowe DE, Van Cappellen P (2011) Degradation of natural organic matter: a thermodynamic analysis. *Geochim Cosmochim Acta* 75(8):2030–2042. doi:10.1016/j.gca.2011.01.020
40. Wang Y, Amundson R, Trumbore S (1996) Radiocarbon dating of soil organic matter. *Quat Res* 45(3):282–288. doi:10.1006/qres.1996.0029
41. Otto A, Shunthirasingham C, Simpson MJ (2005) A comparison of plant and microbial biomarkers in grassland soils from the prairie ecozone of Canada. *Org Geochem* 36(3):425–448. doi:10.1016/j.orggeochem.2004.09.008
42. Rasse DP, Rumpel C, Dignac M-F (2005) Is soil carbon mostly root carbon? Mechanisms for a specific stabilisation. *Plant Soil* 269(1–2):341–356. doi:10.1007/s11104-004-0907-y
43. Simpson AJ, Simpson MJ, Smith E, Kelleher BP (2007) Microbially derived inputs to soil organic matter: are current estimates too low? *Environmental Science & Technology* 41(23):8070–8076. doi:10.1021/es071217x
44. Jr G, Charles T, Brice DJ, Castro HF, Graham RL, Mayes MA, Phillips JR, Post WM III et al (2011) Response of ‘Alamo’ switchgrass tissue chemistry and biomass to nitrogen fertilization in West Tennessee, USA. *Agric Ecosyst Environ* 140(1–2):289–297. doi:10.1016/j.agee.2010.12.016
45. Chen R, Senbayram M, Blagodatsky S, Myachina O, Dittert K, Lin X, Blagodatskaya E, Kuzyakov Y (2014) Soil C and N availability determine the priming effect: microbial N mining and stoichiometric decomposition theories. *Glob Chang Biol* 20(7):2356–2367. doi:10.1111/gcb.12475
46. Nottingham, Andrew T., Benjamin L. Turner, Andrew W. Stott, and Edmund V. J. Tanner. 2015. “Nitrogen and phosphorus constrain labile and stable carbon turnover in lowland tropical forest soils.” *Soil Biol Biochem* 80 (January): 26–33. doi:10.1016/j.soilbio.2014.09.012.
47. Bach EM, Hofmockel KS (2016) A time for every season: soil aggregate turnover stimulates decomposition and reduces carbon loss in grasslands managed for bioenergy. *GCB Bioenergy* 8(3):588–599. doi:10.1111/gcbb.12267
48. Dimoyiannis D (2009) Seasonal soil aggregate stability variation in relation to rainfall and temperature under Mediterranean conditions. *Earth Surf Process Landf* 34(6):860–866. doi:10.1002/esp.1785
49. Kuzyakov Y, Friedel JK, Stahr K (2000) Review of mechanisms and quantification of priming effects. *Soil Biol Biochem* 32:1485–1498
50. De Vries, Franciska T., Helene Bracht Jørgensen, Katarina Hedlund, and Richard D. Bardgett. 2015. “Disentangling plant and soil microbial controls on carbon and nitrogen loss in grassland mesocosms.” *Journal of Ecology*, February, n/a-n/a. doi:10.1111/1365-2745.12383.
51. Kallenbach CM, Grandy AS, Frey SD, Diefendorf AF (2015) Microbial physiology and necromass regulate agricultural soil carbon accumulation. *Soil Biol Biochem* 91(December):279–290. doi:10.1016/j.soilbio.2015.09.005
52. Robertson GP, Dale VH, Doering OC, Hamburg SP, Melillo JM, Wander MM, Parton WJ, Adler PR, Barney JN, Cruse RM, Duke CS, Fearnside PM, Follett RF, Gibbs HK, Goldemberg J, Mladenoff DJ, Ojima D, Palmer MW, Sharpley A, Wallace L, Weathers KC, Wiens JA, Wilhelm WW (2008) Sustainable biofuels redux. *Science* 322:49

Supporting Information

Contents

Table S1. Carbon and Nitrogen Stocks (kg m^{-2}) for Soil and Roots. Values are averages for 4 replicated plots. ANOVA results for harvesting and fertilizer treatment effects. (H x F: Harvest by Fertilizer 2-way ANOVA; H x F x D: Harvest, Fertilizer, Depth 3-way ANOVA interaction)

Table S2. Total mass, carbon, and nitrogen stocks (kg m^{-2}) of the low-density (LF) and the high-density (DF) fractions of the soil organic matter. Values are averages for 4 replicated plots. ANOVA results for harvesting and fertilizer treatment effects.

Table S3. Seasonal effects on soil and root carbon and nitrogen stocks (kg m^{-2}) within the biannual harvesting treatment. Values are averages for 4 replicated plots. ANOVA results for harvesting and fertilizer treatment effects.

Table S4. Seasonal effects on total mass, carbon, and nitrogen stocks (kg m^{-2}) of the low-density (LF) and the high-density (DF) fractions of the soil organic matter within the biannual harvesting treatment. Values are averages for 4 replicated plots. ANOVA results for harvesting and fertilizer treatment effects.

Table S5. Initial and end-of-season values for each treatment by depth for bulk density, soil C%, and soil C stock.

Table S6. Soil dry weight comparison between 50 and 105 °C.

Figure S1: Depthwise effect of harvesting and fertilizer treatments on soil N and C stocks.

Table S1. Carbon and Nitrogen Stocks (kg m^{-2}) for Soil and Roots. Values are averages for 4 replicated plots. ANOVA results for harvesting and fertilizer treatment effects.

Harvesting frequency		Annual	Annual	Biannual	Biannual	3 way ANOVA		
Fertilization rate:		0kg N/ha	196 kg N/ha	0kg N/ha	196 kg N/ha	F Value	P Value	
Soil Depth (cm)		(kg/m^2)	(kg/m^2)	(kg/m^2)	(kg/m^2)			
Soil C stock	0-5	0.968	0.859	0.978	1.020	Harvest	0.416	0.522
	5-15	1.440	1.305	1.375	1.396	Fertilizer	9.409	0.004
	15-30	1.336	1.011	1.225	1.093	Depth	16.958	0.000
	30-60	1.022	0.808	1.160	0.765	H x F	0.618	0.436
	0-60	4.766	3.983	4.737	4.274	H x F x D	0.739	0.534
Soil N Stocks	0-5	0.093	0.081	0.098	0.104	Harvest	3.879	0.055
	5-15	0.140	0.134	0.145	0.143	Fertilizer	8.213	0.006
	15-30	0.139	0.109	0.159	0.115	Depth	11.227	0.000
	30-60	0.128	0.106	0.144	0.118	H x F	0.011	0.917
	0-60	0.501	0.430	0.546	0.480	H x F x D	0.339	0.797
Root Biomass	0-5	1.552	1.549	0.914	0.885	Harvest	5.243	0.026
	5-15	1.385	0.956	1.134	0.981	Fertilizer	2.075	0.156
	15-30	0.955	0.911	0.523	0.609	Depth	0.991	0.405
	30-60	2.039	0.747	0.899	0.411	H x F	0.525	0.472
	0-60	5.930	4.163	3.470	2.886	H x F x D	0.195	0.899
Root C stock	0-5	0.110	0.100	0.061	0.067	Harvest	5.96	0.018
	5-15	0.099	0.071	0.057	0.055	Fertilizer	1.340	0.253
	15-30	0.067	0.051	0.030	0.036	Depth	1.393	0.256
	30-60	0.111	0.043	0.044	0.018	H x F	0.827	0.368
	0-60	0.387	0.265	0.191	0.176	H x F x D	0.035	0.991
Root N Stock	0-5	0.0027	0.0020	0.0015	0.0016	Harvest	3.347	0.074
	5-15	0.0018	0.0013	0.0014	0.0013	Fertilizer	1.511	0.225
	15-30	0.0012	0.0010	0.0006	0.0009	Depth	2.49	0.071
	30-60	0.0022	0.0006	0.0007	0.0005	H x F	1.714	0.197
	0-60	0.0080	0.0049	0.0042	0.0043	H x F x D	0.137	0.937

1 tailed ANOVA. Items bolded $P < 0.05$

25

26

Table S2. Total mass, carbon, and nitrogen stocks (kg m^{-2}) of the low-density (LF) and the high-density (DF) fractions of the soil organic matter. Values are averages for 4 replicated plots. ANOVA results for harvesting and fertilizer treatment effects.

Harvesting frequency:		Annual	Annual	Biannual	Biannual	ANOVA		
Fertilization rate:		0kg N/ha	196 kg N/ha	0kg N/ha	196 kg N/ha	F Value	P Value	
Soil depth (cm)		(kg/m^2)	(kg/m^2)	(kg/m^2)	(kg/m^2)			
DF C stock	0-5	0.853	0.720	0.891	0.913	Harvest	1.327	0.255
	5-15	1.349	1.169	1.329	1.347	Fertilizer	10.071	0.003
	15-30	1.288	0.982	1.180	1.056	Depth	16.979	0.000
	30-60	0.973	0.786	1.132	0.740	H x F	0.617	0.417
	0-60	4.463	3.657	4.532	4.056	H x F x D	0.907	0.445
DF N stock	0-5	0.089	0.072	0.095	0.098	Harvest	4.608	0.037
	5-15	0.137	0.127	0.142	0.140	Fertilizer	8.671	0.005
	15-30	0.137	0.108	0.157	0.114	Depth	12.105	0.000
	30-60	0.126	0.104	0.142	0.117	H x F	0.036	0.850
	0-60	0.489	0.412	0.536	0.469	H x F x D	0.386	0.764
LF mass	0-5	0.102	0.167	0.087	0.137	Harvest	1.739	0.194
	5-15	0.049	0.072	0.024	0.034	Fertilizer	2.036	0.160
	15-30	0.021	0.016	0.027	0.014	Depth	24.462	0.000
	30-60	0.014	0.010	0.013	0.006	H x F	0.232	0.632
	0-60	0.186	0.265	0.151	0.190	H x F x D	0.020	0.996
LF C Stock	0-5	0.115	0.139	0.088	0.107	Harvest	4.081	0.049
	5-15	0.091	0.136	0.046	0.049	Fertilizer	0.125	0.725
	15-30	0.048	0.029	0.045	0.037	Depth	8.895	0.000
	30-60	0.048	0.022	0.028	0.025	H x F	0.014	0.908
	0-60	0.302	0.326	0.206	0.218	H x F x D	0.309	0.819
LF N stock	0-5	0.0041	0.0082	0.0035	0.0052	Harvest	3.371	0.073
	5-15	0.0037	0.0072	0.0024	0.0027	Fertilizer	1.292	0.261
	15-30	0.0023	0.0012	0.0025	0.0015	Depth	6.087	0.001
	30-60	0.0018	0.0012	0.0014	0.0012	H x F	0.619	0.435
	0-60	0.0119	0.0179	0.0098	0.0106	H x F x D	0.441	0.725

Table S3. Seasonal effects on soil and root carbon and nitrogen stocks (kg m^{-2}) within the biannual harvesting treatment. Values are averages for 4 replicated plots. ANOVA results for harvesting and fertilizer treatment effects.

Sampling month:	July	July	November	November	3 way ANOVA			
Harvesting frequency:	Biannual	Biannual	Biannual	Biannual	F Value	P Value		
Fertilization rate:	0kg N/ha	196 kg N/ha	0kg N/ha	196 kg N/ha				
	Soil Depth (cm)	(kg/m^2)	(kg/m^2)	(kg/m^2)	(kg/m^2)			
Soil C stock	0-5	1.000	0.766	0.978	1.020	Harvest	2.971	0.091
	5-15	1.600	1.493	1.375	1.396	Fertilizer	5.316	0.025
	15-30	1.429	1.483	1.225	1.093	Depth	14.914	0.000
	30-60	1.276	0.847	1.160	0.765	H x F	0.245	0.623
	0-60	5.305	4.588	4.737	4.274	H x F x D	0.570	0.638
Soil N Stocks	0-5	0.097	0.076	0.098	0.104	Harvest	3.191	0.080
	5-15	0.159	0.161	0.145	0.143	Fertilizer	2.378	0.130
	15-30	0.149	0.169	0.159	0.115	Depth	17.799	0.000
	30-60	0.159	0.145	0.144	0.118	H x F	1.091	0.302
	0-60	0.565	0.552	0.546	0.480	H x F x D	2.171	0.104
Root Biomass	0-5	0.748	0.658	0.914	0.885	Harvest	2.481	0.122
	5-15	0.439	0.921	1.134	0.981	Fertilizer	0.96	0.332
	15-30	0.415	0.903	0.523	0.609	Depth	1.925	0.138
	30-60	0.196	0.735	0.899	0.411	H x F	5.535	0.023
	0-60	1.797	3.216	3.470	2.886	H x F x D	1.141	0.342
Root C stock	0-5	0.044	0.049	0.061	0.067	Harvest	1.59	0.213
	5-15	0.027	0.057	0.057	0.055	Fertilizer	1.109	0.298
	15-30	0.018	0.048	0.030	0.036	Depth	2.882	0.045
	30-60	0.016	0.030	0.044	0.018	H x F	2.302	0.136
	0-60	0.104	0.184	0.191	0.176	H x F x D	0.327	0.806
Root N Stock	0-5	0.0010	0.0008	0.0015	0.0016	Harvest	7.585	0.008
	5-15	0.0004	0.0010	0.0014	0.0013	Fertilizer	1.218	0.275
	15-30	0.0003	0.0008	0.0006	0.0009	Depth	5.121	0.004
	30-60	0.0002	0.0006	0.0007	0.0005	H x F	0.900	0.347
	0-60	0.002	0.003	0.004	0.004	H x F x D	0.504	0.681

28

29

Table S4. Seasonal effects on total mass, carbon, and nitrogen stocks (kg m^{-2}) of the low-density (LF) and the high-density (DF) fractions of the soil organic matter within the biannual harvesting treatment. Values are averages for 4 replicated plots. ANOVA results for harvesting and fertilizer treatment effects.

Sampling month:	July	July	November	November	ANOVA			
Harvesting frequency:	Biannual	Biannual	Biannual	Biannual	F Value	P Value		
Fertilization rate:	0kg N/ha	196 kg N/ha	0kg N/ha	196 kg N/ha				
	Soil depth (cm)	(kg/m^2)	(kg/m^2)	(kg/m^2)	(kg/m^2)			
DF-C stock	0-5	0.920	0.670	0.891	0.913	Harvest	4.515	0.039
	5-15	1.566	1.403	1.329	1.347	Fertilizer	8.144	0.006
	15-30	1.408	1.456	1.180	1.056	Depth	17.359	0.000
	30-60	1.370	0.825	1.132	0.740	H x F	0.617	0.417
	0-60	5.264	4.355	4.532	4.056	H x F x D	0.636	0.595
DF-N stock	0-5	0.094	0.072	0.095	0.098	Harvest	3.494	0.068
	5-15	0.157	0.157	0.142	0.140	Fertilizer	2.865	0.097
	15-30	0.148	0.168	0.157	0.114	Depth	19.495	0.000
	30-60	0.160	0.145	0.142	0.117	H x F	0.897	0.348
	0-60	0.560	0.541	0.536	0.469	H x F x D	2.134	0.108
LF mass	0-5	0.101	0.140	0.087	0.137	Harvest	0.100	0.753
	5-15	0.026	0.060	0.024	0.034	Fertilizer	4.321	0.043
	15-30	0.009	0.012	0.027	0.014	Depth	55.322	0.000
	30-60	0.007	0.005	0.013	0.006	H x F	0.407	0.527
	0-60	0.142	0.217	0.151	0.190	H x F x D	0.00	0.817
LF C stock	0-5	0.080	0.096	0.088	0.107	Harvest	0.204	0.653
	5-15	0.034	0.090	0.046	0.049	Fertilizer	1.907	0.174
	15-30	0.020	0.026	0.045	0.037	Depth	16.537	0.000
	30-60	0.029	0.022	0.028	0.025	H x F	0.962	0.334
	0-60	0.164	0.234	0.206	0.218	H x F x D	0.785	0.508
LF N stock	0-5	0.0034	0.0046	0.0035	0.0052	Harvest	0.184	0.670
	5-15	0.0018	0.0047	0.0024	0.0027	Fertilizer	2.041	0.160
	15-30	0.0009	0.0012	0.0025	0.0015	Depth	8.524	0.000
	30-60	0.0020	0.0009	0.0014	0.0012	H x F	0.735	0.396
	0-60	0.008	0.011	0.010	0.011	H x F x D	0.721	0.544

1 tailed ANOVA. Items bolded $P < 0.05$

30

31

32 **TABLE S5**

Bulk Density (g/cm ³)	Depth	Initial		Depth	Annual				Biannual			
		Average	S.E.		0 kg N/ha		196 kg N/ha		0 kg N/ha		196 kg N/ha	
					Average	S.E.	Average	S.E.	Average	S.E.	Average	S.E.
	0-10cm	1.131	0.037	0-5cm	1.697	0.256	1.522	0.185	1.664	0.227	1.656	0.261
	10-25cm	1.301	0.030	5-15cm	1.791	0.101	1.579	0.216	1.707	0.156	1.645	0.098
	25-50cm	1.328	0.016	15-30cm	1.854	0.070	1.686	0.082	1.678	0.146	1.690	0.107
	50-100cm	1.284	0.009	30-60cm	1.851	0.084	1.732	0.082	1.709	0.077	1.737	0.065
Soil C% (wt. percent)	Depth	Average	S.E.	Depth	Average	S.E.	Average	S.E.	Average	S.E.	Average	S.E.
	0-10cm	1.104	0.070	0-5cm	1.141	0.032	1.129	0.080	1.176	0.057	1.232	0.075
	10-25cm	0.555	0.050	5-15cm	0.804	0.050	0.826	0.048	0.805	0.041	0.849	0.030
	25-50cm	0.228	0.029	15-30cm	0.480	0.041	0.400	0.036	0.487	0.047	0.431	0.023
	50-100cm	0.089	0.012	30-60cm	0.184	0.017	0.155	0.012	0.226	0.018	0.147	0.013
Soil C Stock (kg C/m ²)	Depth	Average	S.E.	Depth	Average	S.E.	Average	S.E.	Average	S.E.	Average	S.E.
	0-10cm	1.252	0.079	0-5cm	0.968	0.047	0.859	0.062	0.978	0.027	1.020	0.061
	10-25cm	1.083	0.097	5-15cm	1.440	0.070	1.305	0.049	1.375	0.090	1.396	0.077
	25-50cm	0.758	0.095	15-30cm	1.336	0.118	1.011	0.059	1.225	0.113	1.093	0.092
	50-100cm	0.568	0.077	30-60cm	1.022	0.091	0.808	0.070	1.160	0.092	0.765	0.063

33

34 **Table S5:** Initial and end-of-season values for each treatment by depth for bulk density, soil C%, and soil C stock.

35

36

37

38 **TABLE S6**

Soil Depth (cm)	Annual Harvest				Twice-annual (July samples)			
	196 kg N/ha		0 kg N/ha		196 kg N/ha		0 kg N/ha	
Drying Temp	50°C	105°C	50°C	105°C	50°C	105°C	50°C	105°C
0-5cm	9075.3	9053.7	4212.5	4196.7	10158.8	10107.2	11426.7	11371.2
5-15cm	10488.2	10446.9	10618.9	10558.9	14685.2	14626.3	18385.6	18307
15-30cm	13284.3	13201.1	14535.7	14358.6	15311.1	15236.7	12200.6	12122.3
30-60cm	11885.1	11782.9	8552.3	8499	9298.8	9238.8	17282.7	17161


Weight in mg.

	percent difference between 50C and 105C			
	0-5cm	5-15cm	15-30cm	30-60cm
h1 401	-0.2%	-0.4%	-0.6%	-0.9%
h1- 408	-0.4%	-0.6%	-1.2%	-0.6%
july 401	-0.5%	-0.4%	-0.5%	-0.6%
july 408	-0.5%	-0.4%	-0.6%	-0.7%


39

40 **Table S6.** Soil dry weight comparison between 50 and 105 °C.

41 **FIGURE S1**



42



43

44 **Figure S1:** Depth effect of harvesting and fertilizer treatments on soil N and C stocks

45

46

47