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Abstract

While emissions of many volatile compounds, such as terpenoids, have been studied quite intensively in North American and Scandinavian boreal forests, the vast Siberian boreal forests have remained largely unexplored by experimental emission studies. In this study the shoot scale terpenoid emission rates from mature Larix cajanderi trees growing in their natural habitat in Eastern Siberia were measured. Dynamic flow-through enclosure technique was applied for adsorbent sampling (Tenax-TA and Carbopack-B used as adsorbents), and the samples were analysed offline with a gas chromatograph. The emissions were dominated by monoterpenes, which constituted between 61 and 92% of the total emission. About half of the monoterpane emissions comprised of Δ^3-carene; α- and β-pinene had significant emissions as well. Linalool emissions were also substantial, especially in June. Sesquiterpenes accounted for less than 3% and isoprene less than 1% of the total emissions. Based on the measured emission rates, the relative atmospheric concentration of each compound was estimated. Monoterpenes were the species with the highest relative concentration, while linalool and sesquiterpenes had a notably smaller contribution to the estimated atmospheric concentration than to the emission rates. Temperature dependent pool algorithm with a constant β (0.09 °C⁻¹ for monoterpenes and 0.143 °C⁻¹ for sesquiterpenes) was used to normalize the measured emission data. For monoterpenes the emission potential varied between 0.5–18.5 µg g⁻¹ dw⁻¹ h⁻¹ and for sesquiterpenes between 0.02 and 0.4 µg g⁻¹ dw⁻¹ h⁻¹.

1 Introduction

The boreal vegetation zone is the largest forested region on Earth (Bonan, 2008) and a major source of volatile organic compounds (VOCs) to the atmosphere (Guenther et al., 1995). Many dominant tree species in the Eurasian boreal region emit isoprene, mono- and sesquiterpenes (Rinne et al., 2009). These compounds have been shown to
contribute to the regional formation and growth of secondary organic aerosol (SOA; e.g. Bonn and Moortgat, 2003; Tunved et al., 2006), growing the initially formed nanoparticles to climatically relevant particle sizes (Kerminen et al., 2005; Kulmala et al., 2007; Sihto et al., 2011). The VOCs also have an effect on the local air quality and participate in lower tropospheric ozone production (Seinfeld and Pandis, 1998).

A major part of the boreal forests lies in Eurasia, east of the Ural mountain range, i.e. in Siberia. The total forested area of Siberia is 6 million km$^2$, of which almost half is dominated by larch (Larix sp.) forests, corresponding to an area equal to one-third of the Eurasian boreal forest or taiga (Shepashenko et al., 1998). Larch species are characterized by soft deciduous needles that are shed every autumn. Three species, as well as several hybrids of these, are distinguished in Siberia: L. cajanderi, L. gmelinii and L. sibirica, growing in the eastern, middle and western part of Siberia, respectively. The majority of Western scientific literature concentrates on L. gmelinii and L. sibirica, with L. cajanderi often being considered as a subspecies of L. gmelinii. However, in Russian literature all these three are recognized as separate species, and therefore, the most detailed and complete information on the larch species in Russian forests has been available only in Russian (see Abaimov, 2010 and references therein).

Larch has been reported to emit significant amounts of monoterpenes and sesquiterpenes (Isebrands et al., 1998; Ruuskanen et al., 2007; Ghirardo et al., 2009). Based on the measurements by Ruuskanen et al. (2007) and Ghirardo et al. (2009), terpenoid emissions from larch are higher than from other common boreal trees such as Norway spruce and Scots pine. However, these measurements were conducted with young seedlings either in the field or in laboratory, and have been restricted to measurements of European larch (L. decidua) and Siberian larch (L. sibirica). Despite the vast area covered by Larix in the Eurasian boreal zone, to our knowledge no prior research has been conducted on the VOC emissions from these species in vivo. Also on a general scale the biogenic VOC (BVOC) source distributions across the Eurasian boreal zone and over the course of a growing season are poorly quantified and limited to a small number of mostly short-term studies in northern Europe and North America.
with particularly few studies having been conducted in the Siberian forests (Rinne et al., 2009; Kulmala et al., 2011).

The aim of this study was to quantify and characterize the VOC emissions from fully grown mature larch trees in Siberia. The shoot scale emissions from mature *L. cajanderi* trees growing in their natural environment were measured during one growing season. Thus, this study provides a unique data set for the emission potential for one of the major tree species of Siberian taiga that can be used in the up-scaling of the VOC emissions of the Siberian Larch forests. Additionally, based on the measured VOC emission by *L. cajanderi*, estimates for the fractional distribution of the air concentrations of the emitted compounds are given.

## 2 Methods

### 2.1 Measurement site

The shoot-scale BVOC emission rates of *Larix cajanderi* were measured at the Spasskaya Pad flux measurement site (62°15′18.4″ N, 129°37′07.9″ E, 220 m a.s.l, Fig. 1.) located on the western bank of the Lena river ca. 30 km to the northwest from the city of Yakutsk. The site is an experimental forest research station of the Russian Academy of Science, Institute for Biological Problems in Cryolithozone. The measurements were conducted during three campaigns in the summer of 2009: 3–24 June, 8–26 July, and 14–30 August.

Around the measurement site, the *L. cajanderi* forest extends over several kilometers in all directions, except for small groves of birch and pine about 500 m south from the site. The canopy of the forest consists of *L. cajanderi* with a stand density of 840 trees ha⁻¹, leaf area index (LAI) of 1.56 and a mean tree height of approximately 18 m. The undergrowth consists mostly of cowberries (*Vaccinium vitis idaea*) (Ohta et al., 2008; Iida et al., 2009). The climate at the measurement site is classified as “Continental Subarctic climate with extremely severe winters (Dfd)” in Köppen
climate classification (Kottek et al., 2006), and the forest is underlaid by permafrost. The annual mean air temperature at the site is $-10.4 \, ^\circ C$, with mean temperature of the coldest month, January, being $-39.5 \, ^\circ C$ and that of the warmest month, July, $18.6 \, ^\circ C$ (Dolman et al., 2004). The annual mean precipitation for the period from 1998 to 2006 was 259 mm (Ohta et al., 2008).

### 2.2 Emission rate measurements

The measurements were done at the upper canopy of *L. cajanderi* trees that were accessed from a 15 m high scaffolding tower. During each campaign, two fully sunlit shoots of two different trees, labeled “A” and “B”, were measured using a dynamic flow-through enclosure technique. The measured shoots were enclosed in Teflon chambers that were flushed with constant flow ($5 \, l\,min^{-1}$) of VOC-free air. In order to avoid measuring emissions from stressed shoots, the chambers were put in place at least one day before the measurements started. The two branches, the shoots of which were measured, were also attached to the scaffolding tower with ropes to prevent wind from moving the shoots and causing mechanical stress. Ozone was removed from the inlet air using MnO$_2$-coated copper nets to prevent oxidation of VOCs before sampling. For more detailed description of the technique see Hakola et al. (2006). Due to practical reasons, the measurements were conducted during daylight time between 08:00 and 20:00 local time (LT).

The shoot-scale VOC emission rate ($E$, $\mu g \, g_{dw}^{-1} \, h^{-1}$) can be determined according to equation

$$E = [(C_{out} - C_{in})F] / g_{dw}, \quad (1)$$

where $g_{dw}$ (g) is the dry mass of the needles, $C_{in}$ ($\mu g$) and $C_{out}$ ($\mu g$) are the concentrations in the incoming and outgoing air, respectively, and $F$ ($l\,min^{-1}$) is the flow rate of incoming air (e.g. Hakola et al., 2006).

For offline analysis, the VOCs were collected onto adsorbent cartridges filled with Tenax-TA and Carbopack-B for one hour at a flow rate of 220 ml min$^{-1}$. Samples were
taken from the early morning to late evening, covering a wide range of photosynthetically active radiation (PAR) and temperature values. The PAR was measured with a Li190 quantum sensor (Li-Cor Inc., USA). The temperature inside the chamber was recorded using Tinytag (Gemini data loggers, UK) thermistor temperature sensors. After each of the measurement campaigns, the measured shoots were cut and their dry needle mass was determined.

The sample cartridges were stored in a refrigerator before they were shipped to Finland, and were later analysed in the laboratory of the Finnish Meteorological Institute. VOC analysis was performed using a thermal desorption instrument (Perkin-Elmer TurboMatrix 650, Waltham, USA) attached to a gas-chromatograph (Perkin-Elmer Clarus 600, Waltham, USA) with DB-5MS (60 m, 0.25 mm, 1 µm) column and a mass selective detector (Perkin-Elmer Clarus 600T, Waltham, USA). The sample tubes were desorbed at 300 °C for 5 min, cryofocused in a Tenax cold trap (−30 °C) prior to injecting the sample into the column by rapidly heating the cold trap (40 °C min⁻¹) to 300 °C. Five-point calibration was utilized using liquid standards in methanol solutions. Standard solutions were injected onto adsorbent tubes and flushed in a nitrogen flow (100 ml min⁻¹) for five minutes in order to remove methanol.

### 2.3 Emission potential calculations

In order to compare the measured emission rates to other emission studies, the emission rates need to be standardized so that the effects of environmental parameters such as changing temperature and light conditions are removed. A simple and commonly used method to standardize and model mono- and sesquiterpene emissions has been the use of temperature dependent as well as temperature and light dependent emission algorithms by Guenther et al. (1993; 1995; 1997). The traditional monoterpane emission algorithm (pool algorithm, Guenther et al., 1993), in which the emission is exponentially dependent on temperature, is implicitly based on evaporation of
monoterpenes from storage pools:

\[ E = E_{\text{pool}} \exp[\beta(T - T_S)], \]  

(2)

where \( E \) (\( \mu g \ g_{dw}^{-1} \ h^{-1} \)) is the measured emission, \( E_{\text{pool}} \) (\( \mu g \ g_{dw}^{-1} \ h^{-1} \)) is the emission in standardized temperature \( T_S \) (30 °C) and \( \beta \) (°C⁻¹) is a temperature dependence coefficient, which describes the strength of the temperature dependence, and \( T \) (°C) the temperature inside the chamber.

The light and temperature dependent algorithm, originally developed for isoprene emission, assumes that the emission originates directly from synthesis (de novo – emission), and the functional form depends on light and temperature dependence of the synthesis (see also Grote and Niinemets, 2008). The synthesis algorithm is determined by

\[ E = E_{\text{synthesis}} C_T C_L, \]  

(3)

where \( E \) (\( \mu g \ g_{dw}^{-1} \ h^{-1} \)) is the measured emission and \( E_{\text{synthesis}} \) (\( \mu g \ g_{dw}^{-1} \ h^{-1} \)) is the emission in normalized temperature (30 °C) and light (1000 \( \mu m \) mol photons m⁻² s⁻¹) conditions, and \( C_T \) and \( C_L \) are semi-empirical temperature and light dependent functions, respectively (see Guenther 1997). As the early stages of monoterpene synthesis are similar to those of isoprene synthesis, the light and temperature dependent de novo emission algorithm has also been successfully applied to monoterpene emissions from certain tree species and ecosystems (Staudt and Seufert, 1995; Kuhn et al., 2002; Rinne et al., 2002), especially for species that do not store monoterpenes in specialized leaf structures.

### 2.4 Implications for the boundary layer VOC concentrations

The turbulent mixing in the atmosphere treats all trace gases in a similar way, thus their relative abundances in the boundary layer depend on relative emission and oxidation
rates. When VOCs are emitted into the atmosphere, they are oxidized in reactions with hydroxyl radicals (OH), ozone (O\textsubscript{3}) and nitrate radicals (NO\textsubscript{3}), leading to numerous oxidation products (Seinfeld and Pandis, 1998). If the oxidation products remain volatile, they undergo further oxidation until eventually CO\textsubscript{2} and H\textsubscript{2}O are formed. Atmospheric oxidation can also lead to formation of less volatile VOCs, which contribute to formation and growth of SOA (Kroll and Seinfeld, 2008; Carslaw et al., 2010).

When assuming a well-mixed boundary layer, the time derivative of the concentration of a certain VOC is

\[
\frac{\partial[X]}{\partial t} = \frac{E_C}{h} - S,
\]

(4)

where \([X]\) is the mean concentration of a certain VOC in the boundary layer, \(E_C\) is the canopy scale emission to the boundary layer, \(S\) is the oxidation rate in the boundary layer, and \(h\) is the boundary layer height (see, e.g. Seinfeld and Pandis, 1998). In Eq. (4) all other loss processes are neglected. Using the biomass density \(bmd\), the measured shoot scale emission rates can be converted to canopy scale emission as:

\[
E_C = E \cdot bmd.
\]

(5)

The oxidation rate can be written as

\[
S = k_{\text{OH,X}}[\text{OH}][X] + k_{\text{O_3,X}}[\text{O}_3][X] + k_{\text{NO_3,X}}[\text{NO}_3][X],
\]

(6)

where \(k_{\text{OH,X}}, k_{\text{O_3,X}}\) and \(k_{\text{NO_3,X}}\) are the reaction rate constants of the oxidation reaction between hydroxyl radical, ozone and nitrite radical and compound \(X\), respectively, and \([\text{OH}], [\text{O}_3], [\text{NO}_3]\) and \([X]\) are the concentrations of hydroxyl radical, ozone, nitrate radical and compound \(X\), respectively. Oxidation due to ozone is important both during day and night time. OH and nitrate radical concentrations vary during the day; OH radicals are important in the day time, when UV-radiation is available (Petäjä et al., 2009), and nitrate radical oxidation is only important at night (e.g. Williams et al., 2011...
and Rinne et al., 2012). Hence, the nitrate radical term can be neglected for daytime oxidation rates. Thus, by combining and reorganizing Eqs. (4)–(6), the steady state concentration of \( X \) is

\[
[X] = \frac{E \cdot \text{bmd}}{h \left( k_{\text{OH},X}[\text{OH}] + k_{\text{O}_3,X}[\text{O}_3] \right)}.
\]

In Eq. (7) the boundary layer height and the biomass density is assumed to be similar for all VOCs, so the relative contribution of the emission of each VOC to the above-canopy atmospheric concentration can be written in a simplified form as

\[
[X_{\text{rel}}] = \frac{E}{k_{\text{OH},X}[\text{OH}] + k_{\text{O}_3,X}[\text{O}_3]}.
\]

Hydroxyl radical and ozone concentrations were not measured at the site, therefore typical daytime concentrations in boreal forest environment need to be used for estimating the patterns of above-canopy concentrations of VOCs. The reaction rate constants due to hydroxyl radical and ozone for each considered VOC compound are listed in Table 1. Equation (8) does not give actual concentrations and the unit is arbitrary, but it can be used for calculating the fractional contribution of individual VOCs based on the measured emission rates. The reactive compounds, meaning those compounds whose fraction of the calculated air concentrations decreases significantly compared to the fraction of the emission rates, produce more first or higher generation oxidation products and are thus more likely to participate in SOA formation than less reactive compounds. This approach does not take into account any emissions from other tree species or the undergrowth.
3 Results and discussion

3.1 The VOC emission spectra

The first measurement day was the 13 June 2009, and by then the Larix cajanderi trees, from which the VOC emissions were measured, already had needles. The emission rates determined from the data are thus representative for L. cajanderi trees during the growing season, excluding the potentially important and different VOC emission spectra and rates during the burst of the needles or the initial growth of the needles.

The speciation of the emissions from both of the trees during the three separate periods is depicted in Fig. 2. Throughout the summer, the total mass-based VOC emission spectra of both measured L. cajanderi trees were dominated by monoterpenes. Other emitted compounds were typically linalool, cineol, sesquiterpenes and very small contributions by isoprene and 2-methyl-3-buten-2-ol (MBO).

The two trees were rather similar in terms of their emission spectra. The contribution of monoterpene emissions to the total emission from tree B (79–92 %) was higher than from tree A (61–92 %), especially in June. Linalool was another significant contributor to the emission spectra of both trees; varying between 7 and 37 % for tree A and 3 and 19 % for tree B. The highest linalool emissions were measured in June and they decreased during the summer and were lowest in August. For most of the time other measured VOCs, i.e. sesquiterpenes, isoprene, cineol and MBO, each constituted 1–3 % or less of the emissions of both trees.

Ruuskanen et al. (2007) reported L. sibirica to be a substantial sesquiterpene emitter with 10 % of the emissions being sesquiterpenes. The tree measured by Ruuskanen et al. (2007) was a young, 5-yr-old L. sibirica, which was growing on a field in southern Finland where it had been planted three years earlier. The young age of the measured L. sibirica might have influenced the emission spectra. Of the emissions of L. cajanderi, sesquiterpenes accounted for 1–2 % of the tree A and 1–3 % of the tree B emissions, respectively. In general, the fraction of sesquiterpene emission have been reported to be about 5–15 % of the total VOC emissions for boreal trees, such as pine and spruce.
(Rinne et al., 2009). The relative fraction of sesquiterpenes had a somewhat increasing trend towards the end of the summer. This trend was clearer for tree B. Sesquiterpene emissions can also be related to herbivore attacks or other damages the tree may have experienced. Haapanala et al. (2009) found large α-farnesene emissions from mountain birches in northern Sweden two years after an outbreak of autumnal moth; when the measurements were repeated the following year, α-farnesene was not found any more.

The monoterpane emission spectra were similar for both measured trees A and B, although the total emission rate of the monoterpenes was notably higher for tree B. The spectra of both trees remained also fairly constant throughout the growing season (Fig. 3). About half of the monoterpane emissions were comprised of Δ3-carene. Other major compounds were α- and β-pinene that accounted for 20–30 % and 10–15 % of the total, respectively. Also camphene, limonene, terpinolene and p-cymene were detected. Of interest, Ruuskanen et al. (2007) reported the emission spectrum of a young L. sibirica to be dominated by sabinene, a compound that was not detected for L. cajanderi. However, the same study showed Δ3-carene and α- and β-pinene to also be important monoterpenes emitted by L. sibirica.

Whereas the sesquiterpene emission spectra for both measured trees were fairly similar, the spectra of the emissions from both trees changed from June and July to August (Fig. 4). In June and July sesquiterpene spectra were dominated by farnesene/alloaromadrendrene (these compounds coeluted so they cannot be separated from each other), which accounted for more than half of the sesquiterpene emissions. β-caryophyllene made up 17–29 % of the total sesquiterpene emission. Other detected sesquiterpenes were α-humulene, aromadrendrene, longicyclene and iso-longifolene. A few other sesquiterpenes were also detected, but due to the lack of suitable laboratory standards these could not be identified. The notable change in the spectra in August is most likely due to low overall emissions of sesquiterpenes in August, when the emissions were close to or below the detection limit and none of the measured sesquiterpenes were clearly dominating the spectra. The sesquiterpene emission
spectrum of *L. cajanderi* was similar to the sesquiterpene emission spectra of *L. sibirica* as measured by Ruuskanen et al. (2007). Generally speaking, β-caryophyllene is usually reported as the most abundant sesquiterpene in sesquiterpene emission spectra. Also α- and β-farnesene and α-humulene are important sesquiterpenes from many tree species (Duhl et al., 2008).

### 3.2 Measured emission rates

Measured emission rates of *L. cajanderi* had a distinct daily pattern following both temperature and light (Fig. 5). The highest emission rates were measured in June, when temperature and photosynthetically active radiation (PAR) were high and the needles were still growing.

The measured emission rates of tree B were substantially higher than those of tree A, up to 10 times higher in June and July. In August when the overall emission rates were low, the emissions from tree B were almost two orders of magnitude higher than from tree A. From the measured branches, one shoot from both trees was enclosed in the chamber for VOC sampling. The measured shoot of the tree A remained in place, but the shoot of the tree B was moving occasionally due to wind. Since mechanical stress is known to lead to high emissions of VOCs stored in the leaves, this movement could underlie the different emission rates (Niinemets et al., 2011). Another and possibly more important cause for difference in measured emission rates between the two trees could be that parts of the branches of tree B were probably affected by some herbivore. After the first campaign white “cotton like” spots were seen on several branches of tree B. These white spots could be caused by *Adelges geniculatus*, which is hosting on Larch. The Austrian Federal Research and Training Centre for Forests, Natural Hazards and Landscape (BFW) describes the symptoms of the *Adelges geniculatus* attack resulting in bent needles with white waxy wool ([http://bfw.ac.at/ws/sdis.schadenstyp_e?sdis_id_in=79](http://bfw.ac.at/ws/sdis.schadenstyp_e?sdis_id_in=79), cited on 20 December 2012). This type of waxy wool, i.e. the white spots, was clearly seen in photographs taken from the tree B. However, the measured shoot was not visibly affected by this herbivore.
In case of mechanical or herbivore attack induced stress, one expects not only different rates of emissions, but also different emission spectra, which was not observed in this study (Haapanala et al., 2009, Duhl et al., 2012). The similar emission spectra of trees A and B do not support the hypothesis that either of the trees would have been more stressed than the other. It should be noted that these results are based on measurements of two trees only, thus the cause of the difference in emission rates remains unsolved. It is possible that the difference in the observed emission rates reflects within-species variation of *L. cajanderi*.

### 3.3 Emission potentials

The emission potentials were determined using both pool and synthesis algorithms (Table 2). The calculations were done for standard conditions of 30 °C for temperature and 1000 µmol photons m⁻² s⁻¹ for the radiation. In the pool algorithm, a value of 0.09 °C⁻¹ was chosen for parameter β, which is commonly applied for monoterpenes (e.g. Guenther et al., 1993; 1995; Lindfors et al., 2000). There is no widely adopted value of β for sesquiterpenes, however; based on measurements in boreal forest, Tarvainen (2008) recommended a “generic” β value 0.19°C⁻¹ for sesquiterpene emissions. In this study (i) a β of value 0.143°C⁻¹, which was found from the nonlinear regression calculations for *L. sibirica* (Ruuskanen et al., 2007), was used, and (ii) β was kept as a free parameter when fitting the algorithm to the observations.

Recently it has become evident that monoterpene emissions from some coniferous trees can have two parallel sources: one directly from synthesis and the other one as evaporation from large storage pools (Shao et al., 2001, Ghirardo et al., 2009). Linear combination of de novo and evaporative algorithms has been used to describe the monoterpene emission via parallel sources from boreal coniferous trees and ecosystems (Steinbrecher et al., 1999; Shao et al., 2001, Ghirardo et al., 2009; Taipale et al., 2011). However, according to Ghirardo et al. (2009) only a small part of the emission from *L. decidua* originated directly from synthesis, and thus it is rather probable that the contribution of the de novo emission is small also for *L. cajanderi*. The applicability
of the hybrid model was also tested, but due to limited number of measurements the results were not reliable.

Measured mono- and sesquiterpene emission rates of L. cajanderi seemed to follow both pool and synthesis algorithm equally well (Table 2). In general the emission rates of tree B follow both pool and synthesis algorithms better than those of tree A for both mono- and sesquiterpenes. In field conditions, especially in the boreal forest in the summertime, the temperature and radiation may be strongly coupled, which makes it difficult to distinguish whether enhanced emissions were caused by increases in the radiation, temperature or both. The emission potentials obtained with the synthesis algorithm were higher than those obtained with the pool algorithm, yet the difference was within the uncertainty range.

Similarly to the measured emission rates, the determined emission potentials were highest in June for both trees A and B and they decreased towards August. Similar decreasing trend during growing season has been observed also for other boreal tree species, e.g. Pinus sylvestris (Tarvainen et al., 2005; Hakola et al., 2006). Reflecting the high emission rates, the mono- and sesquiterpene emission potentials of tree B were high compared to tree A. The normalized monoterpene emission potential, using the temperature dependent pool algorithm with constant \( \beta \) (Guenther et al., 1993), varied between 1.5 and 2.2 \( \mu g \text{g}_{dw}^{-1} \text{h}^{-1} \) for tree A and 0.5 and 18.5 \( \mu g \text{g}_{dw}^{-1} \text{h}^{-1} \) for tree B. In June and July the emission potential of tree B was almost an order of magnitude higher than that of tree A, whereas in August the monoterpene emission potential of tree A was more than four times higher than that of tree B. The monoterpene emission potentials of tree B are comparable to those of L. sibirica, which have been reported to be 5–21 \( \mu g \text{g}_{dw}^{-1} \text{h}^{-1} \) by Ruuskanen et al. (2007).

Several studies have been done on the emissions of other boreal tree species. Normalized pool emission potentials of 0.2–4.4 \( \mu g \text{g}_{dw}^{-1} \text{h}^{-1} \), 0.2–8.3 \( \mu g \text{g}_{dw}^{-1} \text{h}^{-1} \), 0.7–7.7 \( \mu g \text{g}_{dw}^{-1} \text{h}^{-1} \) and 0.2–5.5 \( \mu g \text{g}_{dw}^{-1} \text{h}^{-1} \) have been determined for Pinus sylvestris, Picea abies, Betula pendula and Betula pubescens, respectively (Janson et al., 1999; Hakola et. al., 2001; Ruuskanen et. al., 2005; Hakola et. al., 2006; for review see Rinne
et al., 2009). The results of this study are in the same range as the previous measurements, indicating that monoterpane emissions of *L. cajanderi* are comparable to other boreal tree species. For sesquiterpenes less data are available in the published literature. The temperature dependent pool emission potential algorithm yielded values of 0.02–0.03 µg g\textsubscript{dw}^{-1} h\textsuperscript{-1} for tree A and 0.04–0.4 µg g\textsubscript{dw}^{-1} h\textsuperscript{-1} for tree B, which were lower than emission potentials of *L. sibirica* (0.4–1.5 µg g\textsubscript{dw}^{-1} h\textsuperscript{-1}; Ruuskanen et al., 2007).

The β-values obtained from the pool algorithm, when varying β, for the monoterpane emissions of tree A are all somewhat close to the commonly used value 0.09°C\textsuperscript{-1}. The mean of all the β values for tree A is 0.10°C\textsuperscript{-1}. Yet, for tree B the mean β value is 0.30°C\textsuperscript{-1}, which is clearly higher than 0.09°C\textsuperscript{-1}. However, in August the β value for tree B is significantly lower than during the other months (0.05°C\textsuperscript{-1}); furthermore, in August the β values of both trees are comparable with each other. In the case of sesquiterpenes the β values of tree A are clearly lower (mean β is 0.083°C\textsuperscript{-1}) and β values of tree B substantially higher (mean 0.243°C\textsuperscript{-1}) than the value 0.143°C\textsuperscript{-1} that was used for constant β calculations.

### 3.4 Estimated relative air concentrations

In order to assess the role of VOC emissions in the atmospheric chemistry and SOA formation, relative above-canopy concentrations of monoterpenes, linalool, sesquiterpenes, isoprene and MBO were estimated for each of the three campaigns (Fig. 6). This approach assumes that the atmospheric concentrations were only due to the emissions from *L. cajanderi*, so the possible contribution from the undergrowth and the small amount of other tree species is neglected. The calculation was done separately for the emission rates obtained from the measurements for trees A and B because of the large difference in the absolute emission rate values of the two trees. For monoterpane and sesquiterpenes weighted mean reaction rate constants, which take into account the emission spectra, were used (Table 1). Because ozone oxidation reaction rate constant for p-cymene does not exist in the literature, p-cymene was omitted from the
calculations. The calculations were done using a typical summer daytime maximum
value of $10^6$ molecules cm$^{-3}$ for hydroxyl radical (Petäjä et al., 2009) and 35 ppb for
ozone (Luybovtseva et al., 2005), based on measurements in Hyytiälä, Finland.

Figure 6 shows that, similarly to the measured emission rates, monoterpenes formed
the main fraction of the total calculated air concentrations for both trees A and B, in
case of tree A especially so towards the end of the summer. As linalool and most of
the observed sesquiterpenes are very reactive, their contributions to the calculated
air concentrations were notably smaller than their contribution to the emission rates.
For linalool, due to high emissions in June and a decreasing emission trend during
the summer, the calculated air concentration was significant in June and negligible
in August. Sesquiterpene emission rates were increasing as the summer progressed,
yielding an increased contribution to the calculated air concentrations, especially in
case of tree B. For isoprene the atmospheric levels increased somewhat compared to
the emission rates for both trees A and B, however isoprene was negligible overall in
both emissions and concentrations.

The relative air concentrations for individual monoterpene species, as well as the
emission rates are shown in Fig. 7. $\Delta^3$-carene, which has the highest emission rate,
is also dominating the calculated monoterpene air concentrations; however due to its
reactivity, its fraction is smaller in air concentrations. For $\alpha$-pinene the fraction in air con-
centrations is slightly smaller compared to emission rates, whereas for $\beta$-pinene and
camphene the situation is opposite. The most reactive of the observed monoterpenes,
limonene and terpinolene have the largest decrease when comparing the fraction in
measured emission rates to the calculated air concentrations. In Scots pine (Pinus
sylvestris) dominated boreal forest the main monoterpene species in the summertime
is $\alpha$-pinene, which corresponds to about half of the monoterpene concentration (Hakola
et al., 2012). The same study showed that $\Delta^3$-carene, $\beta$-pinene, limonene and cam-
phene are the other important contributors to the total monoterpene emission, and that
the rest of the detected monoterpenes are less significant.
4 Conclusions

The shoot scale emission rates of VOCs from *Larix cajanderi* were dominated by monoterpenes, between 61 and 92% of the total emission. Also linalool emissions were substantial, especially in June. Sesquiterpenes accounted for less than 3% of the total emission. Isoprene, cineol and MBO were also detected, but their shared percentage was about 2% of the total. The emission spectra of monoterpenes remained somewhat constant throughout the summer. $\Delta^3$-carene constituted about half of the monoterpane spectra. Other significant compounds were $\alpha$- and $\beta$-pinene. In June and July more than half of the sesquiterpene spectra consisted of farnesene/allobromadrendrene. In August the sesquiterpene emissions were close to detection limits and none of the compounds were dominating the spectra.

In June, when the linalool emission rate was highest, its contribution to air chemistry and SOA formation was most significant. Nevertheless, due to their high emission rates monoterpenes contribute most to the air chemistry during the whole summer. As the atmospheric oxidation reaction rates of the main monoterpenes emitted by *L. cajanderi* are all in the same range, the calculated relative air concentrations of monoterpenes closely reflect their relative emission rates. The calculated relative abundance of sesquiterpenes is even smaller than their relative emission rates due to their high reactivity.

Large differences were observed in the emission rates of the two trees. Possibly, the measured shoots of tree B were exposed to mechanical stress; additionally, other parts of tree B may have been influenced by a herbivore attack. However, based on measurements of only two trees, it cannot be concluded whether these stress factors are explaining the different emission rates or if it is caused by tree to tree variation.

The normalized emission potentials of both mono- and sesquiterpenes were highest in the early summer and decreased towards the end of the summer. For the two measured trees A and B, the monoterpane emission potential using the temperature dependent pool algorithm with constant $\beta$ were 1.5–2.2 $\mu$g g$_{dw}^{-1}$ h$^{-1}$ and
0.5–18.5 µg g\textsubscript{dw} h\textsuperscript{-1}, respectively. These results are consistent with previous measurements done for other boreal tree species, except for the highest emission potential values of the tree B, which were higher than has been observed for other boreal tree species with the exception of *L. sibirica*. The normalized sesquiterpene emission potentials were between 2 and 3% of those of monoterpenes, 0.02–0.03 µg g\textsubscript{dw} h\textsuperscript{-1} for tree A and 0.04–0.4 µg g\textsubscript{dw} h\textsuperscript{-1} for tree B.

The structure of today’s global BVOC emission models, which linearly upscale the leaf emission potentials, requires robust information on this variable for the vegetation functional unit of the models (Arneth et al., 2008; Niinemets et al., 2010a,b). Naik et al. (2004) and Schurgers et al. (2009) adopted a value of 2.4 µgC g\textsuperscript{-1} h\textsuperscript{-1} as leaf emission potential for the boreal needle-leaf summer green plant functional type. This value is comparable to the measurements of tree A (1.3–1.9 µg g\textsubscript{dw} h\textsuperscript{-1} for monoterpenes). However, if values of tree B (0.4–16.3 µg g\textsubscript{dw} h\textsuperscript{-1} for monoterpenes) would be adopted, or some average of the two, modelled monoterpene emissions over a large part of the boreal forest would increase substantially (Arneth et al., unpublished). As a result, this would increase the derived SOA and regional radiative forcing due to SOA (Makkonen et al., 2011). Based on these measurements, a robust advice on the emission potential to be used for boreal larch in global models cannot be provided. Thus more emission measurements need to be done on several individual *L. cajanderi* trees and also on different larch species. However, the data provides evidence that previous modelling studies have underestimated the emission factors, and that estimates of monoterpene emissions across Siberia have to be revised.
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Table 1. Reaction rate constants (molecules cm\(^{-3}\) s\(^{-1}\)) of the oxidation reactions of the measured VOCs due to OH radicals and ozone.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>(k_{\text{OH}} \times 10^{12}) [molecules cm(^{-3}) s(^{-1})]</th>
<th>(k_{\text{O}_3} \times 10^{18}) [molecules cm(^{-3}) s(^{-1})]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>isoprene</td>
<td>101(^a)</td>
<td>12.8(^a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MBO</td>
<td>88.3</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monoterpenes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(\alpha)-pinene</td>
<td>53.7(^a)</td>
<td>86.6(^a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>camphene</td>
<td>53(^a)</td>
<td>0.9(^a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(\beta)-pinene</td>
<td>78.9(^a)</td>
<td>15(^a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(\Delta^3)-carene</td>
<td>88(^a)</td>
<td>37(^a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p-cymene</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>limonene</td>
<td>171(^a)</td>
<td>200(^a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>terpinolene</td>
<td>225(^a)</td>
<td>1380(^a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sesquiterpenes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>longicyclene</td>
<td>9.4(^b)</td>
<td>44(^b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iso-longifolene</td>
<td>96.2(^b)</td>
<td>11(^b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(\beta)-caryophyllene</td>
<td>145.9(^a)</td>
<td>442(^a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aromadendrene</td>
<td>62.5(^b)</td>
<td>12(^b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(\alpha)-humulene</td>
<td>235.2(^b)</td>
<td>870(^b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>alloaromadendrene</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>farnesene</td>
<td>319.6(^b)</td>
<td>10.4(^b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>linalool</td>
<td>119.6(^b)</td>
<td>432(^b)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\) Atkinson (1994)

**Table 2.** The calculated emission potentials $E_{pool}$ and $E_{synthesis}$ ($\mu$g g$_{dw}^{-1}$ h$^{-1}$) of mono- (MT) and sesquiterpenes (ST) at standard conditions (30°C and 1000 µmol photons m$^{-2}$ s$^{-1}$) using temperature dependent pool algorithm (Guenther et al., 1993) and temperature and light dependent synthesis algorithm (Guenther, 1997). The pool emission potential was determined in two different ways: by keeping the $\beta$ value constant (0.09°C$^{-1}$ for mono- and 0.143°C$^{-1}$ for sesquiterpenes) and by keeping $\beta$ as a free parameter.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>pool, constant $\beta$</th>
<th>pool, variable $\beta$</th>
<th>synthesis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$E_{pool}$</td>
<td>$r$</td>
<td>$E_{pool}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MT Tree A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June</td>
<td>2.20 ± 0.96</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>1.90 ± 2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July</td>
<td>1.50 ± 0.57</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>1.50 ± 0.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August</td>
<td>1.80 ± 2.06</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>1.50 ± 2.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All</td>
<td>1.90 ± 0.54</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>1.70 ± 0.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MT Tree B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June</td>
<td>18.50 ± 6.80</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>10.10 ± 8.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July</td>
<td>7.40 ± 2.50</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>2.10 ± 1.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August</td>
<td>0.46 ± 0.14</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>0.42 ± 0.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All</td>
<td>9.60 ± 2.60</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>3.80 ± 2.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST Tree A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June</td>
<td>0.03 ± 0.01</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>0.03 ± 0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July</td>
<td>0.02 ± 0.01</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.03 ± 0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August</td>
<td>0.03 ± 0.03</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>0.03 ± 0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All</td>
<td>0.03 ± 0.01</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>0.03 ± 0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST Tree B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June</td>
<td>0.36 ± 0.18</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>0.17 ± 0.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July</td>
<td>0.23 ± 0.09</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>0.05 ± 0.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August</td>
<td>0.04 ± 0.02</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>0.001 ± 0.004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All</td>
<td>0.25 ± 0.06</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>0.08 ± 0.06</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$^a$ only 3 data points

$^b$ only 5 data points
Fig. 1. Map showing the location of the Spasskaya Pad measurement site.
Fig. 2. Measured emission spectra of VOCs from the two *Larix cajanderi* trees during the measurement campaigns. Given below each pie chart are the monthly median and 5th and 95th percentile values of the total terpenoid emission rates.
Fig. 3. Measured emission spectra of monoterpenes from the two *Larix cajanderi* trees during the measurement campaigns. Given below each pie chart are the monthly median and 5th and 95th percentile values of the total monoterpene emission rates.
**Fig. 4.** Measured emission spectra of sesquiterpenes from the two *Larix cajanderi* trees during the measurement campaigns. Given below each pie chart are the monthly median and 5th and 95th percentile values of the total sesquiterpene emission rates.
Fig. 5. An example of the measured mono- and sesquiterpene emission rates (top) and temperature and photosynthetically active radiation (PAR) (bottom) between 13 and 15 July 2009.
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Fig. 6. Relative emission rates of the measured VOCs and their calculated air concentrations due to oxidation with OH and ozone.
Fig. 7. Relative emission rates of monoterpenes: $\Delta^3$-carene, $\alpha$-pinene, $\beta$-pinene, terpinolene, camphene, and limonene, and their calculated air concentrations due to oxidation with OH and ozone.