

FUNDAMENTALS  
OF ECOSYSTEM SCIENCE

---

# FUNDAMENTALS OF ECOSYSTEM SCIENCE

---

KATHLEEN C. WEATHERS, DAVID L. STRAYER, AND GENE E. LIKENS



AMSTERDAM • BOSTON • HEIDELBERG • LONDON  
NEW YORK • OXFORD • PARIS • SAN DIEGO  
SAN FRANCISCO • SINGAPORE • SYDNEY • TOKYO  
Academic Press is an imprint of Elsevier



Academic Press is an imprint of Elsevier

225 Wyman Street, Waltham, MA 02451, USA  
525 B Street, Suite 1800, San Diego, CA 92101-4495, USA  
84 Theobald's Road, London WC1X 8RR, UK

Copyright © 2013 Elsevier, Inc. All rights reserved.

No part of this publication may be reproduced or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic or mechanical, including photocopying, recording, or any information storage and retrieval system, without permission in writing from the Publisher. Details on how to seek permission, further information about the Publisher's permissions policies, and our arrangements with organizations such as the Copyright Clearance Center and the Copyright Licensing Agency, can be found at our website: [www.elsevier.com/permissions](http://www.elsevier.com/permissions).

This book and the individual contributions contained in it are protected under copyright by the Publisher (other than as may be noted herein).

### Notices

Knowledge and best practice in this field are constantly changing. As new research and experience broaden our understanding, changes in research methods, professional practices, or medical treatment may become necessary.

Practitioners and researchers must always rely on their own experience and knowledge in evaluating and using any information, methods, compounds, or experiments described herein. In using such information or methods they should be mindful of their own safety and the safety of others, including parties for whom they have a professional responsibility.

To the fullest extent of the law, neither the Publisher nor the authors, contributors, or editors assume any liability for any injury and/or damage to persons or property as a matter of products liability, negligence or otherwise, or from any use or operation of any methods, products, instructions, or ideas contained in the material herein.

### Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

A catalog record for this book is available from the Library of Congress

### British Library Cataloguing-in-Publication Data

A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library.

ISBN: 978-0-12-088774-3

For information on all Academic Press publications  
visit our website at <http://store.elsevier.com>

Printed in the United States of America  
13 14 15 16 9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1

Working together to grow  
libraries in developing countries

[www.elsevier.com](http://www.elsevier.com) | [www.bookaid.org](http://www.bookaid.org) | [www.sabre.org](http://www.sabre.org)

ELSEVIER

BOOK AID  
International

Sabre Foundation

# Preface

---

This book provides an introduction to the content, ideas, and major findings of contemporary ecosystem science. We wrote the book primarily for beginning graduate students and advanced undergraduates but it should also be useful to a broad range of academic scientists and resource managers, and even to dedicated amateurs who seek an introduction to the field. Ecosystem science is a rigorous, quantitative science; we assume that readers of the book will have had an introductory class in ecology and basic understanding of chemistry and math. The book deliberately covers multiple approaches to understanding ecosystems (e.g., the use of experiments, theory, cross-system comparisons), in multiple environments (terrestrial, freshwater, and marine; managed, built, and natural ecosystems), across all parts of the world (although many examples come from the authors' experience in North America).

The origins of this book stem from an intensive two-week Fundamentals of Ecosystem Ecology class (the FEE class) that we have taught to graduate students from around the world every year or two at the Cary Institute of Ecosystem Studies since 1989. We, and many of the chapter authors, have played central roles in the development, evolution, and running of the FEE class since its origin.

We decided upon an edited book for several reasons, not the least of which was its genesis in this team-taught course. While we shepherded and integrated the chapters and their contents, we also deliberately allowed—and even encouraged—multiple

approaches, and as a result, multiple “voices” will be evident throughout the book. We believe that this diversity reflects some of the myriad perspectives and approaches that are fruitfully brought to bear on the field of ecosystem science.

The book contains six major sections. The opening chapter introduces the concept of the ecosystem, explores some of the consequences of this concept, describes the intellectual tools of the science, and briefly reviews the history of this young science. Chapters 2 through 8 lay the foundation for the study of ecosystems, and cover the two major branches of ecosystem science: energetics (Chapters 2–4) and biogeochemistry (Chapters 5–8). These chapters present the core content of ecosystem science—the movement and fate of energy and materials in ecosystems—in some detail. In the synthetic Chapters 9–11, we revisit major themes that cut across multiple areas of study in ecosystem science. Authors of these chapters review the power and utility of the ecosystem concept, the roles of heterogeneity in space and time, and the importance of various types of controls in ecosystems. Chapters 12–16 take ecosystem science into the real world by illustrating, through five case studies, the value of ecosystem science in identifying and solving a range of environmental problems. The book closes with Chapter 17, co-authored by several current Cary Institute postdoctoral associates, which lays out some challenges and needs for the future. Today's ecosystem science is evolving rapidly, with major new discoveries and ideas

emerging every year. The ultimate shape and contributions of this science remain to be discovered.

This book benefited from the persistent and hard work of the Academic Press team, especially Jill Cetel, Candice Janco, and multiple graphic artists. We were also fortunate to have received helpful and critical reviews of chapters from colleagues, including Clifford Ochs and several anonymous reviewers who teach

ecosystem science; their comments substantially improved the book. We thank the authors of various chapters for their scholarship, patience, goodwill, and commitment to bringing this project to fruition. The Cary Institute's assistant, Matt Gillespie, was an enormous help as well. Finally, generations of FEE students were and continue to be an impetus and inspiration to us and the field of ecosystem science.

# Introduction to Ecosystem Science

---

*Kathleen C. Weathers, David L. Strayer, and Gene E. Likens*

Cary Institute of Ecosystem Studies, Millbrook, NY

Humans have devised many intellectual systems to understand and manage the complicated world in which we live, from physics to philosophy to economics. In this book, we present one such intellectual system, ecosystem science, that tries to make sense of the complex natural world and help us better manage it. As you will see, ecosystems can be highly varied in size and character, from a little pool of water in a tree cavity, to a redwood forest, to a neighborhood in a city, to a frigid river, to the entire globe (Figure 1.1). Nevertheless, a common set of tools and ideas can be used to analyze and understand these varied and complicated systems. The results of these analyses are both intellectually satisfying and useful in managing our planet for the benefit of humankind and nature. Indeed, because of the growing demands placed on the living and nonliving resources by humans, it could be argued that ecosystem science is one of the essential core disciplines needed to understand and manage the modern planet Earth.


This book defines the ecosystem, describes the chief characteristics of ecosystems and the major tools that scientists use to analyze them, and presents major discoveries that scientists have made about ecosystems. It also lays out some of the important questions for the future. This book is not specifically about ecosystem management, but throughout the book some of the management implications of ecosystem science are described.

## WHAT IS AN ECOSYSTEM?

---

*An ecosystem is the interacting system made up of all the living and nonliving objects in a specified volume of space.*

This deceptively simple definition both says much and leaves out much. First, as with other systems (Box 1.1), ecosystems contain more than one object, and those objects interact. More surprisingly, living and nonliving objects are given equal status in ecosystem science. A particle of clay and the plant drawing its nutrition from that clay are both parts of



**FIGURE 1.1** Some examples of ecosystems: (a) the frigid Salmon River, Idaho; (b) a residential neighborhood in Baltimore, Maryland; (c) a biofilm on a rock in a stream; (d) a section of the southern ocean containing a phytoplankton bloom; (e) a redwood forest in the fog in California; (f) a tree cavity; (g) the Earth (Photocredits: 1a - John Davis; 1b - Baltimore Ecosystem Study LTER; 1c - Colden Baxter; 1d - US government, public domain; 1e - Samuel M. Simkin; 1f - Ian Walker; 1g - NASA, <http://visibleearth.nasa.gov/>).

an ecosystem, and therefore equally valid objects of study. This viewpoint contrasts with physiology and population ecology, for example, in which the organism is the object of study, and the nonliving environment is conceived of as an external influence on the object of study. Finally, the definition implies that ecosystems have definite boundaries, but does not tell us how we might go about setting or finding the boundaries to an ecosystem.

There are some unexpectedly powerful advantages to this simple definition. First, by including all living and nonliving objects in a specified space, it is possible to use the tool of mass balance to follow the movement and fate of materials (Box 1.2). Material that comes into an ecosystem must either stay in the ecosystem or leave—there is simply no

## BOX 1.1

## SOME NONECOLOGICAL SYSTEMS

Thinking about some of the many familiar examples of nonecological systems may help you understand how ecosystems are described and compared. A system is just a collection of more than one interacting object. A few familiar systems include the group of planets rotating around the sun as a system (the solar system); the group of electrons, protons, and neutrons forming an atom; and the system of banks that controls the money supply of the United States (the Federal Reserve System). Just as with ecosystems, we can describe these systems by their structures, their functions, and the factors that control them.

A description of system structure often begins with the number and kinds of objects in the system. Thus, we might note that our solar system contains eight or nine planets; or that the copper atom has 29 electrons, 29 protons, and 35 neutrons; or that the Federal Reserve System contains a seven-member Board of Governors, 12 banks, and 26 branch banks. Systems have functional properties as well—the copper atom exchanges electrons with other atoms in chemical reactions, and the Federal Reserve System exchanges money with

other banks. Systems may be described according to their controls as well. Gravity and rotational dynamics control the motions of the planets, and the copper atom is controlled by strong and weak atomic forces, whereas the Federal Reserve System is controlled by the decisions of its Board of Governors (who, in turn are chosen by a president who is elected by the voters of the United States). All of these descriptions allow us to understand how each system works. Perhaps more importantly, they let us compare one system to another—our solar system with those of other stars; the copper atom with the cadmium atom; our current banking system in the United States with that of France, or with that of the United States in the nineteenth century. Ecosystem scientists likewise describe ecosystems in various ways to understand them better, and to allow comparisons across ecosystems.

Systems science, the general field of understanding all kinds of systems, is well developed. Many of the conceptual frameworks for ecosystem science are those of system science (e.g., [Hogan and Weathers 2003](#)).

other place for the material to go. Mass balance offers a convenient quantitative tool for measuring the integrated activity of entire, complicated systems without having to measure the properties and interactions of each of its parts. It also allows ecosystem scientists to estimate the size of a single unknown flux by difference. Consequently, it will become evident throughout the book that ecosystem scientists often use the powerful tool of mass balance.

Second, defining an ecosystem as we have done makes it possible to measure the total activity of an ecosystem without having to measure all the parts and exchanges within the ecosystem. This is sometimes referred to as a “black-box” approach, because we can




## BOX 1.2

## MASS BALANCE

To see just how useful the tool of mass balance can be, suppose we are trying to evaluate whether a lake ecosystem is taking up or releasing phosphorus. We could try to measure all the exchanges between parts of the ecosystem (e.g., the uptake of phosphorus by phytoplankton and rooted plants; the consumption and excretion of phosphorus by the animals that eat phytoplankton and plants; the release of phosphorus during the decay of phytoplankton, plants, and animals; and dozens of other exchanges), then simply sum up all of these measurements. It would take an enormous amount of work to measure all the exchanges, and our final answer would be fraught with large uncertainties. Alternatively, we could define a lake ecosystem

that was bounded by the lakeshore, the overlying air, and the bedrock deep beneath the lake sediments. Using mass balance, we note that the amount of phosphorus being retained by the lake ecosystem is simply the amount of phosphorus going into the lake minus the amount that is leaving the lake. Now we just have to measure the exchanges across the ecosystem boundary (stream water and ground water going into and out of the lake; rain, snow, and particles falling on the lake; and any animals entering and leaving the lake; hard enough!) to calculate whether the lake is taking up or releasing phosphorus. In the case of Mirror Lake, New Hampshire (Figure 1.2), almost 40% of incoming phosphorus is retained by the lake.




**FIGURE 1.2** Average phosphorus inputs and outputs in kilograms/year to Mirror Lake, NH. Total average inputs = 6.7 kilograms/year; total average outputs = 4.1 kilograms/year. Inputs - outputs = 2.7 kilograms/year or 39.7% retention of phosphorus in the lake. (Data from *Winter and Likens 2009*.)

measure the function (input and output) of a box (the ecosystem) without having to know what is in the box (Figure 1.3). Sometimes ecologists debate whether it is philosophically possible to predict the properties of a complex system by studying its parts (reductionism) or whether it is necessary to study intact systems (holism). It is not necessary to accept the philosophical claims of holism, though, to recognize that studies of whole systems may be a much more efficient way than reductionism to understand ecosystems. Such a holistic approach to ecosystems is a powerful tool of ecosystem science, and is often combined with reductionist approaches to develop insights into the functioning and controls of ecosystems.

Third, the definition gives the investigator complete flexibility in choosing where to set the boundaries of the ecosystem in time and space. The size, location, and timescale at which ecosystems are defined can therefore precisely match the question that the scientist is trying to answer. Boundaries often are drawn at places where fluxes are easy to measure (e.g., a single point on a stream as it leaves a forested-watershed ecosystem) or so that fluxes across the boundary are small compared to cycling inside the ecosystem (e.g., a lake shore). Nevertheless, boundaries are required to make quantitative measures of these fluxes. It is true that ecosystems frequently are defined to be large (e.g., lakes and watersheds hectares to square kilometers in size) and are studied on the scale of days to a few years, but there is nothing in the definition of ecosystem that *requires* ecosystems to be defined at this scale. Indeed, as you will see, an ecosystem may be as small as a single rock or as large as the entire Earth, and can be studied for time periods as long as hundreds of millions of years.

Fourth, defining an ecosystem to contain both living and nonliving objects recognizes the importance of both living and nonliving parts of ecosystems in controlling the functions and responses of these systems. There are examples throughout the book in which living organisms, nonliving objects, or both acting together determine what ecosystems look like (structure) and how they work (function). Furthermore, the close ties and strong interactions between the living and nonliving parts of ecosystems are so varied and so strong that it would be very inconvenient to study one without the other. Thus, the



**FIGURE 1.3** Two views of the same ecosystem. The left side shows some of the parts inside an ecosystem and how they are connected, as well as the exchanges between the ecosystem and its surroundings, whereas the right side shows a black-box approach in which the functions of an ecosystem (i.e., its inputs and outputs) can be studied without knowing what is inside the box. (Modified from *Likens 1992*.)

inclusion of living and nonliving objects in ecosystems has practical as well as intellectual advantages.

Finally, we note one further property of ecosystems—they are open to the flow of energy and materials. It might be theoretically possible to define particular examples of ecosystems that are closed systems, not exchanging energy or materials with their surroundings, but nearly all ecosystems as actually defined have important exchanges of energy and materials with their surroundings. Indeed, such exchanges are one of the central subjects of ecosystem science. We note in particular that most ecosystems depend on energy inputs from external sources, either as energy from the sun or as organic matter brought in from neighboring ecosystems.

Now consider briefly what is missing from the definition. We have already noted that the definition does not specify the time or space scales over which an ecosystem is defined, or where exactly the boundaries are placed. Ecosystems are not required to be self-regulating, permanent, stable, or sustainable. They are not required to have any particular functional properties. For example, they need not be in balance or efficient in the way that they process materials. Our definition does not require ecosystems to have a purpose. Although ecosystems change over time, the basic definition does not suggest anything about the nature or direction of that change. It might seem like a shame not to include such interesting attributes in a definition of ecosystem (O'Neill 2001), and indeed some ecologists have included such attributes in their definitions, but we think it is neither necessary nor helpful to include them in a basic definition. They may, however, be useful hypotheses and the subject of fruitful research projects. For instance, we might hypothesize that as forest ecosystems recover from disturbances like fire or clear-cutting, they retain a higher proportion of nutrient inputs. This viewpoint is quite different than saying that ecosystems *are* systems that tend to maximize efficiency of use of limiting nutrients.

## WHAT ARE THE PROPERTIES OF ECOSYSTEMS?

---

All systems have characteristic properties that allow us to describe them and compare them with other similar systems (Box 1.1). How might we describe the properties of ecosystems?

### What Is in an Ecosystem?

We might begin simply by listing the contents of an ecosystem. Plants and animals occur in most ecosystems. As we will see later in the book, the number and kinds of plants and animals can have a strong influence on ecosystem function. Many ecosystems also contain people. Historically, many ecologists treated humans as being outside of the ecosystem, or deliberately studied ecosystems without people, but it has become increasingly common to treat people and our institutions as parts of ecosystems (e.g., Pickett et al. 2001, 2011; see Chapter 17). Certainly the structure and function of many modern ecosystems cannot be understood without considering human activities.

Almost all ecosystems contain microbes (bacteria and fungi); although not as conspicuous as plants and animals, their activities are vital to ecosystem functioning. Viruses occur in most ecosystems, and may play important roles as regulators of plant, animal, and microbial populations. Ecosystems also contain water and air, which are themselves resources for many organisms and also serve as media in which organisms and nonliving materials can be transported. Finally, ecosystems contain an enormous variety of nonliving materials, organic and inorganic, solid and dissolved. These nonliving materials, including such disparate items as dead wood, clay particles, bedrock, oxygen, and dissolved nutrients, interact with the living biota and exercise strong influences on the character and functioning of ecosystems. Thus, the total inventory of an ecosystem can be very long; it might contain thousands or millions of kinds of items, living and nonliving.

### Ecosystems Have Structure

This complexity allows for an essentially infinite number of possible descriptions of ecosystem structure. Nevertheless, only a few descriptions of ecosystem structure are commonly used by the scientists who study ecosystems. Often ecosystems are described by the numbers and kinds of objects that they contain, focusing on key materials or organisms. Thus, we may describe an ecosystem as having a plant biomass of  $300 \text{ g/m}^2$ , or a deer population of  $5/\text{km}^2$ , or a nitrogen content of  $200 \text{ kg/ha}$ . Sometimes ecosystem scientists describe ecosystems by the ratios of key elements such as the nitrogen:phosphorus ratio of a lake ecosystem. If we were interested in the role of biological communities in regulating ecosystem function, we would refer to the biodiversity (especially the species richness) of the organisms in the ecosystem. We may be interested in the spatial variation, as well as the mean value, of any such key variables (see Chapter 10). Thus, we may describe ecosystems as being highly patchy as opposed to relatively homogeneous in nitrogen content or biodiversity. Finally, scientists often describe ecosystems by their size or location (e.g., latitude, altitude, biogeographic realm, or distance from the coast).

### Ecosystems Perform Functions

In the broadest sense, ecosystems consume energy and transform materials. As with all systems subject to the second law of thermodynamics, some of the useful energy that comes into ecosystems in forms such as solar radiation, chemical energy (e.g., organic matter), or mechanical energy (e.g., wind) is degraded to heat and becomes unable to perform further work. In particular, living organisms need a continual source of energy to maintain biochemical and physiological integrity, as well as to perform activities such as swimming, running, and flying. Curiously, although these biological energy transformations are only a part of the energy transformations that occur in an ecosystem, most studies of energy flow through ecosystems treat only forms of energy that can be captured and used by living organisms (i.e., solar radiation and chemical energy), and ignore such purely abiotic processes as the conversion of kinetic energy to heat by flowing water. Organisms can capture solar energy or chemical energy from inorganic

compounds (photosynthesis and chemosynthesis, respectively), store energy, obtain energy from other organisms (e.g., predation), or convert energy into heat (respiration). Patterns of energy flow through ecosystems can be of direct interest to humans who harvest wild populations, and can tell ecosystem scientists a good deal about how different ecosystems function.

Ecosystems also transform materials in various ways. Materials that come into the ecosystem may be taken up by some part of the ecosystem and accumulate. In some cases, this accumulation may be temporary so that the ecosystem acts as a sort of capacitor, releasing the material at a later time. The lag time between atmospheric deposition of sulfate onto a terrestrial ecosystem and its export in stream water from that system is an example. Ecosystems may also be a source of material, releasing their internal stores to neighboring systems. Weathering of soils and bedrock is a prime example. Finally, and perhaps most interesting, ecosystems transform materials by changing their chemical and physical states (see Chapter 5). Nitric acid contained in rainwater falling on a forest soil may react with the soil and form calcium nitrate in soil water. The nitrate in the solution may then be taken up by a plant and incorporated into protein in a leaf. At the end of the growing season, the leaf may fall into a stream where it is eaten by an insect and chopped into small leafy bits, which then wash out of the ecosystem. The description of chemical and biological transformations by ecosystems forms the field of biogeochemistry (Schlesinger 1997; see Chapter 5), a major part of modern ecosystem sciences (and this book). Many biogeochemical functions are important to humans (e.g., the removal of nitrate by riparian forests in the Mississippi River basin), as well as essential to understanding how different ecosystems work.

Ecosystems often are described by their functions as well as their structures. One of the most common functional descriptions of ecosystems is whether the system is a source or a sink of a given material; that is, whether the inputs of that material to the ecosystem are less or more, respectively, than the outputs of that material from the ecosystem. In the special case of energy flow through ecosystems, the degree to which an ecosystem is a source or a sink is described by the P/R (gross photosynthesis to respiration) ratio for the system. At a steady state, ecosystems with a P/R ratio less than 1 must import chemical energy (usually organic matter) from neighboring ecosystems and are called heterotrophic; those with a P/R ratio greater than 1 export chemical energy to neighboring ecosystems and are called autotrophic. Another useful functional description is the residence time of a given material in an ecosystem; that is, the average amount of time that a material spends in an ecosystem. Residence time is calculated by dividing the standing stock of the material in the ecosystem by its input rate.

Recently, people have begun to formally recognize that ecosystem structures and functions may have economic value. For instance, ecosystems provide lumber, they purify water and air, they regulate the prevalence of human diseases, and they provide pollination for crop plants. These and many other goods and services provided by ecosystems are now commonly called “ecosystem services”—the benefits that people derive from ecosystem structures and functions (e.g., Millennium Ecosystem Assessment 2005; Kareiva et al. 2011). Developing ways to estimate quantitatively the value of ecosystem services is an important and developing field at the intersection of ecology and economics.

## Ecosystem Structure and Function Are Controlled by Many Factors

Unlike systems like the solar system, the dynamics of which are controlled by just a few factors, ecosystem structure and function depend on many factors. Ecosystem scientists have learned much about how ecosystems are controlled, and much of the remainder of this book will be concerned with this subject (see Chapter 11). Ecosystem structure and function often are affected by organisms (including humans), either through trophic activities such as herbivory, predation, and decomposition, or through engineering activities (Jones et al. 1994) such as burrowing, shelter construction (beaver dams), and the like (see Box 11.1 in Chapter 11). Likewise, the nonliving parts of ecosystems often control ecosystems by determining supplies and movement of air, water, key nutrients, and other materials. Temperature is another abiotic factor that has strong effects on ecosystems. Finally, because most ecosystems are open and exchange energy and materials with the ecosystems that surround them or that preceded them, the structure and function of an ecosystem can be strongly affected by its spatial and temporal context (see Chapter 10).

## Ecosystems Change Through Time

Ecosystems change through time (see Chapters 10 and 11). These changes may be gradual and subtle (the millennial losses of minerals from a weathering soil) or fast and dramatic (a fire sweeping through a forest). Both external forces (changes in climate or nutrient inputs) and internal dynamics (aging of a tree population, accumulation or depletion of materials in a soil or a lake) are important in driving temporal changes in ecosystems. In some cases, changes are directional and predictable (e.g., soil weathering, the filling of a lake basin), while in other cases changes may be idiosyncratic and difficult to predict (e.g., the arrival of an invasive species, disturbance by a hurricane). Understanding and predicting how ecosystems change through time is of great theoretical and practical interest, and is a major part of contemporary ecosystem science.

## How Do We Classify or Compare Ecosystems?

Thus, ecosystem scientists use structure, function, control, and temporal dynamics to classify and compare ecosystems. For instance, it is common to see ecosystems described as rich in nitrogen (structure), sinks for carbon (function), fire-dominated (control), or recently disturbed (dynamics). All of these attributes of ecosystems can provide useful frameworks to classify ecosystems, and ultimately to organize and interpret the vast amount of information that scientists have collected about ecosystems. Similar descriptions and classifications are evident throughout the book.

## WHY DO SCIENTISTS STUDY ECOSYSTEMS?

Scientists have been motivated to study ecosystems for several reasons. To begin with, if ecosystems truly are the “basic units of nature” on Earth, any attempt to understand our planet and the products of evolution on it must include ecosystem science as a central

theme. Indeed much of ecosystem science has been motivated by simple curiosity about how our world and how systems—whether ecological, social, or socio-ecological—work. Many salable products such as timber and fish are taken directly from “wild” ecosystems, so many early ecosystem studies were done to try to better understand the processes that supported these products and ultimately increase their yields. Especially in the past 20 years, we have come to realize that the valuable products of nature include far more than obviously salable products like timber and fish. Wild ecosystems also provide us with clean air and water, opportunities for recreation and spiritual fulfillment, protection from diseases, and many more “ecosystem services” (e.g., [Millennium Ecosystem Assessment 2005](#); [Kareiva et al. 2011](#)). Human economies and well-being are wholly embedded in and dependent on wild ecosystems. Thus, many contemporary ecosystem studies are concerned with how ecosystems provide this broad array of services, how human activities reduce or restore the ability of ecosystems to provide these services, and ultimately trying to reconcile the growing demands of human populations with the needs of both nature and ourselves for functioning ecosystems.

## HOW DO ECOSYSTEM SCIENTISTS LEARN ABOUT ECOSYSTEMS?

---

Depending on the problem that they are studying, ecosystem scientists use a wide variety of approaches and an array of simple to sophisticated tools to measure different aspects of ecosystem structure and function. We offer a few examples here; however, new approaches and tools emerge every year, and with them come more ways to open black boxes in ecosystem science (see Chapter 17).

### Approaches for Learning about Ecosystems

There are multiple approaches by which scientists can understand ecosystem structure, function, and development, both qualitatively and quantitatively. Five approaches are especially important in ecosystem science, including (1) natural history or observation, (2) theory and conceptual models, (3) long-term study, (4) cross-ecosystem comparison, and (5) experiments (modified from the lists of [Likens 1992](#); [Carpenter 1998](#)). These approaches are complementary to one another ([Table 1.1](#)), and are best used in combination. Almost every scientific question of any size or importance requires the use of two or more of these approaches to get a satisfactory answer.

#### ***Natural History***

A good deal can be learned about ecosystems simply from watching them and documenting what is observed in some fashion. Do fallen leaves decay in place, wash away into a stream, or burn in episodic fires? Is the soil deep and rich, or shallow and rocky? Does it freeze in the winter? As a result, our understanding of an ecosystem often is based on simple observations of its natural history. Indeed, without such careful observations, even the most sophisticated studies can go astray by formulating nonsensical questions or

omitting key observations or measurements. Not surprisingly, careful natural history studies (such as Forbes' "The Lake as a Microcosm," discussed later) were important precursors to modern ecosystem science. Although these forerunners of ecosystem science often included speculation about ecosystem processes, they did not have the technical means to easily measure such functions as net ecosystem productivity or nutrient cycling, or to quantify trophic transfers.

### ***Long-Term Studies***

Long-term studies (i.e., those lasting for more than 3 to 5 years—the length of most grants or the time it takes to earn a PhD!) are relatively rare in ecology as a whole. However, long-term studies are especially good at providing insight into slow processes (e.g., changes associated with forest succession), subtle changes (e.g., changing chemistry of precipitation), rare events (e.g., effects of hurricanes or insect outbreaks), or processes controlled by multiple interacting factors (e.g., fish recruitment; [Likens 1989](#); [Lindenmayer and Likens 2010](#); and see the Long-Term Ecological Research Program (LTER) of the National Science Foundation, <http://www.lternet.edu>). Sometimes long-term understanding can be obtained by short-term analyses of materials that record history, such as soil or sediment cores, otoliths (fish ear-stones), or written historical records. For example, analysis of pollen, diatoms, pigments, geochemistry, and minerals in lake sediment can reveal the history of terrestrial vegetation, phytoplankton, soils, and lake level—in short, the history of the development of the linkages between terrestrial and aquatic ecosystems. It is from long-term studies or their surrogates that scientists have documented climatic, atmospheric, geochemical, and organismal changes over decades to billions of years.

### ***Cross-Ecosystem Comparison***

Comparative studies have served two important roles in ecosystem science. Most simply, scientists often have measured some variable associated with ecosystem structure or function across a series of ecosystems to identify typical values of that variable, show how it varies among types of ecosystems, and generate hypotheses about what factors might

**TABLE 1.1** Strengths and limitations of approaches to understanding ecosystems. Natural history observations and understanding underpin all of these approaches.

| <b>Approach</b>       | <b>Some Strengths</b>  | <b>Some Limitations</b>  |
|-----------------------|--|--|
| Theory                | Flexibility of scale; integration; deduction of testable ideas   | Cannot develop without linkage to observation, experiment                                  |
| Long-term observation | Temporal context; detection of trends and surprises; test hypotheses about temporal variation                    | Potentially site specific, difficult to determine cause                                    |
| Comparison            | Spatial or inter-ecosystem context; detection of spatial pattern; test hypotheses about spatial variation        | Difficult to predict temporal change or response to perturbation                           |
| Ecosystem experiment  | Measure ecosystem response to perturbation; test hypothesis about controls and management of ecosystem processes | Potentially site specific; potentially difficult to rule out some explanations; hard to do |

*After Carpenter (1998).*



control that variable. An example of such an analysis is shown in Table 2.1 in Chapter 2. Alternatively, scientists often test whether some factor controls an ecosystem by comparing ecosystems that differ in that factor and not (to the extent possible) in any other relevant characteristic (Cole et al. 1991). For instance, if we wanted to test whether phosphorus inputs control primary production in lakes, we might try to measure primary production in a series of 10 lakes of similar size, depth, and terrain that differ in their phosphorus inputs. In practice, it often is difficult to find such a perfect series of well-matched study sites.

### ***Experiments***

Experiments, whether conducted in the laboratory or in the field, are powerful ways to reveal controls on ecosystem structure and function (Likens 1985; Carpenter et al. 1995). There are no rules about the size of experimental units: manipulations have been made across hundreds of square kilometers (e.g., iron fertilization experiments conducted in the ocean) and within square centimeters. Often, the goal of experiments is to measure an ecosystem's response to a change in a single variable while holding all others as constant as possible. For example, to understand whether phytoplankton in lakes were controlled by phosphorus or by other nutrients such as nitrogen and carbon, scientists in the Experimental Lakes area of Canada added phosphorus, nitrogen, and carbon to one-half of a lake (cut in two by a massive curtain) and just nitrogen and carbon to the other half. They then compared responses—such as the amount of primary production—in each half of the lake to see what effects the treatments had (see Chapter 8). This whole-lake experiment helped to demonstrate that phosphorus was a major factor controlling algal productivity in lakes.

### ***Theory and Conceptual Models***


As in other sciences, ecosystem scientists routinely use theory and conceptual models. Such theories and models are highly varied in structure and purpose (Canham et al. 2003; Pickett et al. 2007). Models may be as simple as a statistical regression (see Chapter 11) or a box-and-arrow diagram drawn on a napkin, or as complex as a detailed simulation model (Figure 1.4). Models are highly flexible, can cover scales of time and space that are difficult to study using other approaches, and often can provide quick answers at low cost. They also are very useful as a way to organize facts and ideas; to generate, sharpen, or narrow hypotheses; and to guide research activities. Scientists often make rapid progress by tightly coupling theory and models to other approaches.

## **What Do Ecosystem Scientists Measure?**

Ecosystem scientists are inherently interested in the connections between structure and function of ecosystems and how they develop over time. Thus, many of the examples of measurements or values in this book are related to structure and function, such as biomass of a species, or rates of carbon cycling. They are what is often found on the  $x$  or  $y$  axes of graphs, or are used as treatments or are measured as responses in experiments. Ecosystem structure is sometimes measured by variables such as leaf area index or the number of trophic levels in a lake (see Chapter 11). Productivity (Chapters 2 and 3), rates of

decomposition (Chapter 4), or mineralization (Chapter 7) over time or space, or the accumulation of some element of interest can be indicators of ecosystem function. Ecosystem development is often described by changes in structure, function, and their relationship over time (e.g., linked changes in soil and vegetation over millennia; Ewing 2002).

Many, if not most, of our measurements of ecosystem function are indirect. Sometimes we can measure function directly, such as measurement of gas exchange, but these measurements are almost inevitably made on a tiny fraction of the ecosystem (e.g., individual leaves within a grassland or bottle of water from a lake). To estimate a flux over a larger area of a grassland, for example, an ecosystem scientist might deploy eddy covariance instruments that measure carbon dioxide, water, temperature, and wind speed and direction continuously at a place within the grassland. From these measures, a model can be used to infer carbon dioxide flux into or out of the ecosystem.



**FIGURE 1.4** DayCent-Chem model processes. DayCent-Chem was developed to address ecosystem responses to combined atmospheric nitrogen and sulfur deposition. DayCent-Chem operates on a daily time step and computes atmospheric deposition, soil water fluxes, snowpack and stream dynamics, plant production and uptake, soil organic matter decomposition, mineralization, nitrification, and denitrification (left side of figure) while utilizing PHREEQC's (an aqueous geochemical equilibrium model) low-temperature aqueous geochemical equilibrium calculations, including CO<sub>2</sub> dissolution, mineral denaturation, and cation exchange, to compute soil water and stream chemistry (right side of figure). ET = evapotranspiration; DOC = dissolved organic carbon; CEC = cation exchange capacity; ANC = acid neutralizing capacity; BC = base cations (Ca, Mg, K, Na). The model requires considerable site-specific environmental data to run. (From Hartman et al. 2009, Figure 1.3.)

Scientists often choose indirect measures because they are easier to make across larger parts of a system or across more systems. As another example, the measurement of chlorophyll-a is often used as an indicator of primary productivity in aquatic ecosystems. However, chlorophyll-a is not a direct measure of productivity, rather it is a measure of the presence of a pigment used in photosynthesis, and the photosynthetic process is the source of building biomass. Likewise, the carbon:nitrogen (C:N) ratio in soil is often used as an indicator of litter or soil quality, and is often used to predict decomposition rates, or rates of nitrogen cycling (see Chapters 4 and 5). To make these indirect measures useful, empirical relationships between direct and surrogate measures must be established—quantifying these relationships is an active area of research (see Chapter 17).

## Some Tools in the Ecosystem Scientist's Toolbox

Ecosystem scientists try to answer a diverse range of questions about a wide array of characteristics of the most varied kinds of ecosystems, using any of several scientific approaches. It will therefore come as no surprise that ecosystem scientists use an enormous number of specific scientific techniques in their investigations, some simple, some sophisticated, some developed within the discipline, and some borrowed and adapted from other disciplines. These techniques are far too numerous to list and discuss in an introductory textbook. Nonetheless, several tools are worth introducing here because they are characteristic of ecosystem science and will appear repeatedly in the coming chapters.

### ***Balances: Mass and Charge***

*Mass balance* (Box 1.2) is a major tool in ecosystem science, especially for ecosystems of which the boundaries are defined by their watersheds. The laws of thermodynamics tell us that matter and energy are not created or destroyed. When both inputs and outputs of energy or matter can be measured relatively completely and accurately it is possible to construct a mass balance and infer processes. For example, an unbalanced watershed mass balance suggests that either the element of interest is being retained in (inputs > outputs) or leaking from (outputs > inputs) the ecosystem (see Chapters 5 and 9). The watershed mass balance approach was pioneered in the 1960s by scientists at the Hubbard Brook Experimental Forest, New Hampshire (Bormann and Likens 1967), and has been used powerfully around the world to understand the abiotic and biotic movement of a suite of elements through ecosystems.

The other powerful “balance” tool that ecosystem scientists use is *charge balance*. In water, the charges held by positive ions (cations) and negative ions (anions) must balance each other. That is, for every anion (such as chloride) in an aqueous solution, there must be a corresponding cation (such as sodium). Why is this tool so useful? Charge balance tells us, for example, that when an anion moves through a forest soil from ground water into a stream, it must be accompanied by a corresponding cation (see Chapter 5). The sum of all the negative charges brought by anions must be balanced by the same number of positive charges. Charge balance also makes it possible to check whether the major ions in a water sample have been measured correctly; a charge imbalance tells us that a measurement error has been made or that we have not quantified all the cations or anions that are important in a sample.

### Tracers

As useful as balances are as tools, they tell us about the bulk (or net) movements of materials through ecosystems, and rarely allow us to distinguish among different pathways of material movement within ecosystems. All nitrogen atoms look alike to a mass balance. Tracers are tools that allow ecosystem scientists to distinguish among particular pathways of material movement by labeling just some of the atoms or molecules of interest. Ecosystem scientists have used several tracer methods, which have been enormously powerful in understanding how ecosystems work.

Radioisotopes (Box 1.3) were some of the first tracers used in ecosystem science. Radioisotopes can be detected and quantified at very low concentrations, so they make excellent tracers, and have had many applications in ecosystem science. In the mid-twentieth century, ecosystem scientists added small amounts of radioisotopes to ecosystems to trace the movement of water and the uptake and movement of carbon and limiting nutrients through ecosystems. Radioisotopes are no longer added to ecosystems as tracers because of associated health risks, but they continue to be used widely in laboratory studies and measurements (e.g., to measure microbial production; see Chapter 3). They also are used in “natural abundance” studies where ecosystem scientists use the very low natural abundance of

#### BOX 1.3

### ECOLOGICAL TRACERS: ISOTOPES

Most elements exist in several forms that contain different numbers of neutrons (but the same number of protons and electrons, and basically the same chemical properties). For example, about 99% of the carbon on Earth is  $^{12}\text{C}$ , which contains six protons, six electrons, and six neutrons, but about 1% of the carbon is  $^{13}\text{C}$ , which contains seven neutrons. A tiny amount ( $\sim 0.000000001\%$ ) of the carbon is  $^{14}\text{C}$ , which has eight neutrons. Some isotopes are stable, while others are radioactive (i.e., they spontaneously decay into other elements or isotopes). In the case of carbon,  $^{12}\text{C}$  and  $^{13}\text{C}$  are stable isotopes, whereas  $^{14}\text{C}$  is a radioisotope that decays into nitrogen ( $^{14}\text{N}$ ) with a half-life of 5730 years. Some isotopes that commonly make an appearance in ecosystem science include the radioisotopes  $^3\text{H}$  (tritium),  $^{14}\text{C}$ ,  $^{32}\text{P}$ , and  $^{35}\text{S}$ , and the stable isotopes  $^2\text{H}$  (deuterium),  $^{13}\text{C}$ ,  $^{15}\text{N}$ ,  $^{18}\text{O}$ , and  $^{34}\text{S}$ , although many other

isotopes have been used in specialized studies (see Figure 1.4).

The concentration of stable isotopes is usually expressed in a “del” ( $\delta$ ) notation that compares the abundance of the heavier isotope to that of the lighter isotope.


Thus, the abundance of  $^{13}\text{C}$  in a sample is expressed as:

$$\delta^{13}\text{C}(\%) = \left( \frac{\left( \frac{^{13}\text{C}}{^{12}\text{C}} \right)_{\text{sample}}}{\left( \frac{^{13}\text{C}}{^{12}\text{C}} \right)_{\text{standard}}} - 1 \right) \times 1000$$

The standard in this case is Vienna Pee Dee Belemnite (a particular kind of fossil). Negative  $\delta$  values indicate that the heavier isotope is less abundant in the sample than in the standard, while positive  $\delta$  values indicate that the heavier isotope is more abundant in the sample than in the standard.

radioisotopes to trace the movement of materials through ecosystems, rather than adding radioisotopes to ecosystems. For example, [Caraco and her colleagues \(2010\)](#) observed that the concentration of  $^{14}\text{C}$  in organic matter washed into the Hudson River from the soils of its watershed was very different from that of organic matter produced by photosynthesis within the river. They could therefore use  $^{14}\text{C}$  to trace movement of terrestrial organic matter through the Hudson River food web, and show that modern zooplankton were being supported in part by carbon that was captured by primary production thousands of years ago ([Figure 1.5](#)).

Stable isotopes have largely taken the place of radioisotopes as tracers outside the laboratory ([Box 1.3](#)). Although much more difficult to measure and often expensive to use, stable isotopes do not present a health risk to humans and wildlife. Stable isotopes are available for many elements of ecological interest, including hydrogen, nitrogen, carbon, oxygen, sulfur, and others. Stable isotopes often are added to ecosystems (or to laboratory experiments) and followed as they move through the system. For example, [Templer and her colleagues \(2005\)](#) added a stable isotope of nitrogen,  $^{15}\text{N}$ , to forest plots in the Catskill



**FIGURE 1.5** Use of stable and radioisotopes to determine the source of organic matter supporting zooplankton in the Hudson River ([Caraco et al. 2010](#)). Isotope bi-plots show  $^{14}\text{C}$  vs.  $^{13}\text{C}$  (left side) and  $^{14}\text{C}$  vs.  $^2\text{H}$  (right side). Sources of carbon from modern primary production are shown near the tops of the graphs (FIAV = floating-leaved aquatic vegetation; SAV = submersed aquatic vegetation). If zooplankton were composed of carbon and hydrogen from these sources, then the data for isotopic composition of zooplankton should fall in the same region of the graph as the sources. Instead, zooplankton fall far outside this region of the graph, showing that they must be composed of organic matter from both modern and “aged” sources (i.e., organic matter thousands of years old from the soils of the Hudson River’s watershed). (*From Caraco et al. 2010.*)

Mountains, NY, and then followed it into soil, microbial biomass, understory plants, tree roots, wood, and leaves, and found that most of the nitrogen stayed in the soil. Alternatively, ecosystem scientists often use natural abundance studies of stable isotopes to follow the movement of materials through ecosystems.

Substances other than isotopes can be used as tracers as well. For instance, certain fatty acids cannot be synthesized by animals and are made only by particular kinds of algae. By analyzing the fatty acid content of zooplankton and fish, we can trace the contribution of different kinds of algae throughout the food web. Caffeine, which is not readily degraded in conventional sewage treatment plants, is sometimes used as a tracer for sewage. The kinds of substances that can be used as tracers are highly varied, limited only by the ingenuity and analytical capabilities of the investigator.

### ***Spatial Data***

Where are the regions of high and low productivity around the globe? How do they change over the seasons? These are questions that can now be answered largely as a result of the availability of remote sensing tools and spatially explicit data. The ability to collect, represent, and analyze spatially explicit data has risen exponentially over the past decade. Remote sensing and the georeferencing of basic data on landscape characteristics such as elevation, water bodies, land cover, and geological materials have opened the door to a description of ecosystem structure over large areas. Geographic information systems (GISs) allow analysis of the relationships between these structures and fluxes in or out of these systems. For example, the variation in atmospheric deposition across the mountainous terrain of Acadia National Park or Great Smoky Mountain National Park can be described by a GIS model that links empirical measurements to landscape features that are described in the GIS (Figure 1.6). Such spatially explicit models greatly enhance our ability to identify places on the landscape and times that may be subject to particularly high levels of atmospheric deposition (Weathers et al. 2006). GIS and other technologies are being used creatively and hold tremendous potential for understanding ecosystem processes across heterogeneous landscapes. Other newly emerging tools and techniques are described in Chapter 17.

## FROM THERE TO HERE: A SHORT HISTORY OF THE ECOSYSTEM CONCEPT IN THEORY AND PRACTICE

---

Ecosystem science is a relatively young discipline, largely developed since the mid-twentieth century (Hagen 1992; Golley 1993; indeed, the term *ecology* was coined only in 1866). The concept of an ecosystem was first formally proposed by the English botanist Arthur Tansley in 1935, although related ideas were in circulation for at least a century before this. For instance, the idea of a biosphere (a region near the Earth's surface in which living organisms are a dominant geochemical force) was outlined by the French scientist Jean-Baptiste Lamarck in 1802; the term *biosphere* was coined in 1875 by an Austrian geologist, Eduard Suess, in describing the genesis of the Alps; and the concept of a biosphere was fully elaborated by the Russian mineralogist Vladimir Vernadsky in 1926. Other