MehemTech Michigan Technological University

Abstract

Phragmites australis is classified as an invasive wetland plant in the U.S. and Canada. There is a growing concern that the plant can colonize agricultural sites through water transport within the rhizome. During this study we will use H_2O^{18} as a tracer to determine how water moves through the plant. Preliminary results have shown differences in rhizome water content between control and treatment samples.

Introduction

•Phragmites australis (Figure 1) is a facultative-wet wetland plant species that has recently been classified as a noxious weed. The plant may be able to colonize dry upland sites (Maheu-Giroux 2007). For this to occur, water must be translocated through its interconnected rhizome system (Chambers 1999).

•To understand water translocation within the rhizome we must first understand water utilization. To do this we will use H_2O^{18} , labeled water ,as a tracer.

• Studies have not been conducted on water relations within the rhizome-leaf interface. Additionally it is unknown if water translocation through a *Phragmites australis* rhizome is possible.



Figure 1. *P. australis* dominated stand (Forestry Images)

Objectives

1) Test if *Phragmites australis* rhizomes and leaves produce different H₂O¹⁸ signatures between control and treatment samples.

2) These results will then be utilized in our sampling protocol to determine if rhizomes can translocate water from wet to dry sites.

H₂O¹⁸ as an analyzer of *Phragmites australis* invasion potential from wet to dry sites

Kayla Griffith¹, Catherine Tarasoff²

¹Department of Biology, Michigan Technological University; ²School of Forest Resources and Environmental Science and Department of Biology, Michigan Technological University

Methods



1) Phragmites australis rhizomes were grown in nine, 3.0 m long vinyl watering troughs filled with vermiculite(Michigan Technological University, Houghton MI)



2) Six rhizome/stem fragments were isolated from the troughs and grown in pans (Figure 3a and 3b) filled with either control water or treatment water (H_2O^{18}).



4) Water was removed from the samples through vacuum extraction (US Forest Service, Houghton MI).

Initial Raw Data

Sample ID	δΟ18 (ο/οο)
O18 labeled water	2.3
O18 water from treatment pan	9.5
Rhizome from treatment plant	8.3
Leaf from treatment plant	29.6

Table 1: Content of ¹⁸O in treatment water sample compared to the scientific standard of 0.



Table 2. Content of ¹⁸O in control water sample compared to the scientific standard of 0.



3) Close up of Phragmites australis segment growing in O18 water. Rhizome and leaf samples were collected from each pan.



5) Water samples were tested using a GasBench II connected to a TermoFinnigan Deltaplus Continuous Flow-Stable Isotope Ratio Mass Spectrophotometer to determine presence and concentration of H2O18 in each sample.

Sample ID	δΟ18 (ο/οο)
Control Water	-12.9
Vater from control pan	-5.9
izome from control plant	-5.6
eaf from control plant	20.7







Results

- Both treatments show elevated values of ¹⁸O in their leaves.
- Water in the pan had a higher than normal ¹⁸O value for both treatments.
- The resulting ¹⁸O values for the rhizomes of both treatments are similar to that of the pan water each was grown in.



Figure 5. *P. australis* (Forestry images)

Conclusions/Speculations

1) Fractionation is occurring in the leaves of both treatments and sampling in further tests would yield inaccurate results.

2) ¹⁸O in the rhizomes was similar to that of the pan even though evaporation slightly increased ¹⁸O in the pan. This indicates that rhizomes may store water from their environment without modification.

3) In order to capture the movement of water by *Phragmites australis* from wet to dry sites it appears that we should sample rhizomes.

Literature cited

Chambers RM, Meyerson LA, Saltonstall K. 1999. Expansion of Phragmites australis into tidal wetlands of North America. Aquatic Botany. 64: 261-273

Maheu-Giroux M, de Blois S. 2006. Landscape ecology of Phragmites australis invasion in networks of linear wetlands. Landscape Ecol. 22:285–301

Acknowledgments

The authors acknowledge the Ecosystem Science Center for funding this research and the MTU Biology department for funding and greenhouse space. Further thanks go to Kevyn Juneau and Mickey Jarvi for laboratory assistance, Jennifer Eikenberry for laboratory machinery assistance, and Tom Pypker, Rod Chimner and Sigrid Resh for method assistance.