



HYDROLOGICAL PROCESSES Hydrol. Process. **19**, 339–347 (2005) Published online in Wiley InterScience (www.interscience.wiley.com). DOI: 10.1002/hyp.5760

# Is surface conductance theoretically independent of reference height?

# Hikaru Komatsu<sup>1,2\*</sup> Tomo'omi Kumagai<sup>3</sup> Norifumi Hotta<sup>4</sup>

 <sup>1</sup> Research Institute for Humanity and Nature, Kyoto, Japan
 <sup>2</sup> Oki/Kanae Laboratory, Institute of Industrial Science, The University of Tokyo, Tokyo, Japan
 <sup>3</sup> University Forest in Miyazaki, Kyushu University, Shiiba-son, Miyazaki, Japan
 <sup>4</sup> Graduate School of Agricultural and Life Sciences, The University of Tokyo, Tokyo, Japan

\*Correspondence to: Hikaru Komatsu, Oki/Kanae Laboratory, Institute of Industrial Science, The University of Tokyo, 4-6-1 Komaba, Meguro-ku, Tokyo 153-8505, Japan. E-mail:

komatsu@rainbow.iis.u-tokyo.ac.jp

#### Abstract

Many studies have compared surface conductance  $G_s$  at different observation sites when examining physiological differences between sites and/or between vegetation categories. However, a theoretical analysis confirming the robustness of such comparisons has not yet been published. It is unclear whether  $G_s$  is independent of the reference height where evaporative fluxes and meteorological factors are observed, as  $G_s$  is a conceptual parameter rather than a purely physiological parameter.

This short note shows that  $G_s$  is independent of reference height when abovecanopy fluxes of evapotranspiration and available energy are independent of reference height, and when energy balance closure is complete. Thus, this note gives a theoretical basis for comparing  $G_s$  values at different observation sites. Furthermore, we make recommendations for examining the  $G_s$  dependency on reference height in field conditions. Copyright © 2005 John Wiley & Sons, Ltd.

**Key Words** surface conductance; Penman–Monteith equation; evapotranspiration; vegetation; reference height

## Introduction

The Penman–Monteith equation (e.g. Monteith and Unsworth, 1990; Jones, 1992; Landsberg and Gower, 1997; Campbell and Norman, 1998; Waring and Running, 1998) is a useful tool for analysing evapotranspiration processes of vegetation canopies (e.g. Cienciala *et al.*, 1994, 1998; Wright *et al.*, 1995; Steduto and Hsiao, 1998a; Komatsu, 2003a, 2004; Kumagai *et al.*, 2004, 2005). When applying the Penman–Monteith equation on an ecosystem scale, physiological and aerodynamic controls of evapotranspiration are represented by surface and aerodynamic conductance respectively (e.g. Monteith and Unsworth, 1990; Landsberg and Gower, 1997; Komatsu, 2003a,b, 2004, 2005). Thus, the significance of physiological and aerodynamic controls of evapotranspiration can be evaluated separately.

As the surface conductance  $G_s$  affects evapotranspiration rates of vegetation canopies greatly, many observational studies (e.g. Lindroth, 1985a,b; Verma *et al.*, 1986; Dunin *et al.*, 1991; Stewart and Verma, 1992; Wilson and Baldocchi, 2000) include calculations of  $G_s$  for each site. Such  $G_s$  calculations are performed by substituting evapotranspiration rate, aerodynamic conductance, and meteorological factors observed above the canopy into the Penman–Monteith equation. In principle,  $G_s$  can be calculated from direct measurements of surface temperature



using the flux/gradient equation. However, few studies have calculated  $G_s$  using this method. The value of  $G_s$  calculated using this method is unreliable because of differences in the projection area of surface temperature and evaporative flux measurements, and because of the horizontal heterogeneity of surface temperature (Sugita *et al.*, 2001).

Summarizing  $G_s$  values for various observation sites, many studies (Shuttleworth, 1989; Jones, 1992; Kelliher et al., 1993, 1995; Schulze et al., 1994, 1995; Granier et al., 1996; Baldocchi et al., 1997, 2000; Dolman et al., 1998; Komatsu, 2003a,b) have compared these  $G_s$  values when examining physiological differences, on an ecosystem scale, between sites and/or between vegetation categories. The results of these comparison studies are especially useful for parameterizing a  $G_s$  sub-model incorporated in hydrological, meteorological, and ecological models (e.g. Running and Coughlan, 1988; McMurtrie et al., 1990a, 1992; Running and Gower, 1991; Whitehead and Kelliher, 1991; Sellers et al., 1996, 1997; Mauser and Schadlich, 1998; Merz and Bardossy, 1998; Soares and Almeida, 2001). For example, Komatsu (2003b) summarized published  $G_s$  data for different coniferous forests and subsequently developed a  $G_{\rm s}$  parameterization (Komatsu, 2004) that reproduces variations in evapotranspiration for different coniferous forests.

Comparisons of  $G_s$  from different observation sites are common, but a theoretical analysis confirming the robustness of such comparisons has not yet been published. Therefore, it is unclear whether  $G_s$  is independent of the reference height where evaporative fluxes and meteorological variables are observed. Actually,  $G_{\rm s}$  may depend on reference height for the following two reasons. First, air temperature and vapour pressure measured at reference height depend on reference height (e.g. Monteith and Unsworth, 1990; Jones, 1992; Campbell and Norman, 1998; Arya, 2001). As  $G_s$  is calculated based on the air temperature and vapour pressure measured at reference height,  $G_{\rm s}$  may depend on reference height. If so,  $G_{\rm s}$ comparisons from different observation sites should be invalid, due to differences in reference height between sites. Second,  $G_s$  is not a purely physiological parameter. If  $G_s$  were a purely physiological parameter, then  $G_s$  would be independent of reference height, as is the case for stomatal conductance (Raupach and Finnigan, 1988; Raupach, 1995). However,  $G_{\rm s}$  is a conceptual parameter that represents physiological control of evapotranspiration. Therefore,  $G_s$ can be affected by non-physiological processes (Raupach and Finnigan, 1988; Baldocchi et al., 1991; Rochette et al., 1991; Watanabe, 1994; Monteith, 1995), implying that  $G_s$  might depend on reference height. For example,  $G_s$  calculated from measurements 5 m above the canopy might differ from  $G_s$  calculated from measurements 10 m above the canopy. Model-based studies (e.g. Kelliher et al., 1995; Raupach, 1995; Baldocchi and Meyers, 1998; Lai et al., 2000) have shown a clear relationship between  $G_s$ and stomatal conductance, a purely physiological parameter. However, these model-based studies show that  $G_{\rm s}$  is an approximately physiological parameter, not a purely physiological parameter (e.g. Raupach, 1995).

For establishing a basis for comparing  $G_s$  values for each observation site, this short note theoretically shows  $G_s$  independence with reference height. Our focus here is to show that  $G_s$  is independent of reference height when fluxes of above-canopy evapotranspiration and available energy are independent of reference height (i.e. when fluxes of evapotranspiration and available energy are vertically constant above the canopy), and when energy balance closure is complete. These are also the assumptions made in deriving the Penman-Monteith equation (e.g. Monteith and Unsworth, 1990; Jones, 1992; Campbell and Norman, 1998; Arya, 2001). It is beyond our scope to consider  $G_{\rm s}$  dependence with reference height when fluxes of above-canopy evapotranspiration and/or available energy vary with reference height, and when energy balance closure is incomplete.

The  $G_s$  independence with reference height might be implicitly recognized by researchers who specialize in vegetation evapotranspiration processes. Even so, explicitly showing the  $G_s$  independence is valuable for the following three reasons.

First, users of the Penman–Monteith equation include researchers who do not specialize in vegetation evapotranspiration processes. For example, Running and Coughlan (1988), Band (1993), Band *et al.* (1993), and Vertessy *et al.* (1993) studied runoff processes in a vegetated catchment using hydrological and ecological models that incorporated the Penman–Monteith equation. Nobre *et al.* (1991) and da Rocha *et al.* (1996) studied climate formation processes using meteorological models that





incorporated the Penman–Monteith equation. Woodward (1987), McMurtrie *et al.* (1990a,b, 1992), Running and Gower (1991), and Hingston and Galbraith (1998) studied vegetation growth and dynamics using ecological models that incorporated the Penman–Monteith equation, because water availability can be an important limiting factor in photosynthesis (e.g. Baldocchi, 1997; Steduto and Hsiao, 1998b; Komatsu and Hashimoto, 2002). As researchers in other fields use the Penman–Monteith equation, understanding its theoretical basis is important.

Second, to establish a basis for comparing  $G_s$  values at different observation sites is critical when examining differences in photosynthetic properties between sites and/or between vegetation categories.  $G_s$  can represent photosynthetic properties in vegetation canopies (Schulze *et al.*, 1994, 1995), because  $G_s$  correlates highly with the photosynthetic rate at canopy scale (Schulze *et al.*, 1994; Law *et al.*, 2001). Therefore, to establish a basis for comparing  $G_s$  values at different observation sites is critical in ecological and physiological senses.

Third,  $G_s$  comparisons by researchers in other fields will be accelerated from now on. Data on evaporative flux (and also CO<sub>2</sub> flux) from many observation sites are now easily available on Websites (e.g. Baldocchi *et al.*, 2001) and are thus accessible to researchers in other fields. Therefore, to establish a basis for comparing  $G_s$  values at different observation sites is becoming more important.

This paper will be useful even for researchers who recognize the  $G_s$  independence with reference height, because it makes recommendations for examining the  $G_s$  dependency on reference height under field conditions. By theoretically showing the  $G_s$  independence, we will confirm which assumptions are needed. In practice, these assumptions might be violated by field conditions that indicate  $G_s$  may be dependent on reference height. We aim to identify cases where the  $G_s$ dependency is likely to be observed, and field studies are to be recommended.

## **Materials and Methods**

This section describes  $G_s$  calculations based on the Penman–Monteith equation and then describes the methods of analysis.

Copyright © 2005 John Wiley & Sons, Ltd.

The Penman–Monteith equation (e.g. Monteith and Unsworth, 1990; Jones, 1992; Landsberg and Gower, 1997; Campbell and Norman, 1998; Waring and Running, 1998) is given as follows:

$$\lambda E = \frac{\Delta A + \rho c_p G_a(z_r) [e_s(T(z_r)) - e(z_r)]}{\Delta + \gamma (1 + G_a(z_r)/G_s(z_r))}$$
(1)

where  $\lambda$  is the latent heat of water vaporization, *E* is the evapotranspiration rate,  $\Delta$  is the slope of the saturation vapour pressure function, *A* is the available energy,  $\rho$  is the air density,  $c_p$  is the specific heat of air,  $G_a(z_r)$  is the aerodynamic conductance at the reference height  $z_r$ ,  $e_s(T(z_r))$  is the saturation vapour pressure at the reference height air temperature  $T(z_r)$ ,  $e(z_r)$  is the air vapour pressure at the reference height,  $\gamma$  is the psychrometer constant, and  $G_s(z_r)$  is the surface conductance calculated from measurements at the reference height  $z_r$ . From Equation (1),  $G_s(z_r)$  can be written as (e.g. Granier and Loustau, 1994; Kelliher *et al.*, 1997, 1998; Granier *et al.*, 2000)

$$G_{\rm s}(z_{\rm r}) = \frac{G_{\rm a}(z_{\rm r})\gamma\lambda E}{\Delta A + \rho c_p G_{\rm a}(z_{\rm r})[e_{\rm s}(T(z_{\rm r}))]}$$
(2)  
$$-e(z_{\rm r})] - (\Delta + \gamma)\lambda E$$

By substituting  $G_a(z_r)$ , E, A,  $T(z_r)$ , and  $e(z_r)$  observed at a reference height above the canopy into Equation (2), previous observational studies have calculated  $G_s$  values for each observation site.

To determine whether  $G_s(z_r)$  is independent of reference height, consider a situation in which the reference height moves from  $z_r = z_{r1}$  to  $z_r = z_{r2}$  (Figure 1), where *A*, *E*, and profiles of the air temperature and vapour pressure above the surface are given. Does  $G_s(z_{r2}) = G_s(z_{r1})$ ? If so, then  $G_s$  is independent of reference height. Here,  $G_s(z_{r1})$  and  $G_s(z_{r2})$  are given by

$$G_{s}(z_{r1}) = \frac{G_{a}(z_{r1})\gamma\lambda E}{\Delta A + \rho c_{p}G_{a}(z_{r1})[e_{s}(T(z_{r1}))]}$$
(3)  
$$-e(z_{r1})] - (\Delta + \gamma)\lambda E$$

$$G_{s}(z_{r2}) = \frac{G_{a}(z_{r2})\gamma\lambda E}{\Delta A + \rho c_{p}G_{a}(z_{r2})[e_{s}(T(z_{r2}))]} \qquad (4)$$
$$-e(z_{r2})] - (\Delta + \gamma)\lambda E$$

The present analysis assumes vertically constant *A* and *E*, complete energy balance closure (sensible heat flux is equal to  $A - \lambda E$ ), and  $z_{r1} < z_{r2}$  (Figure 1). Note that vertically constant sensible heat flux is

341

Hydrol. Process. 19, 339-347 (2005)



#### H. KOMATSU, T. KUMAGAI, N. HOTTA



Figure 1. Schematic drawing of water transport processes from the inner space of the canopy stomata to the reference height. Surface conductance  $G_s$  conceptually represents physiological control of evapotranspiration from the surface. Thus,  $G_s$  independence with reference height is not apparent

implicitly assumed because of sensible heat flux equalling  $A - \lambda E$  and because of vertically constant A and E. Vertically constant A and E and complete energy balance closure are assumptions that were also made in deriving the Penman–Monteith equation (e.g. Monteith and Unsworth, 1990; Jones, 1992; Campbell and Norman, 1998). We assume  $z_{r1} < z_{r2}$  does not alter the generality of the analysis.

#### Results

When considering water vapour transport between the surface and  $z_{r1}$  and between  $z_{r1}$  and  $z_{r2}$  separately,  $G_a(z_{r2})$  relates to  $G_a(z_{r1})$  by (Figure 1)

$$G_{a}^{-1}(z_{r2}) = G_{a}^{-1}(z_{r1}) + G_{a,r1 \sim r2}^{-1}$$
(5)

where  $G_{a,r1\sim r2}^{-1}$  is the aerodynamic conductance between  $z_{r1}$  and  $z_{r2}$ .  $T(z_{r2})$  and  $e(z_{r2})$  relate to  $T(z_{r1})$ and  $e(z_{r1})$  by

$$\rho c_p G_{a,r1 \sim r2}(T(z_{r1}) - T(z_{r2})) = A - \lambda E$$
 (6)

$$\rho G_{a,r1\sim r2} \frac{\varepsilon(e(z_{r1}) - e(z_{r2}))}{p} = E$$
(7)

where  $\varepsilon$  is the ratio of molecular weights of water vapour and air, and p is the total air pressure. In Equation (6), complete energy balance closure (i.e.

Copyright © 2005 John Wiley & Sons, Ltd.

sensible heat flux is equal to  $A - \lambda E$ ) is assumed. Equations (6) and (7) are rewritten as follows:

$$T(z_{r2}) = T(z_{r1}) - \frac{A - \lambda E}{\rho c_p G_{a,r1 \sim r2}}$$
(8)

$$e(z_{r2}) = e(z_{r1}) - \frac{pE}{\rho \varepsilon G_{a,r1 \sim r2}}$$
(9)

If Equations (5), (8), and (9) are substituted into Equation (4),  $G_s(z_{r2})$  can be shown to be equal to  $G_s(z_{r1})$  in the following way. Below, we try to detail transformation between equations, because the audience of this paper would include researchers who do not specialize in vegetation evapotranspiration processes.

The numerator of Equation (4) is rewritten, using Equation (5), as follows:

$$G_{a}(z_{r2})\gamma\lambda E = (G_{a}^{-1}(z_{r1}) + G_{a,r1\sim r2}^{-1})^{-1}\gamma\lambda E \quad (10)$$
  
=  $(G_{a}^{-1}(z_{r1}) + G_{a,r1\sim r2}^{-1})^{-1}$   
 $\times G_{a}^{-1}(z_{r1})G_{a}(z_{r1})\gamma\lambda E \quad (11)$ 

The denominator of Equation (4) is rewritten, using Equations (5), (8), and (9), as follows:

$$\Delta A + \rho c_p G_{a}(z_{r2})[e_s(T(z_{r2})) - e(z_{r2})] - (\Delta + \gamma)\lambda E$$
  
=  $\Delta A + \rho c_p (G_a^{-1}(z_{r1}) + G_{a r1 \sim r2}^{-1})^{-1}$ 

Hydrol. Process. 19, 339-347 (2005)



#### SCIENTIFIC BRIEFING

$$\times \left[ e_{s} \left( T(z_{r1}) - \frac{A - \lambda E}{\rho c_{p} G_{a,r1 \sim r2}} \right) - \left( e(z_{r1}) - \frac{pE}{\rho \varepsilon G_{a,r1 \sim r2}} \right) \right] - (\Delta + \gamma) \lambda E$$
(12)  
$$= \Delta A + \rho c_{p} (G_{a}^{-1}(z_{r1}) + G_{a,r1 \sim r2}^{-1})^{-1} \times \left\{ \left[ e_{s}(T(z_{r1})) - \Delta \frac{A - \lambda E}{\rho c_{p} G_{a,r1 \sim r2}} \right] - \left( e(z_{r1}) - \frac{pE}{\rho \varepsilon G_{a,r1 \sim r2}} \right) \right\} - (\Delta + \gamma) \lambda E$$
(13)  
$$= \Delta A + \rho c_{p} (G_{a}^{-1}(z_{r1}) + G_{a,r1 \sim r2}^{-1})^{-1} [e_{s}(T(z_{r1}))$$

$$= \Delta A + \rho c_{p} (G_{a}^{-1}(z_{r1}) + G_{a,r1\sim r2}^{-1})^{-1} + (G_{a}^{-1}(z_{r1}) + G_{a,r1\sim r2}^{-1})^{-1} \times \left(\Delta \frac{A - \lambda E}{G_{a,r1\sim r2}} - \frac{\gamma \lambda E}{G_{a,r1\sim r2}}\right) - (\Delta + \gamma) \lambda E$$
(14)

$$= \Delta A[1 - (G_{a}^{-1}(z_{r1}) + G_{a,r1\sim r2}^{-1})^{-1}G_{a,r1\sim r2}^{-1}] + \rho c_{p}(G_{a}^{-1}(z_{r1}) + G_{a,r1\sim r2}^{-1})^{-1}$$

$$\times [e_{s}(T(z_{r1})) - e(z_{r1})] - (\Delta + \gamma)\lambda E[1 - (G_{a}^{-1}(z_{r1}) + G_{a,r1\sim r2}^{-1})^{-1}G_{a,r1\sim r2}^{-1}]$$
(15)

$$= \Delta A(G_{a}^{-1}(z_{r1}) + G_{a,r1\sim r2}^{-1})^{-1}G_{a}^{-1}(z_{r1}) + \rho c_{p}(G_{a}^{-1}(z_{r1}) + G_{a,r1\sim r2}^{-1})^{-1} \times [e_{s}(T(z_{r1})) - e(z_{r1})] - (\Delta + \gamma)\lambda E(G_{a}^{-1}(z_{r1}) + G_{a,r1\sim r2}^{-1})^{-1}G_{a}^{-1}(z_{r1})$$
(16)  
$$= (G_{a}^{-1}(z_{r1}) + G_{a,r1\sim r2}^{-1})^{-1}G_{a}^{-1}(z_{r1}) \times \{\Delta A + \rho c_{p}G_{a}(z_{r1})[e_{s}(T(z_{r1})) - e(z_{r1})] - (\Delta + \gamma)\lambda E\}$$
(17)

Transformation of Equation (12) into Equation (13) is accomplished using the following approximation:

$$e_{s}\left(T(z_{r1}) - \frac{A - \lambda E}{\rho c_{p} G_{a,r1 \sim r2}}\right) = e_{s}(T(z_{r1}))$$
$$-\Delta \frac{A - \lambda E}{\rho c_{p} G_{a,r1 \sim r2}}$$
(18)

A similar approximation is made to derive the Penman–Monteith equation (e.g. Monteith and Unsworth, 1990; Jones, 1992; Campbell and Norman, 1998). Transformation of Equation (13) into Equation (14) is accomplished using the following

relationship (e.g. Monteith and Unsworth, 1990; Arya, 2001):

$$\gamma = \frac{c_p p}{\lambda \varepsilon} \tag{19}$$

 $G_{\rm s}(z_{\rm r2})$  is rewritten from Equations (11) and (17) as

$$G_{s}(z_{r2}) = \frac{(G_{a}^{-1}(z_{r1}) + G_{a,r1\sim r2}^{-1})^{-1}}{(G_{a}^{-1}(z_{r1}) + G_{a,r1\sim r2}^{-1})^{-1}G_{a}^{-1}(z_{r1})} \times \{\Delta A + \rho c_{p}G_{a}(z_{r1})[e_{s}(T(z_{r1})) - e(z_{r1})] - (\Delta + \gamma)\lambda E\}$$

$$= \frac{G_{a}(z_{r1})\gamma\lambda E}{\Delta A + \rho c_{p}G_{a}(z_{r1})[e_{s}(T(z_{r1})) - e(z_{r1})] - (\Delta + \gamma)\lambda E}$$

$$= G_{s}(z_{r1}) - (\Delta + \gamma)\lambda E$$

Thus,  $G_s(z_{r2})$  is equal to  $G_s(z_{r1})$ , and  $G_s$  is shown to be independent of reference height.

## **Conclusions and Recommendations**

This note shows that  $G_s$  is independent of reference height when above-canopy fluxes of evapotranspiration and available energy are independent of reference height, and when energy balance closure is complete. The  $G_s$  independence shown here gives a theoretical basis for  $G_s$  comparisons using data from different observation sites.

Some researchers might already have recognized the  $G_s$  independence implicitly, as described in the Introduction. However, no theoretical analysis confirming this independence has been published. This paper is the first to show the  $G_s$  independence with reference height, thus confirming the robustness of comparing  $G_s$  from different observation sites.

Subsequent studies should examine  $G_s$  dependence with reference height under field conditions, where the assumptions given in this paper may be violated.

The analysis in this note implicitly assumes an accurate  $G_a$  estimation. The analysis gives E and the air vapour pressure profile above the surface. This is equivalent to assuming an accurate  $G_a$  estimation, because  $G_a$  is uniquely determined when E and the air vapour pressure profile are given. Therefore, an inaccurate  $G_a$  estimation could violate the theoretical relationship between reference height and  $G_s$  obtained in the present analysis.

Copyright © 2005 John Wiley & Sons, Ltd.



In fact, many observational studies have used simplified methods to estimate  $G_a$ , which might result in inaccurate  $G_a$  estimates. For example, Shuttleworth *et al.* (1984), Lee and Black (1993), and Kumagai *et al.* (2004, 2005) assumed that turbulent heat diffusion is as effective as turbulent momentum diffusion for their  $G_a$  estimates. In reality, the efficiency of turbulent heat diffusion differs from that of turbulent momentum diffusion (e.g. Thom, 1975; Kondo and Watanabe, 1992; Watanabe, 1994; Hall, 2002). How the use of such simplified methods affects the relationship between reference height and  $G_s$  should be examined.

The analysis given in this note assumes constant fluxes of evapotranspiration and available energy above the canopy and complete energy balance closure. In fact, these assumptions can be violated under field conditions, especially for vegetation on sloping planes or for patchy vegetation. If vegetation stands on sloping planes, advective scalar transport (e.g. Lee, 1998; Yi et al., 2000; Aubinet et al., 2003; Davis et al., 2003) might be significant because of gravitational acceleration (e.g. Aubinet et al., 2003; Komatsu et al., 2003, 2005; Turnipseed et al., 2003). Such transports could cause vertical variation in evaporative flux and, therefore, incomplete energy balance closure. If vegetation has a patchy structure, then the projection area of evaporative and radiative flux measurements could vary with reference height, which could result in vertical variation in evaporative and radiative fluxes and, therefore, incomplete energy balance closure (e.g. Schmid and Oke, 1990; Horst and Weil, 1992; Lloyd, 1995). Thus, examining  $G_s$  dependence with reference height is especially necessary for vegetation on sloping planes and for patchy vegetation.

## Acknowledgements

We would like to thank Dr Shinjiro Kanae (Research Institute for Humanity and Nature, Japan) and Professor Masakazu Suzuki (The University of Tokyo, Japan) for commenting on earlier drafts of this paper. We express sincere thanks to Mr Yusuke Yamazaki (Kyoto University, Japan), who introduced us to several of the literature citations in this paper. Acknowledgements are also made to Ms Kayoko Takino and Ms Reiko Suezawa (Research Institute for Humanity and Nature, Japan) for their help in arranging discussions between each author and in preparing the literature cited in this paper respectively.

This research was supported by Project 5-1, Research Institute for Humanity and Nature (Leader: Dr Shinjiro Kanae, Research Institute for Humanity and Nature, Japan) and Research Fellowships of the Japan Society for the Promotion of Science for Young Scientists (#16.6152).

## References

Arya SP. 2001. An Introduction to Micrometeorology. Academic Press: San Diego; 420.

Aubinet M, Heinesch B, Yernaux M. 2003. Horizontal and vertical  $CO_2$  advection in a sloping forest. *Boundary-Layer Meteorology* **108**: 397–417.

Baldocchi D. 1997. Measuring and modelling carbon dioxide and water vapour exchange over a temperate broad-leaved forest during the 1995 summer drought. *Plant Cell and Environment* **20**: 1108–1122.

Baldocchi DD, Meyers TP. 1998. On using eco-physiological, micrometeorological and biogeochemical theory to evaluate carbon dioxide, water vapor and trace gases fluxes over vegetation: a perspective. *Agricultural and Forest Meteorology* **90**: 1–25.

Baldocchi DD, Luxmoore RJ, Hatfield JL. 1991. Discerning the forest from the trees: an essay on scaling canopy stomatal conductance. *Agricultural and Forest Meteorology* **54**: 197–226.

Baldocchi DD, Vogel CA, Hall B. 1997. Seasonal variation of energy and water vapor exchange rates above and below a boreal jack pine forest canopy. *Journal of Geophysical Research* **102**: 28 939–28 951.

Baldocchi D, Kelliher FM, Black TA, Jarvis P. 2000. Climate and vegetation controls on boreal zone energy exchange. *Global Change Biology* **6**: 69–83.

Baldocchi D, Falge E, Gu L, Olson R, Hollinger D, Running S, Anthoni P, Bernhofer Ch, Davis K, Evans R, Fuentes J, Goldstein A, Katul G, Law B, Lee X, Malhi Y, Meyers T, Munger W, Oechel W, Paw UKT, Pilegaard K, Schmid HP, Valentini R, Verma S, Vesala T, Wilson K, Wofsy S. 2001. FLUXNET: a new tool to study the temporal and spatial variability of ecosystem-scale carbon dioxide, water vapor, and energy flux densities. *Bulletin of the American Meteorological Society* **82**: 2415–2434.

Band LE. 1993. Effect of land surface representation on forest water and carbon budgets. *Journal of Hydrology* **150**: 749–772.

Band LE, Patterson P, Nemani R, Running SW. 1993. Forest ecosystem processes at the watershed scale: incorporating hillslope hydrology. *Agricultural and Forest Meteorology* **63**: 93–126.

Campbell GS, Norman JM. 1998. An Introduction to Environmental Biophysics. Springer-Verlag: New York; 286.

Cienciala E, Eckersten H, Lindroth A, Hallgren J. 1994. Simulated and measured water uptake by *Picea abies* under non-limiting soil water conditions. *Agricultural and Forest Meteorology* **71**: 147–164.

Cienciala E, Kucera J, Ryan MG, Lindroth A. 1998. Water flux in boreal forest during two hydrologically contrasting years; species



#### SCIENTIFIC BRIEFING

specific regulation of canopy conductance and transpiration. *Annales des Sciences Forestieres* **55**: 47–61.

Da Rocha HR, Nobre CA, Bonatti JP, Wright IR, Sellers PJ. 1996. A vegetation–atmosphere interaction study for Amazonian deforestation using field data and a 'single column' model. *Quarterly Journal* of the Royal Meteorological Society **122**: 567–594.

Davis KJ, Bakwin PS, Yi C, Berger BW, Zhao C, Teclaw RM, Isebrands JG. 2003. The annual cycles of  $CO_2$  and  $H_2O$  exchange over a northern mixed forest as observed from a very tall tower. *Global Change Biology* **9**: 1278–1293.

Dolman AJ, Moors EJ, Elbers JA, Snijders W. 1998. Evaporation and surface conductance of three temperate forests in the Netherlands. *Annales des Sciences Forestieres* **55**: 255–270.

Dunin FX, Barr HD, Meyer WS, Trevitt ACF. 1991. Foliage temperature and latent-heat flux of irrigated wheat. *Agricultural and Forest Meteorology* **55**: 133–147.

Granier A, Loustau D. 1994. Measuring and modelling the transpiration of a maritime pine canopy from sap-flow data. *Agricultural and Forest Meteorology* **71**: 61–81.

Granier A, Biron P, Kostner B, Gay LW, Najjar G. 1996. Comparisons of xylem sap flow and water vapour flux at the stand level and derivation of canopy conductance for Scots pine. *Theoretical and Applied Climatology* **53**: 115–122.

Granier A, Loustau D, Breda N. 2000. A generic model of forest canopy conductance dependent on climate, soil water availability and leaf area index. *Annals of Forest Science* **57**: 755–765.

Hall RL. 2002. Aerodynamic resistance of coppiced poplar. *Agricultural and Forest Meteorology* **114**: 83–102.

Hingston FJ, Galbraith JH. 1998. Application of the process-based model BIOMASS to *Eucalyptus globulus* spp. *globulus* plantations on ex-farmland in south western Australia. II. Stemwood production and seasonal growth. *Forest Ecology and Management* **106**: 157–168.

Horst TW, Weil JC. 1992. Footprint estimation for scalar flux measurements in the atmospheric surface layer. *Boundary-Layer Meteorology* **59**: 279–296.

Jones HG. 1992. *Plants and Microclimate*. Cambridge University Press: Cambridge; 428.

Kelliher FM, Leuning R, Schulze ED. 1993. Evaporation and canopy characteristics of coniferous forests and grasslands. *Oecologia* **95**: 153–163.

Kelliher FM, Leuning R, Raupach MR, Schulze ED. 1995. Maximum conductances for evaporation from global vegetation types. *Agricultural and Forest Meteorology* **73**: 1–16.

Kelliher FM, Hollinger DY, Schulze ED, Vyodskaya NN, Byers JN, Hunt JE, McSeveny TM, Milukova I, Sogatchev A, Varlargin A, Ziegler W, Arneth A, Bauer G. 1997. Evaporation from an eastern Siberian larch forest. *Agricultural and Forest Meteorology* **85**: 135–147.

Kelliher FM, Lloyd J, Arneth A, Byers JN, McSeveny TM, Milukova I, Grigoriev S, Panfyorov M, Sogatchev A, Varlargin A, Ziegler W, Bauer G, Schulze ED. 1998. Evaporation from a central Siberian pine forest. *Journal of Hydrology* **205**: 279–296.

Komatsu H. 2003a. Values of the decoupling factor observed on forest canopies. *Journal of Japan Society of Hydrology and Water Resources* **16**: 423–438 (in Japanese with English summary).

Komatsu H. 2003b. Relationship between canopy height and the reference value of surface conductance for closed coniferous stands. *Hydrological Processes* **17**: 2503–2512.

Komatsu H. 2004. A general method of parameterizing the bigleaf model to predict the dry-canopy evaporation rate of individual coniferous forest stands. *Hydrological Processes* **18**: 3019–3036.

Komatsu H. 2005. Forest categorization according to dry-canopy evaporation rates in a growing season: comparison of the Priestley–Taylor coefficient values from various observation sites. *Hydrological Processes* **18**: in press.

Komatsu H, Hashimoto S. 2002. Process-based models, useful tools to investigate water, carbon, and nitrogen cycles in forest ecosystems. *Journal of the Japan Forestry Society* **84**: 54–62 (in Japanese with English summary).

Komatsu H, Yoshida N, Takizawa H, Kosaka I, Tantasirin C, Suzuki M. 2003. Seasonal trend in the occurrence of nocturnal drainage flow on a forested slope under a tropical monsoon climate. *Boundary-Layer Meteorology* **106**: 573–592.

Komatsu H, Hotta N, Kuraji K, Suzuki M, Oki T. 2005. Classification of vertical wind speed profiles observed above a sloping forest at nighttime using the bulk Richardson number. *Boundary-Layer Meteorology* in press.

Kondo J, Watanabe T. 1992. Studies on bulk transfer coefficients over a vegetated surface with a multilayer energy budget model. *Journal of the Atmospheric Sciences* **49**: 2183–2199.

Kumagai T, Saitoh TM, Sato Y, Morooka T, Manfroi OJ, Kuraji K, Suzuki M. 2004a. Transpiration, canopy conductance and the decoupling coefficient of a lowland mixed dipterocarp forest in Sarawak, Borneo: dry spell effects. *Journal of Hydrology* **287**: 238–252.

Kumagai T, Saitoh TM, Sato Y, Takahashi H, Manfroi OJ, Morooka T, Kuraji K, Suzuki M, Yasunari T, Komatsu H. 2005. Annual water balance and seasonality of evapotranspiration from a Bornean tropical rainforest. *Agricultural and Forest Meteorology* in press.

Lai CT, Katul GG, Oren R, Ellsworth D, Schafer K. 2000. Modeling CO<sub>2</sub> and water vapor turbulent flux distributions within a forest canopy. *Journal of Geophysical Research* **102**: 26 333–26 351.

Landsberg JJ, Gower ST. 1997. Applications of Physiological Ecology to Forest Management. Academic Press: San Diego; 354.

Law BE, Goldstein AH, Anthoni PM, Unsworth MH, Panek JA, Bauer MR, Fracheboud JM, Hultman N. 2001. Carbon dioxide and water vapor exchange by young and old ponderosa pine ecosystems during a dry summer. *Tree Physiology* **21**: 299–308.

Lee X. 1998. On micrometeorological observations of surface-air exchange over tall vegetation. *Agricultural and Forest Meteorology* **91**: 39–49.

Lee X, Black A. 1993. Atmospheric turbulence within and above a Douglas-fir stand. Part II: eddy fluxes of sensible heat and water vapor. *Boundary-Layer Meteorology* **64**: 369–389.

Lindroth A. 1985a. Seasonal and diurnal variation of energy budget components in coniferous forests. *Journal of Hydrology* **82**: 1–15.

Lindroth A. 1985b. Canopy conductance of coniferous forests related to climate. *Water Resources Research* **21**: 297–304.

Lloyd CR. 1995. The effect of heterogeneous terrain on micrometeorological flux measurements: a case study from HAPEX-SAHEL. *Agricultural and Forest Meteorology* **73**: 209–216.



Mauser W, Schadlich S. 1998. Modelling the spatial distribution of evapotranspiration on different scales using remote sensing data. *Journal of Hydrology* **212–213**: 250–267.

McMurtrie RE, Rook DA, Kelliher FM. 1990a. Modelling the yield of *Pinus radiata* on a site limited by water and nutrition. *Forest Ecology and Management* **30**: 381–413.

McMurtrie RE, Benson ML, Linder S, Running SW, Talsma T, Crane WJB, Myers BJ. 1990b. Water/nutrient interactions affecting the productivity of stands of *Pinus radiata*. *Forest Ecology and Management* **30**: 415–430.

McMurtrie RE, Leuning R, Thompson WA, Wheeler AM. 1992. A model of canopy photosynthesis and water use incorporating a mechanistic formulation of leaf CO<sub>2</sub> exchange. *Forest Ecology and Management* **52**: 261–278.

Merz B, Bardossy A. 1998. Effects of spatial variability on the rainfall runoff process in a small loess catchment. *Journal of Hydrology* **212–213**: 304–317.

Monteith JL. 1995. Accommodation between transpiring vegetation and the convective boundary layer. *Journal of Hydrology* **166**: 251–263.

Monteith JL, Unsworth M. 1990. Principles of Environmental Physics. Arnold: London; 291.

Nobre CA, Sellers PJ, Shukla J. 1991. Amazonian deforestation and regional climate. *Journal of Climate* **4**: 957–988.

Raupach MR. 1995. Vegetation-atmosphere interaction and surface conductance at leaf, canopy and regional scales. *Agricultral and Forest Meteorology* **73**: 151–179.

Raupach MR, Finnigan JJ. 1988. 'Single-layer models of evaporation from plant canopies are incorrect but useful, whereas multilayer models are correct but useless': discuss. *Australian Journal of Plant Physiology* **15**: 705–716.

Rochette P, Pattey E, Desjardins RL, Dwyer LM, Stewart DW, Dube PA. 1991. Estimation of maize (*Zea mays* L.) canopy conductance by scaling up leaf stomatal conductance. *Agricultral and Forest Meteorology* **54**: 241–261.

Running SW, Coughlan JC. 1988. A general model of forest ecosystem processes for regional applications. I. Hydrologic balance, canopy gas exchange and primary production processes. *Ecological Modelling* **42**: 125–154.

Running SW, Gower ST. 1991. FOREST-BGC, a general model of forest ecosystem processes for regional applications. II. Dynamics carbon allocation and nitrogen budgets. *Tree Physiology* **9**: 147–160.

Schmid HP, Oke TR. 1990. A model to estimate the source area contributing to turbulent exchange in the surface layer over patchy terrain. *Quarterly Journal of the Royal Meteorological Society* **116**: 965–988.

Schulze ED, Kelliher FM, Korner C, Lloyd J, Leuning R. 1994. Relationships among maximum stomatal conductance, ecosystem surface conductance, carbon assimilation rate, and plant nitrogen nutrition: a global ecology scaling exercise. *Annual Review of Ecol*ogy and Systematics **25**: 629–660.

Schulze ED, Leuning R, Kelliher FM. 1995. Environmental regulation of surface conductance for evaporation from vegetation. *Vegetatio* **121**: 79–87.

Sellers PJ, Bounoua L, Collatz GJ, Berry J, Field C, Dazlich DA, Zhang C. 1996. A revised land-surface parameterization (SiB2) for

atmospheric GCMs. Part 1: model formulation. *Journal of Climate* **9**: 738–763.

Sellers PJ, Dickinson RE, Randall DA, Betts AK, Hall FG, Berry JA, Collatz GJ, Denning AS, Mooney HA, Nobre CA, Sato N, Field CB, Henderson-Sellers A. 1997. Modeling the exchanges of energy, water, and carbon between continents and the atmosphere. *Science* **275**: 502–509.

Shuttleworth WJ. 1989. Micrometeorology of temperate and tropical forest. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society of London* **324**: 299–334.

Shuttleworth WJ, Gash JHC, Lloyd CR, Moore CJ, Roberts J, Marques Filho ADO, Fisch G, Silva Filho VDP, Goes Ribeiro MDN, Molion LCB, Abreu Sa LDD, Nobre JCA, Cabral OMR, Patel SR, De Moraes JC. 1984. Eddy correlation measurements of energy partition for Amazonian forest. *Quarterly Journal of the Royal Meteorological Society* **110**: 1143–1162.

Soares JV, Almeida AC. 2001. Modeling the water balance and soil water fluxes in a fast growing *Eucalyptus* plantation in Brazil. *Journal of Hydrology* **253**: 130–147.

Steduto P, Hsiao TC. 1998a. Maize canopies under two soil water regimes. I. Diurnal patterns of energy balance, carbon dioxide flux, and canopy conductance. *Agricultural and Forest Meteorology* **89**: 169–184.

Steduto P, Hsiao TC. 1998b. Maize canopies under two soil water regimes. II. Seasonal trends of evapotranspiration, carbon dioxide assimilation and canopy conductance, and as related to leaf area index. *Agricultural and Forest Meteorology* **89**: 185–200.

Stewart JB, Verma SB. 1992. Comparison of surface fluxes and conductances at two contrasting sites within the Fife area. *Journal of Geophysical Research* **97**: 8623–8628.

Sugita M, Aoki M, Tsukamoto O, Kaihatsu I, Hayashi Y. 2001. Flux measurements based on the gradient/diffusion method, and estimation of evaporation rates based on humidity measurements. *Climatological Notes* **199**: 57–104 (in Japanese).

Thom AS. 1975. Momentum, mass and heat exchange of plant communities. In *Vegetation and the Atmosphere*, Monteith JL (ed.). Academic Press: London; 57–110.

Turnipseed AA, Anderson DE, Blanken PD, Baugh WM, Monson RK. 2003. Airflows and turbulent flux measurements in mountainous terrain. Part 1. Canopy and local effects. *Agricultural and Forest Meteorology* **119**: 1–21.

Verma SB, Baldocchi DD, Anderson DE, Matt DR, Clement RJ. 1986. Eddy fluxes of CO<sub>2</sub>, water vapor, and sensible heat over a deciduous forest. *Boundary-Layer Meteorology* **36**: 71–91.

Vertessy RA, Hatton TJ, O'Shaughnessy PJ, Jayasuriya MDA. 1993. Predicting water yield from a mountain ash forest catchment using a terrain analysis based catchment model. *Journal of Hydrology* **150**: 665–700.

Waring RH, Running SW. 1998. Forest Ecosystems. Academic Press: San Diego; 370.

Watanabe T. 1994. Plants and the atmosphere. In *Meteorology of Water Environments*, Kondo J (ed.). Asakura: Tokyo; 208–239 (in Japanese).

Whitehead D, Kelliher FM. 1991. Modeling the water balance of a small *Pinus radiata* catchment. *Tree Physiology* **9**: 17–33.

Wilson KB, Baldocchi DD. 2000. Seasonal and interannual variability of energy fluxes over a broadleaved temperate deciduous



#### SCIENTIFIC BRIEFING

forest in North America. Agricultural and Forest Meteorology 100: 1–18.

Woodward FI. 1987. An Introduction to Phytoclimatology. Cambridge University Press: Cambridge; 174.

Wright IR, Manzi AO, da Rocha HR. 1995. Surface conductance of Amazonian pasture: model application and calibration for canopy climate. *Agricultural and Forest Meteorology* **75**: 51–70.

Yi C, Davis KJ, Bakwin PS, Berger BW, Marr LC. 2000. Influence of advection on measurements of the net ecosystem–atmosphere exchange of  $CO_2$  from a very tall tower. *Journal of Geophysical Research* **105**: 9991–9999.