

# Quantifying structural and physiological controls on variation in canopy transpiration among planted pine and hardwood species in the southern Appalachians

Chelcy R. Ford,<sup>1\*</sup> Robert M. Hubbard<sup>2</sup> and James M. Vose<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> USDA FS SRS, Coweeta Hydrologic Laboratory, Otto, NC 28763, USA

<sup>2</sup> USDA FS RMRS, Fort Collins, CO 80526, USA

## ABSTRACT

Recent studies have shown that planted pine stands exhibit higher evapotranspiration (ET) and are more sensitive to climatic conditions compared with hardwood stands. Whether this is due to management and stand effects, biological effects or their interaction is poorly understood. We estimated growing season canopy- and sap flux-scaled leaf-level transpiration ( $E_c$  and  $E_L$ ) in five major overstory species over 3 years. Four hardwood species, *Liriodendron tulipifera*, *Carya* spp., *Quercus rubra* and *Quercus prinus*, were measured in an unmanaged watershed. *Pinus strobus* was measured in an adjacent planted pine watershed. We hypothesized that (1) species would differ in  $E_L$  and stomatal conductance ( $G_S$ ), and their relationship with vapour pressure deficit ( $D$ ); and (2) differences in growing season ET between the stands would result primarily from the differences in interception ( $E_i$ ). Growing season ET in the planted pine stand exceeded hardwood ET by twofold during all 3 years. Transpiration and  $E_i$  contributed similarly to the ET difference, suggesting that physiological differences were equally as important as structural factors to the overall difference in ET. Among species, mean  $E_L$  and  $G_S$  differed significantly, as did their relationship with  $D$ .  $E_L$  and  $G_S$  of oaks and hickories were least responsive to changing  $D$ , while *L. tulipifera* and *P. strobus* were most responsive. This species-level understanding of variation in  $E_L$  and  $G_S$  and their interactions with climatic driving variables has important implications for predicting watershed-level responses to stand management, species invasion and loss, and climate variability. Published in 2010. This article is a US Government work and is in the public domain in the USA.

KEY WORDS evapotranspiration; sap flow; species; stomatal conductance; transpiration

Received 13 January 2010; Accepted 15 April 2010

## INTRODUCTION

Over the past century, rapid changes in species composition in forest ecosystems have occurred on a wide-spread scale. Often these changes have been associated with disturbances (e.g. non-native insects or diseases) that target individual species. In contrast to whole-basin vegetation changes (reviewed in Brown *et al.*, 2005; Farley *et al.*, 2005), the impacts of long-term changes in individual species composition on hydrology are less well known (Ellison *et al.*, 2005). Our ability to understand and predict how changes in forest species composition will impact hydrologic processes [e.g. evapotranspiration (ET), soil moisture dynamics, and stream flow] is an increasingly important issue (National Research Council of the National Academies, 2008), because of the accelerated pace of tree species losses (or gains) due to insects, diseases, native and non-native invasive plants, and afforestation projects.

Much of what is known about differences in water use among species has been inferred from the water yield studies on intensively managed forests that are

typically monospecific, fully stocked and have short rotations; thus, resulting in significant differences in forest structure, age and species composition relative to unmanaged stands. One example of these intensive management practices is the conversion of hardwood stands to coniferous stands, which often results in a reduced stream flow (Swank and Douglass, 1974; Komatsu *et al.*, 2008). A synthesis of the literature indicates that across many sites, for any given precipitation regime, annual ET from coniferous forests (both managed and unmanaged) is generally greater than hardwood forests (Figure 1). Mechanisms regulating the increase in ET for coniferous species compared with deciduous species have been postulated to include: (1) greater interception because of higher stocking density and year-round leaf area, (2) greater annual transpiration in moderate climates because of persistent leaf area and hence a longer growing season and (3) differences in leaf-level transpiration. Hence, differences in ET are driven by the physical factors (e.g. interception), biological factors (e.g. transpiration) or some combination of the two. The relative importance of physical versus biological controls varies throughout the year and interacts with climatic conditions. For example, in the growing season, species-specific variation in transpiration was the primary reason for differences between ET

\* Correspondence to: Chelcy R. Ford, USDA FS SRS, Coweeta Hydrologic Laboratory, Otto, NC 28763, USA.  
E-mail: crford@fs.fed.us; chelcy.ford@gmail.com




Figure 1. Relationship between ET and precipitation ( $P$ ) for different forest biomes (in various countries) dominated by either conifers (black symbols) or hardwood (grey symbols) species. Data are from  $\blacktriangle$  Knight *et al.* (1985),  $\blacktriangledown$  Vose and Swank (1992),  $\bullet$  Ewel and Gholz (1991),  $\blacksquare$  Waring and Schlesinger (1985),  $\blacklozenge$  Grip *et al.* (1979),  $\bullet$  Whitehead and Kelliher (1991),  $\star$   $\star$  Stoy *et al.* (2006); Vose and Swank (1992). IFS sites  $\triangle$  NC,  $\circ$  CAN,  $\square$  WA;  $\blacktriangledown$  Granier *et al.* (2000);  $\blacklozenge$  Wilson *et al.* (2001). Regression lines and fits for conifer and hardwood data sets, respectively, are  $ET = 0.72 \times P - 10.48$ ,  $R^2_{adj} = 0.75$ ,  $P < 0.001$ ; and  $ET = 0.42 \times P + 46.35$ ,  $R^2_{adj} = 0.74$ ,  $P = 0.002$ . All values are for annual ET except  $\blacktriangledown$   $\star\star$ , which are growing season only.

in hardwood and coniferous stands (Stoy *et al.*, 2006); moreover, these species also differed in their sensitivity to climatic variation, with ET of hardwood stands being less sensitive to climate variability than coniferous stands.

Understanding the factors regulating transpiration among species within mixed stands is also important for quantifying the potential consequences of shifting species composition due to succession, introduction of invasive species, or selective loss of species due to invasive insects and disease. For example, large differences in transpiration among species exist in many forested systems (Wullschlegel *et al.*, 2001; Moore *et al.*, 2004; Ewers *et al.*, 2005). In addition, several studies also indicate that younger or shorter trees may have higher transpiration rates than older or taller trees because as trees grow taller, the path length of water flow from soil to leaf to atmosphere increases (Dunn and Connor, 1993; Hubbard *et al.*, 1999; Moore *et al.*, 2004; Ryan *et al.*, 2006; Novick *et al.*, 2009), and stomata can respond directly to this change in hydraulic conductance (Hubbard *et al.*, 2001). Young trees also may be more affected by climate variability than more mature ones, especially if the latter has a larger or deeper functional rooting zone than the former that could buffer it against transient droughts (Sperry *et al.*, 2002). Thus, age- and species-related changes in forest structure can also be important factors affecting forest ET.

The objectives of this research were to estimate and compare whole-tree water use of major canopy species in a native deciduous southern Appalachian hardwood forest and an adjacent planted pine forest. Using sap flux probes, we estimated growing season canopy transpiration ( $E_c$ )

and transpiration per unit leaf area ( $E_L$ ) in five major overstory species over 3 years. Four hardwood species, *Liriodendron tulipifera*, *Carya* spp., *Quercus rubra* and *Quercus prinus*, were measured in the unmanaged reference watershed; and one coniferous species, *Pinus strobus*, was measured in the adjacent species-conversion treatment watershed. We hypothesized that  $E_L$  would vary by species, and that the relationship between  $E_L$  and stomatal conductance ( $G_s$ ) with vapour pressure deficit ( $D$ ) would vary by species. We also hypothesized that differences in growing season ET between the planted pine watershed and the hardwood watershed would be the result of structural differences (interception and tree height) and biological differences ( $E_c$  among species), with structural differences contributing more to the difference than  $E_c$ . Differences in interception were expected to be the result of management effects (e.g. stocking related differences in leaf, branch and bole surface area), whereas differences in  $E_c$  were expected to be largely species-specific effects (e.g.  $E_L$  and  $G_s$ ).

## MATERIALS AND METHODS

### Study site

The study sites were located in watersheds 17 and 18 (WS17 and WS18), two adjacent, northwest-facing, steeply sloping (average 57 and 53% slopes, respectively), 13.5- and 12.5-ha catchments within the Coweeta Basin in the Nantahala Mountain Range of western North Carolina, USA. Climate in the Coweeta Basin is classified as marine, humid temperate (Swift *et al.*, 1988), and average annual precipitation is 2014 mm. WS17 elevation ranges from 742 to 1021 m, and WS18 elevation ranges from 726 to 993 m. Soils on both watersheds fall into two main series: the Saunook series, a fine-loamy, mixed, mesic Humic Hapludult, is present at streamside positions (~50-cm depth); and Cowee-Evard complex soils, a fine-loamy, mixed-oxidic, mesic, Typic Hapludult, typically present on ridges (~70-cm depth) (Knoepp and Swank, 1994).

WS18, a mixed hardwood reference watershed, has been undisturbed since being selectively logged in the early 1900s, with the exception of the chestnut blight which decimated American chestnut trees in the southern Appalachians in the 1920s (Kovner, 1955; Woods and Shanks, 1957; Elliott and Swank, 2008). Plant community composition in WS18 is closely associated with elevation, aspect and soil moisture (Day and Monk, 1974). A chestnut oak–hickory overstory and mountain laurel understory dominates the upper slopes and drier ridges, a northern red oak–red maple–tulip poplar overstory and rhododendron understory dominates the intermediate mid-slopes, and a birch–red maple–tulip poplar overstory and rhododendron understory dominates the mesic cove and riparian areas (Day and Monk, 1974).

Prior to 1941, WS17 was similar in species composition and forest age to that of WS18 (Hoover, 1944).

Table I. Characteristics of stands and tree species monitored for sap flux density in each watershed.

Species	LAI (m <sup>2</sup> m <sup>-2</sup> )*	BA (m <sup>2</sup> ha <sup>-1</sup> )*	Density (stems ha <sup>-1</sup> )*	<i>N</i>	DBH (cm)	Height (m) <sup>†</sup>	<i>A</i> <sub>sw</sub> (cm <sup>2</sup> ) <sup>†</sup>	<i>A</i> <sub>L</sub> (m <sup>2</sup> ) <sup>†</sup>	<i>A</i> <sub>L</sub> : <i>A</i> <sub>sw</sub>
Hardwood reference watershed	6.2	39.1	558						
<i>Carya</i> spp.	0.9	5.5	50	9	38.6 (3.3) <sup>b‡</sup>	28.7 (1.5) <sup>b</sup>	491.1 (78.1)	194.3 (30.8) <sup>bc</sup>	0.40 (0.00) <sup>c</sup>
<i>L. tulipifera</i> L.	0.6	4.0	53	5	45.4 (2.2) <sup>ab</sup>	36.6 (1.8) <sup>a</sup>	725.9 (104.2)	219.0 (33.1) <sup>bc</sup>	0.30 (0.00) <sup>c</sup>
<i>Q. prinus</i> L.	2.2	13.5	81	12	51.2 (5.8) <sup>ab</sup>	27.9 (1.8) <sup>b</sup>	381.0 (63.0)	366.3 (74.5) <sup>ab</sup>	0.87 (0.05) <sup>b</sup>
<i>Q. rubra</i> L.	1.1	6.5	19	5	59.4 (9.3) <sup>a</sup>	30.2 (2.6) <sup>ab</sup>	305.5 (78.9)	505.6 (149.4) <sup>a</sup>	1.57 (0.09) <sup>a</sup>
Other	1.5	9.6	355						
Planted pine watershed	7.2	66.5	556						
<i>P. strobus</i> L.	7.2	66.5	556	42	40.5 (1.4) <sup>b</sup>	30.9 (0.5) <sup>b</sup>	498.3 (42.1)	149.5 (13.3) <sup>c</sup>	0.31 (0.03) <sup>c</sup>

Peak \* LAI (projected for hardwoods and  $\sim 2/3$  for pine), basal area (BA), and stem density of trees >5 cm in diameter at 1.3 m above the ground height. Values shown are integrated across all plots for each watershed during 2005. <sup>†</sup> Height, sapwood (*A*<sub>sw</sub>), and leaf area (*A*<sub>L</sub>) measurements or estimates are for 2006 growing season. Means (standard error) shown. <sup>‡</sup> Species not sharing the same lowercase letters within individual columns denote significant differences for that variable if a significant species effect was found in the full model.

In January to March 1941, all shrub and forest vegetation was cut in WS17 and left onsite. Thereafter, annual sprout growth was cutback most years until 1955. In 1956, WS17 was planted with eastern white pine (*P. strobus* L.) seedlings at a 2 × 2 m spacing to experimentally evaluate how hardwood-to-pine conversion affected catchment water yield (Swank and Douglass, 1974). The stand was unmanaged until 2001 when a small area of the watershed ( $\sim 2$  ha) was cut to stop the spread of southern pine beetle (*Dendroctonus frontalis* Z.).

#### Interception and transpiration estimates

Interception for the growing season was estimated using empirical equations developed on stands with similar species, stocking density, basal area and climate (Helvey and Patric, 1965; Helvey, 1967). The equation used for the growing season interception by the hardwood stand was based on a meta-analysis of over 12 studies that published interception equations, which included the hardwood stand in the present study. The general equation was developed by using a weighted average equation based on the number of throughfall gages used. Interception was estimated based on the total precipitation measured in the growing season, and the number of events [ $\sum E_i = 0.083(\sum P) + 0.036(n)$ , where  $E_i$  is interception,  $P$  the precipitation and  $n$  the number of events in the growing season] (all units in inches, Helvey and Patric, 1965). The equation used for the growing season interception by the pine stand was based on an empirical equation developed by Helvey (1967, Table III) for eastern white pine stands of similar age (60 years old) but lesser basal area (35 m<sup>2</sup> ha<sup>-1</sup> vs a mean basal area of 66 m<sup>2</sup> ha<sup>-1</sup> in the present study). The equation [ $\sum E_i = 0.06(n) + 0.18(\sum P)$ ] predicted interception losses as a function of total growing season precipitation and the number ( $n$ ) of storm events (all units in inches).

To estimate the transpirational water loss, we used constant heat dissipation probes (Granier, 1985) to monitor

a subset of trees in the two watersheds. Mid-slope on WS17, 42 trees in three plots (289, 292 and 203 m<sup>2</sup> in area), and on the mid-to-upper slopes on WS18, 31 trees in two plots (1295 and 1905 m<sup>2</sup> in area) were monitored for sap flux density throughout 2004–2006 (Table I). Plot locations and sizes in both watersheds were chosen to sample a range of comparable mid-slope conditions and sample the major overstory species present in WS18 (Day and Monk, 1974). However, they do not represent the full range of conditions (e.g. soils, topography, species composition for WS18, etc.) in either watershed.

Sap flux density ( $v$ , g H<sub>2</sub>O m<sup>-2</sup> sapwood s<sup>-1</sup>) was determined by installing probes in the outer 2 or 3 cm of the functional xylem. Probe length was determined based on the estimated sapwood depth: if 2 cm did not span at least 30% of the sapwood depth, a 3-cm probe was installed. For each tree monitored, we installed two sets of probes circumferentially at least 90° apart. Probes were installed, shielded from thermal gradients and wired to dataloggers as described by Ford and Vose (2007). Sensors were queried every 30 s and 15 min averages were logged. The temperature difference ( $\Delta T$ ) between the upper and lower probes was converted to  $v$  using the equation of Granier (1985), with the maximum temperature difference ( $\Delta T_{\max}$ ) between probes identified for each biweekly period. The  $\Delta T_{\max}$  values were determined using this time step due to the positive relationship between  $\Delta T_{\max}$  and rainfall events, and because at least one rainfall event typically occurred in a biweekly period (Lu *et al.*, 2004). In 7 of the 28 hardwood trees, corrections to  $\Delta T$  values were made according to Clearwater *et al.* (1999) because probes were in contact with heartwood. For all trees,  $v$  estimates for the two replicate sets of sensors were averaged. Sensors were replaced in newly drilled holes each year. Within a year, sensors were replaced if null, out of range, erratic, or negative readings were recorded, or if probes were physically damaged. Probes typically performed well in the hardwood

trees for 6–8 months, and 10–12 months in the pine trees.

#### Scaling and allometry

Leaf areas for all trees and sapwood areas for the hardwood trees were estimated using species- and site-specific allometric equations (Martin *et al.*, 1998, B. D. Kloeppel and J. M. Vose, unpublished data). To estimate the sapwood area for the pine trees monitored, we visually estimated sapwood length based on the dye uptake at breast height (described in Ford and Vose, 2007). Diameter at breast height (DBH, 1.3 m above the ground height) was measured, and assuming circular symmetry we developed equations predicting sapwood area ( $A_{SW}$ ) as a function of DBH on log-transformed data ( $\log A_{SW} = \log DBH \times 2.27 - 1.11$ , correction factor = 1.1015; Sprugel, 1983). In the dormant season following sap flux measurements, we measured DBH and bark thickness ( $T_b$ ) on all trees and estimated  $A_{SW}$ .

To scale  $v$  in the outer 2 or 3 cm of sapwood to whole-tree sap flow ( $F$ , g H<sub>2</sub>O s<sup>-1</sup>), we developed general radial profile functions of  $v$  versus fraction of hydroactive sapwood depth for each species (methods presented in Ford *et al.*, 2007). We measured  $v$  at various depths in the sapwood of three *P. strobus* trees (45.6 cm mean DBH) (data presented in Ford *et al.*, 2007), two *L. tulipifera* trees (57.8 cm mean DBH), two *Carya* spp. trees (36.8 cm mean DBH), and two *Q. rubra* trees (46.5 cm mean DBH) (data not shown). Individuals monitored for radial profile functions were outside of the long-term sap flow plots and were monitored over several days during 2005 (*P. strobus*) or 2006 (hardwood spp.).

We estimated mean stomatal conductance ( $G_S$ , m s<sup>-1</sup>) from  $E_L$  and  $D$  (vapour pressure deficit, kPa, measurements described below) using the following equation:

$$G_S = \frac{K_G(T) \cdot E_L}{D} \quad (1)$$

where  $K_G$  is a function of temperature ( $115.8 + 0.4236T$ ; kPa m<sup>3</sup> kg<sup>-1</sup>), and accounts for the temperature effects on the psychrometric constant, latent heat of vapourization and the specific heat and density of air (Phillips and Oren, 1998). We converted to molar units following Pearcy *et al.* (1989). Several conditions must be met for Equation (1) to estimate  $G_S$  in conifers and hardwoods (discussed in Ewers and Oren, 2000). Specifically, (1) boundary layer conductance must be high so that atmospheric  $D$  approximates leaf-to-air  $D$ , (2) heterogeneity in canopy  $D$  must be low and (3) stem sap flow must represent the magnitude and timing of leaf fluxes from the canopy. For the hardwood stands, we used canopy  $D$  (as in Ewers *et al.*, 2007) while for the planted pine stands we used open-field  $D$  (measurements described below) to minimize errors due to (1). We used rain-free days and excluded days when  $D < 0.6$  kPa to minimize errors due to (1) and (2). We used mean daytime  $E_L$  to minimize errors due to (3).

To make inferences about the relationship between  $G_S$  and  $D$ , we used a boundary line approach (Schafer *et al.*,

2000; Ewers *et al.*, 2005). This approach fit a nonlinear model through the greatest values of  $G_S$  for any level of  $D$  for each tree. Because many variables affect  $G_S$  [soil moisture, photosynthetically active radiation (PAR), etc.], there is typically a distribution of  $G_S$  values for any level of  $D$ . By only fitting a model through the upper values of  $G_S$  for any level of  $D$ , the constraints of other variables on  $G_S$  are minimized and the inference of the effect of  $D$  on  $G_S$  is maximized. For each tree, we therefore divided  $D$  into five bins ( $D_i$ ), every 0.2 kPa, and excluded all  $G_S$  data less than the mean plus 1 standard deviation of  $G_S$  in bin  $D_i$ . The values falling above the mean plus 1 standard deviation were the values we fit a nonlinear model through (described below).

To estimate the plot transpiration per unit ground area ( $E_t$ , mm), we multiplied  $E_L$  for each species by the proportion of total leaf area index (for all trees >5 cm DBH, m<sup>2</sup> m<sup>-2</sup>) represented by that species. Sap flux gaged trees represented 74–79% of the species that occupy the overstory in the reference hardwood stand (Table I). Unrepresented species were *Acer rubrum* L., *Acer pensylvanicum* L., *Betula lenta* L., *Oxydendrum arboreum* (L.) DC. and *Nyssa sylvatica* Marsh. The  $A_L$  of unrepresented species >5 cm DBH was assigned a mean  $E_L$  of all species measured. Because we did not measure transpiration of either herbaceous or woody (<5-cm diameter), understory species, canopy transpiration ( $E_c$ ) and plot transpiration ( $E_t$ ) definitions are used interchangeably. Understory species are a minor component of overall stand leaf area [e.g. LAI for woody understory species <5-cm diameter in similar hardwood control watersheds averaged 0.4 m<sup>2</sup> m<sup>-2</sup> in 2007 (K. Elliott, unpublished data)]; and are likely to contribute little to plot-level transpiration. Values from all plots within a watershed were averaged.

Growing season  $E_t$  was estimated by summing daily scaled  $E_t$  during days of year 128–280. Across all years and plots, missing data averaged 26%. To estimate missing data, we developed time-series models predicting daily  $E_t$  from the climate variables ( $D$ , PAR and wind speed, measurements described below) according to the procedures in Ford *et al.* (2005). Missing data resulted from sap flux or data logging equipment malfunction, which typically occurred as a result of thunderstorms. Because missing data typically occurred on rainy days when sapflow was likely low, the significance of errors associated with predicting sap flux was assumed to be minor.

#### Environmental variables

An open-field climate station (CS17) was located mid-slope in WS17 (<200 m from the measured plots). CS17 measured precipitation ( $P$ , Belfort Instrument Co., Baltimore, MD, USA) every 1 min and logged 15 min totals, air temperature, and relative humidity ( $T_a$  and RH, model HMP45C, Campbell Scientific, Inc. Logan, UT, USA), solar radiation (model 8–48, Epply Lab Inc., Newport, RI, USA) and wind speed and direction

(Met One 014A anemometer, Campbell Scientific, Inc.) every 1 min and logged 15 min averages and totals. In WS18, a  $T_a$  and RH sensor (model CS500, Campbell Scientific, Inc.) was mounted in the canopy layer of the lower plot. We used  $T_a$  to calculate saturation vapour pressure ( $e_s$ ) according to Lowe (1977). Actual vapour pressure ( $e_a$ ) was calculated from fractional RH and  $e_s$ . Air vapour pressure deficit ( $D$ ) was calculated as the difference between  $e_s$  and  $e_a$ . Barometric air pressure was recorded hourly in the valley floor (Chart No. 5–1071, Belfort Instrument Co.).

Volumetric soil water content ( $\theta$ , v/v %) was estimated using time domain reflectometry probes (models CS615 and CS616, Campbell Scientific, Inc.). Two 30-cm long probes were inserted vertically into the soil in each plot spanning 0- to 30-cm soil depth on WS18. One probe in each of the three plots on WS17 spanned 0- to 30-cm soil depth. Probes were queried every 1 min, and 15 min averages were logged by dataloggers. We removed a soil monolith from the appropriate depth in soils adjacent to each plot and calibrated period output from the sensors to known volumetric water content in the laboratory.

### Statistics

We tested for differences among tree species characteristics ( $A_{SW}$ ,  $A_L$ ,  $A_L$ :  $A_{SW}$  and DBH) in 2006 with a one-factor analysis of variance (ANOVA) (SAS v9.1, SAS Institute, Inc., Cary, NC, USA) using PROC GLM and Tukey's *post hoc* means separation test. The variable  $A_L$ :  $A_{SW}$  was transformed with a square root function prior to statistical analysis. We tested for differences in mean growing season  $E_L$  and  $G_S$  among all years and species using a two-factor repeated-measure ANOVA (PROC MIXED) with unstructured variance.

We tested for differences in the mean species  $E_L$  response to  $D$  and the mean species  $G_S$  response to  $D$  for each year by using a repeated-measure, mixed effects, nonlinear model (PROC NL MIXED) in the form:

$$y = f(x_{ij}, \beta, u_i) + e_{ij} \quad (2)$$

where  $f$  is a function of known vector covariates ( $x_{ij}$ ), in our case, daytime  $D$  on the  $j$ th day for the  $i$ th tree; a vector of unknown fixed parameters ( $\beta$ ); and a vector of unknown random effect parameters ( $u_i$ ), in our case,  $u_0$  and  $u_1$ ; and  $e_{ij}$  is unknown random errors associated with the  $j$ th day for the  $i$ th tree (Peek *et al.*, 2002). For the  $E_L$  versus  $D$  relationship, the function had the following form:

$$E_L = \beta_0(1 - e^{-\beta_1 \cdot D}) \quad (3)$$

where  $E_L$  is transpiration per unit leaf area ( $\text{mm day}^{-1}$ ), and  $\beta_0$  and  $\beta_1$  represent the maximum  $E_L$  and the initial increase in  $E_L$  with each unit  $D$ , respectively. For the  $G_S$  versus  $D$  relationship, the function had the following form:

$$G_S = -\beta_2 \cdot \ln(D) + \beta_3 \quad (4)$$

where  $G_S$  is the stomatal conductance ( $\text{mmol m}^{-2} \text{s}^{-1}$ ),  $\beta_2$  is the slope and represents the apparent sensitivity of  $G_S$  to  $D$  (sensu Oren *et al.*, 1999), and  $\beta_3$  is the intercept and represents a reference stomatal conductance ( $G_{S\text{ref}}$ ) at  $D = 1$  kPa. We tested for significant differences among parameter estimates for each species using custom contrast statements. To compare response curve parameters among years for any species, if the upper and lower 95% confidence interval for each parameter estimate did not overlap, we interpreted this as a significant difference.

We tested for differences in the relationship between stomatal conductance at a reference  $D$  (i.e.  $G_{S\text{ref}}$ ) and tree height among hardwood species. We excluded *P. strobus* from the analysis because of low variation in tree height within the species measured. We averaged the  $G_{S\text{ref}}$  parameters for each tree across years. We fit a linear model to the  $G_{S\text{ref}}$  versus height relationship using trees as individual replicates and species as a covariate (PROC GLM, SAS Institute, Inc.). We used contrast statements to test for differences among the slopes and intercepts of lines for each species.

## RESULTS

### Stand and species characteristics

Stand characteristics were markedly different between the two watersheds. The hardwood stand had lower LAI than the planted pine (Table I) and more than half of the LAI was contributed by two oak species. Although the planted pine stand had roughly 1.7 times the basal area of the hardwood stand, stem density was similar between the stands due to a large number of small stems in the understory of the hardwood stand. Tree diameter, height and tree-level leaf area all varied among species (Table I). Mean diameters of the *Q. rubra*, *L. tulipifera* and *Q. prinus* trees were the largest, and *P. strobus* and *Carya* spp. were the smallest trees ( $F_{4, 68} = 4.23$ ,  $P < 0.01$ ; Table I). Mean tree height ( $F_{4, 68} = 4.37$ ,  $P < 0.01$ ) and leaf area ( $F_{4, 68} = 9.51$ ,  $P < 0.01$ ) among species also varied. *L. tulipifera* and *Q. rubra* were significantly taller than the other species; tree heights among other species did not differ. *Q. rubra* trees supported the greatest and *P. strobus* trees supported the least amount of leaf area among all species. Individual species also supported significantly different amounts of leaf area for each unit of sapwood area ( $F_{4, 68} = 82.15$ ,  $P < 0.01$ ). The ranking among species was related to xylem anatomy: the two ring-porous sapwood species (*Quercus* spp.) supported significantly more leaf area per unit sapwood area than species with smaller conduits which included semi-ring porous (*Carya* spp.), tracheid (*P. strobus*) and diffuse porous (*L. tulipifera*) sapwood species.

### Inter-annual climate

Total annual precipitation varied among the three study years, 2159, 2320 and 1691 mm, and was 7% higher,




Figure 2. Daily growing season (days of year 128–280) precipitation ( $P$ , bars) and solar radiation (open symbols), and transpiration ( $E_L$ , solid symbols) and  $D$  (open symbols) for planted pine watershed (WS17) and hardwood reference watershed (WS18) during 2004–2006. Numbers in individual panels show  $P$  or  $E_L$  growing season totals.

15% higher and 16% lower than the long-term average (67-year average 2014 mm,  $SD \pm 312$  mm). Growing season precipitation (1073, 1272 and 528 mm) was 32% higher, 46% higher and 33% lower than the long-term average (67-year average during May to October was 878 mm,  $SD \pm 210$  mm; Figure 2).

Average soil moisture during the growing season in the planted pine plots did not vary considerably from year to year; the mean was 20, 23 and 19% for the three study years. In contrast, soil moisture in the hardwood plots was more variable among years. In the lower plot, the mean soil moisture for the three years was  $\geq 24\%$ ; however, in the upper plot, mean growing season soil moisture was 16, 21 and 12% in 2004, 2005 and 2006, respectively.

#### Variation in species $E_L$ and $G_S$ , and responses to climate

Growing season daily transpiration per unit leaf area ( $E_L$ ) varied significantly among species ( $F_{4, 65.6} = 17.94$ ,  $P < 0.01$ ) and years ( $F_{2, 65.3} = 5.91$ ,  $P < 0.01$ ; Table II), and there was a significant species by year interaction ( $F_{8, 89.2} = 2.89$ ,  $P < 0.01$ ). Among species, *L. tulipifera* always had the highest  $E_L$  while *Q. rubra* always had the lowest.  $E_L$  rates were highest for all species in 2004. *P. strobus* and *Q. prinus* exhibited the greatest variation in  $E_L$  over the study period. In 2004 and 2005, *P. strobus* had  $E_L$  values similar to *L. tulipifera*; however,

Table II. Mean (standard error) growing season daily transpiration per unit leaf area ( $E_L$ , mm) for species in the two study watersheds.

Species	$E_L$		
	2004	2005	2006
Hardwood reference watershed			
<i>Carya</i> spp.	0.20 (0.03) <sup>b,A*</sup>	0.19 (0.02) <sup>b,A</sup>	0.18 (0.02) <sup>c,A</sup>
<i>L. tulipifera</i> L.	0.45 (0.05) <sup>a,AB</sup>	0.39 (0.07) <sup>a,B</sup>	0.46 (0.03) <sup>a,A</sup>
<i>Q. prinus</i> L.	0.21 (0.03) <sup>b,A</sup>	0.07 (0.01) <sup>b,B</sup>	0.10 (0.02) <sup>cd,AB</sup>
<i>Q. rubra</i> L.	0.10 (0.02) <sup>b,A</sup>	0.07 (0.02) <sup>b,A</sup>	0.07 (0.01) <sup>c,A</sup>
Planted pine watershed			
<i>P. strobus</i> L.	0.41 (0.02) <sup>a,A</sup>	0.36 (0.03) <sup>a,B</sup>	0.30 (0.02) <sup>b,C</sup>

\* Within columns, species not sharing the same lowercase letters denote significant differences among species for that year. Within rows, years not sharing the same uppercase letters denote significant differences among years for that species.

in 2006  $E_L$  of *P. strobus* was intermediate between *L. tulipifera* and *Carya* spp. During 2004, *Q. prinus* had a significantly higher  $E_L$  compared with 2005, and was similar to the *Q. rubra* and *Carya* spp. These three species were also similar in 2005, but only *Q. prinus* had a significantly lower  $E_L$  compared with the previous year. Species with significant variation in  $E_L$  among years were *L. tulipifera*, *Q. prinus* and *P. strobus*. By 2006, *P. strobus*  $E_L$  had declined 27% compared with  $E_L$  in

Table III. Parameter estimates for species' mean daily transpiration per unit leaf area ( $E_L$ , mm day<sup>-1</sup>) response curves to daytime mean vapour pressure deficit ( $D$ , kPa).

Species	$\beta_0^*$			$-\beta_1^*$		
	2004	2005	2006	2004	2005	2006
Hardwood reference watershed						
<i>Carya</i> spp.	0.54 (0.14) <sup>b,A†</sup>	0.31 (0.10) <sup>b,A</sup>	0.26 (0.04) <sup>c,A</sup>	0.68 (0.19) <sup>b,A</sup>	1.16 (0.19) <sup>b,A</sup>	1.33 (0.22) <sup>b,A</sup>
<i>L. tulipifera</i> L.	1.19 (0.23) <sup>a,A</sup>	0.60 (0.14) <sup>a,A</sup>	0.74 (0.07) <sup>a,A</sup>	0.75 (0.24) <sup>b,A</sup>	1.33 (0.22) <sup>b,A</sup>	0.97 (0.24) <sup>b,B</sup>
<i>Q. prinus</i> L.	0.53 (0.19) <sup>b,A</sup>	0.10 (0.02) <sup>c,A</sup>	0.13 (0.05) <sup>d,A</sup>	0.72 (0.27) <sup>b,A</sup>	1.15 (0.28) <sup>b,A</sup>	1.40 (0.42) <sup>b,A</sup>
<i>Q. rubra</i> L.	0.26 (0.11) <sup>c,A</sup>	0.12 (0.06) <sup>c,A</sup>	0.09 (0.05) <sup>d,A</sup>	0.69 (0.27) <sup>b,A</sup>	1.13 (0.26) <sup>b,A</sup>	1.26 (0.40) <sup>b,A</sup>
Planted pine watershed						
<i>P. strobus</i> L.	0.76 (0.14) <sup>b,A</sup>	0.51 (0.09) <sup>a,AB</sup>	0.38 (0.04) <sup>b,B</sup>	1.18 (0.21) <sup>a,A</sup>	1.98 (0.20) <sup>a,AB</sup>	2.53 (0.24) <sup>a,B</sup>

Standard error of the parameter estimate given in parentheses. \* Maximum  $E_L$  described by  $\beta_0$ , and rate of increase in  $E_L$  per unit  $D$  described by  $\beta_1$ . † Within columns, species not sharing the same lowercase letters denote significant differences among species for that year. Within rows, years not sharing the same uppercase letters denote significant differences among years for that species. Curves shown in Figure 3 use the parameter estimates given above.

2004. From 2004 to 2005, *Q. prinus*  $E_L$  declined by 67%. From 2005 to 2006,  $E_L$  had increased 18% in *L. tulipifera*.

For all species,  $E_L$  was significantly related to  $D$  (Table III and Figure 3). The model that described the relationship best was a nonlinear two-parameter exponential saturation model. These two parameters described the initial linear increase in  $E_L$  with increasing  $D$  ( $\beta_1$ ), and the maximum  $E_L$  ( $\beta_0$ ). Maximum  $E_L$  parameter estimates differed significantly among species. During 2004, *L. tulipifera* had the highest and *Q. rubra* had the lowest maximum  $E_L$  parameter estimate compared with all the other species, which were not significantly different from one another. In 2005 and 2006, species fell roughly into three groups: *L. tulipifera* had a significantly higher maximum  $E_L$  parameter estimate compared with *P. strobus* and *Carya* spp., and the *Quercus* spp. had the lowest parameter estimates. Parameter estimates for the initial increase in  $E_L$  with  $D$  had large standard errors, and thus did not differ significantly. The exception to this was *P. strobus*, in which  $E_L$  increased more sharply with initial  $D$  compared with all other species.

During the growing season, stomatal conductance ( $G_S$ ) varied significantly among species ( $F_{4, 68.5} = 17.44$ ,  $P < 0.01$ ) and years ( $F_{2, 68} = 11.86$ ,  $P < 0.01$ ; Table IV). The ranking among species was not the same for all years (species  $\times$  year interaction  $F_{8, 93} = 5.21$ ,  $P < 0.01$ ). Similar to  $E_L$ , among species *L. tulipifera* maintained the greatest mean  $G_S$  while the two oak species always had the lowest. In the hardwood stand, stomatal conductance of *Carya* spp. and *Q. rubra* was consistent among years; however, stomatal conductance of two hardwood species (*L. tulipifera* and *Q. prinus*) was greater in 2004 compared with 2005 and 2006. Stomatal conductance of *P. strobus* was greatest in 2005 followed by 2004 then 2006.

The stomatal conductance response to  $D$  varied significantly among species, but was fairly consistent among years (Table V and Figure 4). The reference stomatal conductance parameter ( $\beta_3$ ) was significantly higher in *L.*

Table IV. Mean (standard error) growing season daily stomatal conductance ( $G_S$ , mmol m<sup>-2</sup> s<sup>-1</sup>) for species during daylight hours and times with no precipitation and  $D > 0.6$  kPa in the two study watersheds.

Species	$G_S$		
	2004	2005	2006
Hardwood reference watershed			
<i>Carya</i> spp.	20.4 (3.3) <sup>c,A*</sup>	16.1 (1.7) <sup>b,A</sup>	15.1 (1.7) <sup>c,A</sup>
<i>L. tulipifera</i> L.	49.5 (4.6) <sup>a,A</sup>	37.8 (8.6) <sup>a,B</sup>	38.2 (1.9) <sup>a,B</sup>
<i>Q. prinus</i> L.	19.5 (2.8) <sup>c,A</sup>	5.9 (0.8) <sup>c,B</sup>	7.9 (1.1) <sup>c,B</sup>
<i>Q. rubra</i> L.	8.6 (1.3) <sup>c,A</sup>	4.9 (0.8) <sup>c,A</sup>	4.6 (0.5) <sup>c,A</sup>
Planted pine watershed			
<i>P. strobus</i> L.	31.8 (2.2) <sup>b,B</sup>	38.4 (2.7) <sup>a,A</sup>	27.5 (1.9) <sup>b,C</sup>

\* Within columns, species not sharing the same lowercase letters denote significant differences among species for that year. Within rows, years not sharing the same uppercase letters denote significant differences among years for that species.

*tulipifera* and *P. strobus* compared with the other species, indicating that at low  $D$ , stomatal conductance was relatively high. The species with ring porous and semi-ring porous xylem anatomy consistently had the lowest modelled reference stomatal conductance among all species. Although the two species with the highest  $G_S$  at 1 kPa appeared to have the greatest sensitivity or decline in  $G_S$  with  $D$ , and the species with the lowest  $G_S$  at 1 kPa appeared to change  $G_S$  only slightly in response to  $D$ , this trend was not statistically significant due to large variance estimates in  $-\beta_2$  among trees.

Among individual hardwood trees within a species,  $G_S$  at a reference  $D$  (i.e.  $\beta_3$  or  $G_{Sref}$ ,  $D = 1$  kPa) was negatively related to tree height ( $R^2 = 0.86$ ,  $F_{5, 26} = 120.50$ ,  $P < 0.001$ ; Figure 5). The rate of decline in  $G_{Sref}$  with height was consistent across species (test of slopes,  $F_{3, 23} = 0.47$ ,  $P = 0.70$ ); however, the intercepts of the lines varied significantly by species (test of intercepts,  $F_{4, 26} = 39.39$ ,  $P < 0.001$ ). At any tree height, *L. tulipifera* had the greatest  $G_{Sref}$ , followed by *Carya* spp., and then the two *Quercus* spp., which did not differ significantly ( $F_{1, 26} = 2.42$ ,  $P = 0.13$ ).






Figure 3. Daily transpiration per unit leaf area ( $E_L$ ) versus vapour pressure deficit ( $D$ ) for species measured. Points represent the mean of all individual trees in a species. Species abbreviations are LITU: *L. tulipifera*, CASP: *Carya* spp., PIST: *P. strobus*, QUPR: *Q. prinus* and QURU: *Q. rubra*. Curves represent a nonlinear mixed model fit to the population of individuals for each species. Parameters for curves are in Table III.

Comparison of growing season  $E_t$  and  $E_i$  between watersheds

When scaled to the plot, daily transpiration rates ( $E_t$ ) were highly correlated in the two watersheds ( $0.62 < R^2 < 0.81$ ) but varied significantly among years (Figures 2 and 6, Table VI). During the growing season,  $E_t$  in WS17 was consistently higher for the 3 years (420, 364 and 327 mm) compared with WS18 (200, 134 and 154 mm).  $E_t$  in WS17 was 52, 63 and 53% greater than WS18 in 2004, 2005 and 2006. From 2004 to 2005,  $E_t$




Figure 4. Relationship between stomatal conductance ( $G_S$ ) and vapour pressure deficit ( $D$ ) when  $D > 0.6$  kPa. Individual points represent the daily mean of all trees within a species. Legend as in Figure 3.

in both watersheds declined; however, WS17  $E_t$  declined by 13% while WS18  $E_t$  declined by 33%. The pronounced decline in WS18  $E_t$  from 2004 to 2005 was mainly attributable to one species—*Q. prinus*—during days of year 147–166 and 185–204. Differences in  $D$  and PAR, and the corresponding relationships between  $E_L$  and  $D$  for the different species during 2004 and 2005 were responsible for differences in  $E_t$  among watersheds for these years. In contrast, low precipitation and resulting low soil moisture restricted  $E_t$  in 2006. During the two wetter years, the  $E_t$  response to  $D$  was greater for the planted pine watershed compared with the hardwood



Table V. Parameter estimates for species' mean stomatal conductance ( $G_S$ ,  $\text{mmol m}^{-2} \text{s}^{-1}$ ) response to daytime mean vapour pressure deficit ( $D$ , kPa) when  $D > 0.6$  kPa.

Species	$-\beta_2^*$			$\beta_3^*$		
	2004	2005	2006	2004	2005	2006
Hardwood reference watershed						
<i>Carya</i> spp.	7.6 (5.0) <sup>b,A</sup> ‡	10.6 (11.5) <sup>a,A</sup>	22.0 (6.1) <sup>ab,A</sup>	15.2 (3.3) <sup>c,A</sup>	28.9 (7.4) <sup>bc,A</sup>	28.3 (3.9) <sup>c,A</sup>
<i>L. tulipifera</i> L.	31.3 (8.3) <sup>a,A</sup>	12.4 (22.3) <sup>a,A</sup>	28.2 (10.7) <sup>ab,A</sup>	68.0 (5.3) <sup>a,A</sup>	54.0 (13.5) <sup>ab,A</sup>	65.5 (6.6) <sup>a,A</sup>
<i>Q. prinus</i> L.	13.5 (6.7) <sup>b,A</sup>	19.5 (15.6) <sup>a,A</sup>	14.2 (8.1) <sup>b,A</sup>	28.5 (4.3) <sup>b,A</sup>	16.6 (9.8) <sup>c,A</sup>	19.9 (5.2) <sup>cd,A</sup>
<i>Q. rubra</i> L.	10.7 (8.2) <sup>b,A</sup>	1.7 (19.7) <sup>a,A</sup>	5.3 (10.2) <sup>b,A</sup>	20.7 (5.4) <sup>bc,A</sup>	6.9 (12.3) <sup>c,A</sup>	8.9 (6.6) <sup>d,A</sup>
Planted pine watershed						
<i>P. strobus</i> L.	21.3 (7.2) <sup>ab,A</sup>	26.6 (12.9) <sup>a,A</sup>	27.9 (6.6) <sup>a,A</sup>	54.7 (4.5) <sup>a,A</sup>	57.9 (8.1) <sup>a,AB</sup>	44.1 (4.3) <sup>b,B</sup>

Standard error of parameter estimate given in parentheses. \* The rate of decrease in  $G_S$  per unit  $D$  is described by  $-\beta_2$ , and stomatal conductance at  $D = 1$  kPa (i.e.  $G_{Sref}$ ) is described by  $\beta_3$ . ‡ Within columns, species not sharing the same lowercase letters denote significant differences among species for that year. Within rows, years not sharing the same uppercase letters denote significant differences among years for that species.

Table VI. Estimates of growing season interception, transpiration and ET.

	Interception ( $E_i$ , mm)		Transpiration ( $E_t$ , mm)*		$E_i + E_t$ (ET, mm)		$\Delta ET$ (mm)	$\Delta E_i / \Delta ET$ (%)	$\Delta E_t / \Delta ET$ (%)
	Planted pine	Hardwood reference	Planted pine	Hardwood reference	Planted pine	Hardwood reference			
2004	282	146	420 (23)	200 (9)	702	346	357	38	62
2005	324	166	364 (76)	134 (67)	687	300	387	41	59
2006	164	88	327 (90)	154 (59)	491	242	249	30	70
Average								36	64

\* Transpiration value is the mean (standard deviation) among plots within the watershed.




Figure 5. Relationship of  $G_S$  at  $D = 1$  kPa ( $G_{Sref}$ ) and tree height for the hardwood species. Symbols correspond to the mean  $G_{Sref}$  for a tree across the three study years. Lines correspond to a linear model with species as covariate: model  $R^2 = 0.86$ ,  $F_{5, 26} = 120.50$ ,  $P < 0.001$ . Parameter estimates (standard errors) for lines: slope =  $-0.786$  (0.26); intercepts:  $\bullet = 52.00$  (7.96);  $\blacksquare = 90.77$  (10.18);  $\blacktriangledown = 40.72$  (7.63);  $\blacklozenge = 34.63$  (8.63). Legend as in Figure 3.

watershed (Figure 6), while in the drier year, the relationship between  $E_t$  and  $D$  was similar between watersheds.

Growing season interception ( $E_i$ ) differed for the two watersheds within and among years (Table VI). Interception by WS17 (282, 324, 164 mm or 26, 25, 31% of growing season precipitation) exceeded interception

by WS18 (146, 166, 88 mm or 14, 13, 17% of growing season precipitation) by about twofold; however, the proportion of growing season ET (i.e.  $ET = E_t + E_i$ ) contributed by  $E_i$  and  $E_t$  was remarkably similar between watersheds. Averaged over the 3 years of measurement,  $E_i$  was 40% of total ET for WS17 versus 45% of total ET for WS18; and  $E_t$  was 60% of total ET for WS17 and 55% of total ET for WS18.

## DISCUSSION

### Inter- and intra-annual differences among species in transpiration

Our data show considerable variation among species in their responsiveness to variation in climate. This supports our expectation that  $E_L$  would vary by species, and that the relationship between  $E_L$  and  $G_S$  with vapour pressure deficit ( $D$ ) would also vary by species. The two species that responded most to climatic variation were *L. tulipifera* and *P. strobus*. Both of these species are among the fastest growing species in the southern Appalachians (Burns and Honkala, 1990; Mohan *et al.*, 2007), and also showed the greatest stomatal sensitivity to  $D$ , and the greatest response to soil moisture. *L. tulipifera* often reduces its leaf area by premature leaf senescence in response to severe drought, thereby increasing the sapwood area to leaf area ratio to increase specific leaf conductance, which allows maintenance of stomatal conductance and photosynthesis. Our estimates of canopy




Figure 6. Daily plot transpiration ( $E_t$ ) during the growing season versus mean daily vapour pressure deficit ( $D$ ) for the three study years. Points represent the mean of all stands measured within a watershed. Days with precipitation events are also shown.

transpiration used constant growing season leaf area values, and thus we would have likely underestimated  $E_L$  and  $G_S$  if *L. tulipifera* exhibited premature leaf senescence; however, we did not see  $E_L$  of *L. tulipifera* decline in the driest year. Instead, *L. tulipifera*  $E_L$  increased from the wettest to the driest year. *P. strobus* showed the largest reduction in mean  $G_S$  (28%) from the wettest to the driest year, and also decreased  $E_L$ . In contrast, *Carya* spp. were the least responsive to inter-annual variation in climate. This species had similar  $G_S$  and  $E_L$  responses to  $D$ , and mean  $G_S$  and  $E_L$  among all years. *Carya* spp. are known to develop deep tap roots (the other species studied here are not) which may provide access to a more stable water source that buffers the effects of drought (Ford *et al.*, 2008).

The *Quercus* spp. were highly conservative in their water use; the majority of the oak trees in this study were found in the upper plot and not the lower plot. Consequently, soils were drier and hence had less available soil water. This reflects the typical distribution for oaks in the

southern Appalachians; they tend to occupy drier locations, such as the ridges and upper side slopes (Bolstad *et al.*, 1998). During exceptional droughts in the southern Appalachians in the mid-1980s, oak species experienced wide-spread mortality (Clinton *et al.*, 1993), with older trees being the most vulnerable to the interaction between drought and root pathogens. Interestingly, the *Quercus* spp. had the greatest amount of leaf area to support per unit sapwood; yet, they had the lowest transpiration per unit leaf area.

The oak and hickory spp. together were consistently the least responsive to  $D$ , a response noted previously in temperate hardwood forests by Oren and Pataki (2001). Similarly, Bush *et al.* (2008) found that  $E_L$  for well-watered oak species was relatively unresponsive to changes in  $D$ . They further found that this relationship held constant across three species with ring-porous xylem anatomy, while across three species with diffuse-porous anatomy, the relationship between  $E_L$  and  $D$  was linear. Our results conform to this pattern. Our data suggest that changes in  $D$  from year to year would have a lesser effect on  $E_t$  in hardwood forests dominated by oak and hickory species compared with forests dominated by diffuse-porous species, such as *L. tulipifera*. By extension, we hypothesize that the intra-annual variability in stream flow in forested catchments dominated by oaks would be lower during the growing season than that of a forest catchment dominated by diffuse-porous species, such as *L. tulipifera*.

Our results suggest that either managing to favour a particular species or suite of species in a watershed, or non-random species removal (e.g. as a result of pests and pathogens that remove single species) may affect forest  $E_t$  and the  $E_t$  response to climatic variation. While others have found similar patterns to what we observed, the consistency of response varies across ecosystems. For example, among native tropical forest species little variation in the relationships between  $E_c$  and climate is evident (Meinzer *et al.*, 2001; O'Brien *et al.*, 2004; Dierick and Holscher, 2009). In contrast, native temperate forest species exhibit considerable variation in the relationships between  $E_c$  and climate (Oren and Pataki, 2001; Wullschlegel *et al.*, 2001; Moore *et al.*, 2004; Ewers *et al.*, 2005). Interestingly, some of the greatest differences observed in  $E_c$  among species within either tropical or temperate forests has been between native and exotic species (Dierick and Holscher, 2009; Kagawa *et al.*, 2009).

#### Structural controls on ET

Differences in growing season ET between the planted pine watershed and the hardwood watershed were the result of structural differences, both in tree height and in interception. Morphological and physiological changes in water use that are directly or indirectly related to tree height can have important effects on water use (Ryan *et al.*, 2000; Woodruff *et al.*, 2007, 2010). Our results also show significant differences in stomatal conductance

with tree height: within any species, shorter trees had a higher conductance at 1 kPa compared with taller trees. Not accounting for the effects of species and tree height on  $E_t$  may have important implications for process-based streamflow models. For example, many process-based stream flow models estimate transpiration from the vegetation layer using a ‘big leaf’ approach, whereby all the leaf area in a catchment behaves the same way [e.g. BIOME-BGC and RHESSYS (Running and Hunt, 1993), PROSPER (Swift *et al.*, 1975)]. Unless the ‘big leaf’ approach adequately accounts for differences in physiology among individual species, as well as age-related changes with tree height within a species, our results suggest that species and size effects may have a large impact on modelled transpiration, and subsequently stream flow and stream flow dynamics. In some cases, it is likely that model calibration is accounting for some of these effects; however, our results suggest that calibrated models will not be particularly useful for examining responses to potential species changes or interactions with climate variability.

Early work on these stands indicated the interception was the primary driver of the differences in ET between the planted pine and hardwood stands, as modelled growing season estimated of  $E_t$  were similar (Swift *et al.*, 1975). Interestingly, this was not the case in our study, at least when comparing mid-slope locations. In fact our data suggest that across both wet and dry years, transpiration accounts for a larger proportion of the differences in ET than does interception. Interception accounted for more of the discrepancy in wet years compared with the dry year, while transpiration accounted for more of the discrepancy in dry years, similar to Oishi *et al.* (2010).

Although the pattern of response we observed agrees with annual precipitation minus runoff ( $P - R_o$ ) estimates which indicate higher ET in the pine stands (Swank and Miner, 1968), the magnitude of the difference in ET is much greater than predicted by annual  $P - R_o$  estimates. A few limitations of our approach may explain the difference. For example, understory transpiration in the hardwood watershed, while a minor component, was not estimated. Most notably, however, is that we do not capture hydrologic processes that occur outside of the growing season [e.g. winter time transpiration by *P. strobus* (Ford *et al.*, 2007)] or hillslope flow path dynamics that contribute to annual streamflow. In addition, by limiting our comparison to mid- and upper-slope positions, we do not fully capture the variation in species composition in WS18 that is driven by topographic position. For example, lower sites in the watershed (cove sites) are dominated by *L. tulipifera* (Elliott *et al.*, 1999), which had the greatest  $E_L$  of any of the hardwood species. Stand-based growing season ET estimates on WS18 would likely increase substantially if sites lower in the watershed, which have a high proportion of *L. tulipifera* were included in the scaling, further emphasizing the importance of species-level information.

## CONCLUSIONS

We found substantial differences in  $E_L$  and  $G_S$  among major canopy species in the southern Appalachians. On per unit leaf area basis, species ranked *L. tulipifera* > *P. strobus* > *Carya* spp. > *Q. prinus* > *Q. rubra* for both  $E_L$  and  $G_S$ . Quantifying this variation in water use among species is useful for evaluating (either empirically or with process-based models) the hydrologic impacts of changes in species composition due to management, succession or invasive insects or diseases. Species also varied in their responses to inter-annual variation in climate. For example,  $E_L$  and  $G_S$  of oaks and hickories were least responsive to changing vapour pressure deficit, while *L. tulipifera* and *P. strobus* were most responsive. This species level understanding of variation in  $E_L$  and  $G_S$  and their interactions with climatic driving variables has important implications for predicting watershed-level responses to climate variability. For example, our data suggest that streamflow from forests dominated by oaks and hickories will be less impacted by drought (when comparing post-drought streamflow with pre-drought streamflow) than streamflow from forests dominated by *P. strobus* and *L. tulipifera*. At the plot scale, *P. strobus* growing season ET ( $E_t + E_i$ ) was twofold greater than growing season hardwood ET. Contrary to our expectations, growing season  $E_t$  in the pine stand was about twofold greater than growing season  $E_t$  in the hardwood stand, suggesting that physiological differences between pine and hardwood species contributed as much to the overall difference in ET as did differences in structural factors (i.e. surface interception by leaf area, branch area, stem area) that influence  $E_i$ .

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This study was supported by the USDA Forest Service, Southern Research Station and by NSF grant DEB0218001 to the Coweeta LTER program at the University of Georgia. Any opinions, findings, conclusions or recommendations expressed in the material are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the views of the National Science Foundation or the University of Georgia. We are grateful to S.D. Wullschlegler and Dave Bell for providing helpful comments on a previous version of this manuscript. We acknowledge the support of many individuals, past and present, as well as the long-term climate and hydrologic data network at Coweeta Hydrologic Laboratory. We acknowledge D. Fowler, B. Kloeppel, S. Laseter, C. Marshall, and R. McCollum for field work and climate data collection and processing.

## REFERENCES

- Bolstad PV, Swank W, Vose J. 1998. Predicting Southern Appalachian overstory vegetation with digital terrain data. *Landscape Ecology* **13**: 271–283.
- Brown AE, Zhang L, McMahon TA, Western AW, Vertessy RA. 2005. A review of paired catchment studies for determining changes in water

- yield resulting from alterations in vegetation. *Journal of Hydrology* **310**: 28–61.
- Burns RM, Honkala BH (eds). 1990. *Silvics of North America: 1. Conifers; 2. Hardwoods*. Agriculture Handbook 654. U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service: Washington, DC; 877.
- Bush SE, Pataki DE, Hultine KR, West AG, Sperry JS, Ehleringer J. 2008. Wood anatomy constrains stomatal responses to atmospheric vapor pressure deficit in irrigated, urban trees. *Oecologia* **156**: 13–20.
- Clearwater MJ, Meinzer FC, Andrade JL, Goldstein G, Holbrook NM. 1999. Potential errors in measurement of nonuniform sap flow using heat dissipation probes. *Tree Physiology* **19**: 681–687.
- Clinton BD, Boring LR, Swank WT. 1993. Canopy gap characteristics and drought influences in oak forests of the Coweeta Basin. *Ecology* **74**: 1551–1558.
- Day FP, Monk CD. 1974. Vegetation patterns on a southern Appalachian watershed. *Ecology* **55**: 1064–1074.
- Dierick D, Holscher D. 2009. Species-specific tree water use characteristics in reforestation stands in the Philippines. *Agricultural and Forest Meteorology* **149**: 1317–1326; DOI: 10.1016/j.agrformet.2009.03.003.
- Dunn GM, Connor DJ. 1993. An analysis of sap flow in mountain ash (*Eucalyptus regnans*) forests of different age. *Tree Physiology* **13**: 321–336.
- Elliott KJ, Swank WT. 2008. Long-term changes in forest composition and diversity following early logging (1919–1923) and the decline of American chestnut (*Castanea dentata*). *Plant Ecology* **197**: 155–172.
- Elliott KJ, Vose JM, Swank WT, Bolstad PV. 1999. Long-term patterns in vegetation-site relationships in a southern Appalachian forest. *Journal of the Torrey Botanical Society* **126**: 320–334.
- Ellison AM, Bank MS, Clinton BD, Colburn EA, Elliott K, Ford CR, Foster DR, Kloeppel BD, Knoepp JD, Lovett GM, Mohan J, Orwig DA, Rodenhouse NL, Sobczak WV, Stinson KA, Stone JK, Swan CM, Thompson J, Holle BV, Webster JR. 2005. Loss of foundation species: consequences for the structure and dynamics of forested ecosystems. *Frontiers in Ecology and the Environment* **9**: 479–486; DOI: 10.1890/1540-9295(2005)003[0479:LOFSCF]2.0.CO;2.
- Ewel KC, Gholz HL. 1991. A simulation model of the role of belowground dynamics in a Florida pine plantation. *Forest Science* **37**: 397–438.
- Ewers BE, Gower ST, Bond-Lamberty B, Wang CK. 2005. Effects of stand age and tree species on canopy transpiration and average stomatal conductance of boreal forests. *Plant, Cell & Environment* **28**: 660–678.
- Ewers BE, Mackay S, Samanta S. 2007. Interannual consistency in canopy stomatal conductance control of leaf water potential across seven tree species. *Tree Physiology* **27**: 11–24.
- Ewers BE, Oren R. 2000. Analyses of assumptions and errors in the calculation of stomatal conductance from sap flux measurements. *Tree Physiology* **20**: 579–589.
- Farley K, Jobbagy E, Jackson RB. 2005. Effects of afforestation on water yield: a global synthesis with implications for policy. *Global Change Biology* **11**: 1565–1576.
- Ford CR, Goranson CE, Mitchell RJ, Will RE, Teskey RO. 2005. Modeling canopy transpiration using time series analysis: a case study illustrating the effect of soil moisture deficit on *Pinus taeda*. *Agricultural and Forest Meteorology* **130**: 163–175.
- Ford CR, Hubbard RM, Kloeppel BD, Vose JM. 2007. A comparison of sap flux-based evapotranspiration estimates with catchment-scale water balance. *Agricultural and Forest Meteorology* **145**: 176–185; DOI: 10.1016/j.agrformet.2007.04.010.
- Ford CR, Mitchell RJ, Teskey RO. 2008. Water table depth affects productivity, water use, and the response to nitrogen addition in a savanna system. *Canadian Journal of Forest Research* **38**: 2118–2127.
- Ford CR, Vose JM. 2007. *Tsuga canadensis* (L.) Carr. mortality will impact hydrologic processes in southern Appalachian forest ecosystems. *Ecological Applications* **17**: 1156–1167; DOI: 10.1890/06-0027.
- Granier A. 1985. Une nouvelle méthode pour la mesure du flux de sève brute dans le tronc des arbres. *Annales des Sciences Forestières* **42**: 193–200.
- Granier A, Biron P, Lemoine D. 2000. Water balance, transpiration and canopy conductance in two beech stands. *Agricultural and Forest Meteorology* **100**: 291–308.
- Grip H, Halldin S, Jansson P, Lindroth A, Noren B, Perttu K. 1979. Discrepancy between energy and water balance estimates of evapotranspiration. In *Comparison of Forest and Water Energy Exchange Models*, Halldin S (ed). Elsevier: Amsterdam; 237–255.
- Helvey JD. 1967. Interception by eastern white pine. *Water Resources Research* **3**: 723–729.
- Helvey JD, Patric JH. 1965. Canopy and litter interception of rainfall by hardwoods of eastern United States. *Water Resources Research* **1**: 193–206.
- Hoover MD. 1944. Effect of removal of forest vegetation upon water yields. *Transactions of the American Geophysical Union* (Part 6): 969–977.
- Hubbard RM, Bond BJ, Ryan MG. 1999. Evidence that hydraulic conductance limits photosynthesis in old *Pinus ponderosa* trees. *Tree Physiology* **19**: 165–172.
- Hubbard RM, Ryan MG, Stiller V, Sperry JS. 2001. Stomatal conductance and photosynthesis vary linearly with plant hydraulic conductance in ponderosa pine. *Plant, Cell & Environment* **24**: 113–121.
- Kagawa A, Sack L, Duarte K, James S. 2009. Hawaiian native forest conserves water relative to timber plantation: species and stand traits influence water use. *Ecological Applications* **19**: 1429–1443.
- Knight D, Fahey TJ, Running S. 1985. Water and nutrient outflow from contrasting lodgepole pine forests. *Ecological Monographs* **55**: 29–48.
- Knoepp JD, Swank WT. 1994. Long-term soil chemistry changes in aggrading forest ecosystems. *Soil Science Society of America Journal* **58**: 325–331.
- Komatsu H, Kume T, Otsuki K. 2008. The effect of converting a native broad-leaved forest to a coniferous plantation forest on annual water yield: a paired-catchment study in northern Japan. *Forest Ecology and Management* **255**: 880–886.
- Kovner JL. 1955. *Changes in streamflow and vegetation characteristics of a Southern Appalachian Mountain watershed brought about by forest cutting and subsequent natural regrowth*. PhD thesis, State University New York, Syracuse, NY; 245.
- Lowe PR. 1977. An approximating polynomial for the computation of saturation vapor pressure. *Journal of Applied Meteorology* **16**: 100–103.
- Lu P, Urban L, Zhao P. 2004. Granier's thermal dissipation probe (TDP) methods for measuring sap flow in trees: theory and practice. *Acta Botanica Sinica* **46**: 631–646.
- Martin JG, Kloeppel BD, Schaefer TL, Kimbler DL, McNulty SG. 1998. Aboveground biomass and nitrogen allocation of ten deciduous southern Appalachian tree species. *Canadian Journal of Forest Research* **28**: 1648–1659.
- Meinzer FC, Goldstein G, Andrade JL. 2001. Regulation of water flux through tropical forest canopy trees: do universal rules apply? *Tree Physiology* **21**: 19–26.
- Mohan J, Clark JS, Schlesinger WH. 2007. Long-term CO<sub>2</sub> enrichment of a forest ecosystem: implications for forest regeneration and succession. *Ecological Applications* **17**: 1198–1212.
- Moore GW, Bond BJ, Jones JA, Phillips N, Meinzer FC. 2004. Structural and compositional controls on transpiration in 40- and 450-year-old riparian forests in western Oregon, USA. *Tree Physiology* **24**: 481–491.
- National Research Council of the National Academies. 2008. *Hydrologic effects of a changing forest landscape*. The National Academies Press: Washington, DC; 168.
- Novick K, Oren R, Stoy P, Juang J-Y, Siqueira M, Katul G. 2009. The relationship between reference canopy conductance and simplified hydraulic architecture. *Advances in Water Resources* **32**: 809–819; DOI: 10.1016/j.advwatres.2009.02.004.
- O'Brien JJ, Oberbauer SF, Clark DB. 2004. Whole tree xylem sap flow responses to multiple environmental variables in a wet tropical forest. *Plant, Cell & Environment* **27**: 551–567.
- Oishi AC, Oren R, Novick KA, Palmroth S and Katul GG. 2010. Interannual invariability of forest evapotranspiration and its consequence to water flow downstream. *Ecosystems* **13**: 421–436. DOI: 10.1007/s10021-010-9328-3.
- Oren R, Pataki DE. 2001. Transpiration in response to variation in microclimate and soil moisture in southeastern deciduous forests. *Oecologia* **127**: 549–559.
- Oren R, Sperry JS, Katul GG, Pataki DE, Ewers BE, Phillips N, Schafer KVR. 1999. Survey and synthesis of intra- and interspecific variation in stomatal sensitivity to vapour pressure deficit. *Plant, Cell & Environment* **22**: 1515–1526.
- Pearcy RW, Schulze E-D, Zimmermann R. 1989. Measurement of transpiration and leaf conductance. In *Plant Physiological Ecology*, Pearcy RW, Ehleringer J, Mooney HA, Rundel PW (eds). Chapman & Hall: London, UK; 137–160.
- Peek MS, Russek-Cohen E, Wait DA, Forseth IN. 2002. Physiological response curve analysis using nonlinear mixed models. *Oecologia* **132**: 175–180.
- Phillips N, Oren R. 1998. A comparison of daily representations of canopy conductance based on two conditional time-averaging methods. *Annals of Forest Science* **55**: 217–235.
- Running SW, Hunt ER Jr. 1993. Generalization of a forest ecosystem process model for other biomes, BIOME-BGC and application for

- global-scale models. In *Scaling Physiological Processes: Leaf to Globe*, Ehleringer JR, Field CB (eds). Academic Press, Inc.: San Diego, CA; 141–158.
- Ryan MG, Bond BJ, Law BE, Hubbard RM, Woodruff D, Cienciala E, Kucera J. 2000. Transpiration and whole-tree conductance in ponderosa pine trees of different heights. *Oecologia* **124**: 553–560.
- Ryan MG, Phillips N, Bond BJ. 2006. The hydraulic limitation hypothesis revisited. *Plant, Cell & Environment* **29**: 367–381.
- Schafer KVR, Oren R, Tenhunen JD. 2000. The effect of tree height on crown level stomatal conductance. *Plant, Cell & Environment* **23**: 365–375.
- Sperry JS, Hacke UG, Oren R, Comstock JP. 2002. Water deficits and hydraulic limits to leaf water supply. *Plant, Cell & Environment* **25**: 251–263.
- Sprugel DG. 1983. Correcting for bias in log-transformed allometric equations. *Ecology* **64**: 209–210.
- Stoy P, Katul G, Siqueira M, Juang J, Novick K, McCarthy HR, Oishi AC, Umbelherr J, Kim H, Oren R. 2006. Separating the effects of climate and vegetation on evapotranspiration along a successional chronosequence in the southeastern US. *Global Change Biology* **12**: 2115–2135.
- Swank WT, Douglass JE. 1974. Streamflow greatly reduced by converting deciduous hardwood stands to pine. *Science* **185**: 857–859.
- Swank WT, Miner NH. 1968. Conversion of hardwood-covered watersheds to white pine reduces water yield. *Water Resources Research* **4**: 947–954.
- Swift LW, Cunningham GB, Douglass JE. 1988. Climate and hydrology. In *Ecological Studies, Vol. 66: Forest Hydrology and Ecology at Coweeta*, Swank WT, Crossley DA (eds). Springer-Verlag: New York; 35–55.
- Swift LW, Swank WT, Mankin JB, Luxmoore RJ, Goldstein RA. 1975. Simulation of evapotranspiration and drainage from mature and clear-cut deciduous forests and young pine plantation. *Water Resources Research* **11**: 667–673.
- Vose JM, Swank WT. 1992. Water balances. In *Atmospheric Deposition and Forest Nutrient Cycling*, Johnson D, Lindberg SE (eds). Ecological Studies 91; 27–49.
- Waring RH, Schlesinger WH. 1985. *Forest Ecosystems: Concepts and Management*. Academic Press: London; 340.
- Whitehead D, Kelliher FM. 1991. A canopy water balance model for a *Pinus radiata* stand before and after thinning. *Agricultural and Forest Meteorology* **55**: 109–126.
- Wilson KB, Hanson PJ, Mulholland PJ, Baldocchi DD, Wullschlegel SD. 2001. A comparison of methods for determining forest evapotranspiration and its components: sap-flow, soil water budget, eddy covariance and catchment water balance. *Agricultural and Forest Meteorology* **106**: 153–168.
- Woodruff DR, McCulloh KA, Warren JM, Meinzer FC, Lachenbruch B. 2007. Impacts of tree height on leaf hydraulic architecture and stomatal control in Douglas-fir. *Plant Cell and Environment* **30**: 559–569; DOI: 10.1111/j.1365-3040.2007.01652.x.
- Woodruff DR, Meinzer FC, McCulloh KA. 2010. Height-related trends in stomatal sensitivity to leaf-to-air vapour pressure deficit in a tall conifer. *Journal of Experimental Botany* **61**: 203–210; DOI: 10.1093/jxb/erp291.
- Woods FW, Shanks RE. 1957. Replacement of chestnut in the Great Smoky Mountains of Tennessee and North Carolina. *Journal of Forestry* **55**: 847.
- Wullschlegel SD, Hanson PJ, Todd DE. 2001. Transpiration from a multi-species deciduous forest as estimated by xylem sap flow techniques. *Forest Ecology and Management* **143**: 205–213.