The effect of warm-season precipitation on the diel cycle of the surface energy balance and carbon dioxide at a Colorado subalpine forest site

S. P. Burns\textsuperscript{1,2}, P. D. Blanken\textsuperscript{1}, A. A. Turnipseed\textsuperscript{3}, and R. K. Monson\textsuperscript{4}

\textsuperscript{1}Department of Geography, University of Colorado, Boulder, Colorado, USA
\textsuperscript{2}National Center for Atmospheric Research, Boulder, Colorado, USA
\textsuperscript{3}2B Technologies, Inc., Boulder, Colorado, USA
\textsuperscript{4}School of Natural Resources and the Environment, University of Arizona, Tucson, Arizona, USA

Received: 15 May 2015 – Accepted: 21 May 2015 – Published: 16 June 2015
Correspondence to: S. P. Burns (sean@ucar.edu)

Published by Copernicus Publications on behalf of the European Geosciences Union.
Abstract

Precipitation changes the physical and biological characteristics of an ecosystem. Using a precipitation-based conditional sampling technique and a 14-year dataset from a 25 m micrometeorological tower in a high-elevation subalpine forest, we examined how warm-season precipitation affected the above-canopy diel cycle of wind and turbulence, net radiation $R_{\text{net}}$, ecosystem eddy covariance fluxes (sensible heat $H$, latent heat $LE$, and $CO_2$ net ecosystem exchange $NEE$) and vertical profiles of scalars (air temperature $T_a$, specific humidity $q$, and $CO_2$ dry mole fraction $\chi_c$). This analysis allowed us to examine how precipitation modified these variables from hourly (i.e., the diel cycle) to multi-day time-scales (i.e., typical of a weather-system frontal passage).

During mid-day we found: (i) even though precipitation caused mean changes on the order of 50–70% to $R_{\text{net}}$, $H$, and $LE$, the surface energy balance (SEB) was relatively insensitive to precipitation with mid-day closure values ranging between 70–80%, and (ii) compared to a typical dry day, a day following a rainy day was characterized by increased ecosystem uptake of $CO_2$ ($NEE$ increased by $\approx 10\%$), enhanced evaporative cooling (mid-day $LE$ increased by $\approx 30 \text{ W m}^{-2}$), and a smaller amount of sensible heat transfer (mid-day $H$ decreased by $\approx 70 \text{ W m}^{-2}$). Based on the mean diel cycle, the evaporative contribution to total evapotranspiration was, on average, around 6% in dry conditions and 20% in wet conditions. Furthermore, increased LE lasted at least 18 h following a rain event. At night, precipitation (and accompanying clouds) reduced $R_{\text{net}}$ and increased LE. Any effect of precipitation on the nocturnal SEB closure and NEE was overshadowed by atmospheric phenomena such as horizontal advection and decoupling that create measurement difficulties. Above-canopy mean $\chi_c$ during wet conditions was found to be about 2–3 $\mu$mol mol$^{-1}$ larger than $\chi_c$ on dry days. This difference was fairly constant over the full diel cycle suggesting that it was due to synoptic weather patterns (different air masses and/or effects of barometric pressure). In the evening hours during wet conditions, weakly stable conditions resulted in smaller
vertical $\chi_c$ differences compared to those in dry conditions. Finally, the effect of clouds on the timing and magnitude of daytime ecosystem fluxes is described.

1 Introduction

Forest ecosystem disturbances can be natural (e.g., wildfire, insect outbreaks) or anthropogenic (clear-cutting of forests, etc.) in origin. Warm-season precipitation is a common perturbation that changes the physical and biological properties of a forest ecosystem. The most obvious effect is the wetting of vegetation and ground surfaces which provides liquid water for evaporation and changes the surface energy partitioning between sensible heat flux $H$ and latent heat flux LE (i.e., evapotranspiration). Such changes are important in the modeling of ecosystem process on both local and global scales (e.g., Bonan, 2008). Liquid water infiltration also changes the thermal diffusivity of the soil (Garratt, 1992; Cuenca et al., 1996; Moene and Van Dam, 2014) as well as the rain itself transporting heat into the soil (Kollet et al., 2009). Rain can also suppress the release of CO$_2$ from soil because of inhibited CO$_2$ diffusion/transport due to water-filled soil pore space (Hirano et al., 2003; Ryan and Law, 2005). The soil and the atmosphere near the ground are closely coupled, and therefore soil moisture changes also affect near-ground atmospheric properties (Betts and Ball, 1995; Pattantyús-Ábrahám and Jánosi, 2004).

Rain has been shown to cause short-lived increases in soil respiration by microorganisms (by as much as a factor of ten) in diverse ecosystems ranging from: deciduous eastern US forests (Lee et al., 2004; Savage et al., 2009), ponderosa pine plantations (Irvine and Law, 2002; Tang et al., 2005; Misson et al., 2006), California oak-savanna grasslands (Xu et al., 2004), Colorado shortgrass steppe (Munson et al., 2010; Parton et al., 2012), arid/semi-arid regions across the western US (Huxman et al., 2004; Austin et al., 2004; Ivans et al., 2006; Jenerette et al., 2008; Bowling et al., 2011), Mediterranean oak woodlands (Jarvis et al., 2007), and abandoned agricultural fields (Inglima et al., 2009). The pulse of CO$_2$ emitted from soil that accompanies precipitation follow-
ing a long drought period is one aspect of the so-called Birch effect (named after H. F. Birch (1912–1982), see Jarvis et al. (2007); Borken and Matzner (2009); Unger et al. (2010) for a summary). The timing, size, and duration of the precipitation event (as well as the number of previous wet–dry cycles) all affect the magnitude of the microbial and plant/tree responses to the water entering the system. The response of soil respiration to a rain pulse typically has an exponential decay with time (Xu et al., 2004; Jenerette et al., 2008). The Birch effect is especially important for the carbon balance in arid or water-limited ecosystems where background soil respiration rates are generally low.

Net ecosystem exchange of CO$_2$ (NEE) is calculated from the above-canopy eddy covariance CO$_2$ vertical flux plus the temporal changes in the CO$_2$ dry mole fraction between the flux measurement-level and the ground (i.e., the CO$_2$ storage term). The studies listed in the previous paragraph have used a combination of eddy-covariance, soil chambers, and continuous in-situ CO$_2$ mixing ratio measurements to examine ecosystem responses to precipitation. Many of these studies have also shown that CO$_2$ pulses due to the Birch effect have an important influence on the seasonal and annual budget of NEE for that particular ecosystem (e.g., Lee et al., 2004; Jarvis et al., 2007; Parton et al., 2012). In the current study we will not be concerned with mechanistic or biological aspects of the Birch effect, but instead focus on how precipitation affects above-canopy NEE and any possible implications on the annual carbon budget.

Evaporation from wet surfaces was initially modeled by Penman (1948) using available energy (primarily net radiation), the difference between saturation vapor pressure and atmospheric vapor pressure at a given temperature (i.e., $e_s - e_d$, also known as the vapor pressure deficit, VPD), and aerodynamic resistances to formulate an expression for surface LE. The concepts by Penman were extended to include transpiration by Monteith (1965) who introduced the concept of canopy resistance (a resistance to transpiration which is in series with the aerodynamic resistance, but controlled by the leaf stomates) leading to the Penman–Monteith equation for latent heat flux over dry vegetation. Based on these formulations, the fundamental variables which are believed to control evapotranspiration are net radiation, sensible heat flux, atmospheric stabil-
ity (which affects the aerodynamic resistances), stomatal resistance, and VPD. It has been questioned whether stomates respond to the rate of transpiration rather than VPD (e.g., Monteith, 1995). It has also been shown that stability/wind speed only has a small direct effect on transpiration (e.g., Kim et al., 2014). Since our study is focused on both evaporation and transpiration changes, we focus on the diel changes in the measured variables listed above.

Near vegetated surfaces, it is known that the atmospheric fluxes of CO₂ and water vapor are correlated to each other because the leaf stomates control both photosynthesis and transpiration (Monteith, 1965; Brutsaert, 1982; Jarvis and McNaughton, 1986; Katul et al., 2012; Wang and Dickinson, 2012). There are also temporal changes (and feedbacks) to LE related to boundary layer growth and entrainment which are summarized by van Heerwaarden et al. (2009, 2010). One of the drawbacks to the eddy covariance measurement of LE is that the contributions from the physical process of evaporation are not easily separated from the biological process of transpiration without making some assumptions of stomatal behavior (e.g., Scanlon and Kustas, 2010), using isotopic methods (e.g., Yakir and Sternberg, 2000; Williams et al., 2004; Werner et al., 2012; Jasechko et al., 2013; Berkelhammer et al., 2013), or having additional measurements, such as sap flow (e.g., Hogg et al., 1997; Oishi et al., 2008; Staudt et al., 2011) or weighing lysimeters (e.g., Grimmond et al., 1992; Rana and Katerji, 2000; Blanken et al., 2001). Another technique uses above-canopy eddy-covariance instruments for evapotranspiration coupled with sub-canopy instruments to estimate evaporation (e.g., Blanken et al., 1997; Law et al., 2000; Wilson et al., 2001; Staudt et al., 2011); this method, however, can have issues with varying flux footprint sizes (Misson et al., 2007). An accurate way to separate transpiration and evaporation has been a goal of the ecosystem-measurement community for many years.

Numerous studies have looked at the annual and interannual relationship between precipitation, water fluxes and NEE at the climate scale (Aubinet et al., 2000; Wilson et al., 2001; Law et al., 2002; Malhi et al., 2002; Thomas et al., 2009; Hu et al., 2010a; Polley et al., 2010, and many others). However, a comprehensive examination of the
effect of precipitation on ecosystem-scale eddy covariance fluxes at the diel (i.e., hourly or “weather-front”) time scale is lacking.

Our study uses fourteen years of data from a high-elevation subalpine forest Ameri-Flux site to explore how warm-season rain events (defined as a daily precipitation total greater than 3 mm) change the mean meteorological variables (horizontal wind speed $U$, air temperature $T_a$ and specific humidity $q$), the surface energy fluxes (latent and sensible heat), and carbon dioxide (both CO$_2$ mole fraction and NEE) over the diel cycle. From this analysis we can evaluate both the magnitude and timing of how the energy balance terms and NEE are modified by the presence of rainwater in the soil and on the vegetation. Precipitation is also closely linked to changes in air temperature and humidity as weather fronts and storm systems pass by the site. Since NEE and the energy fluxes depend on meteorological variables such as net radiation, air temperature and VPD, it can be difficult to separate out the effect of precipitation vs. other environmental changes (Turnipseed et al., 2009; Riveros-Iregui et al., 2011). To estimate the atmospheric stability, we use the bulk Richardson number ($Ri_b$) calculated with sensors near the ground and above the canopy.

Though the primary goal of our study is to quantify how precipitation modifies the warm-season mean diel cycle of the measured scalars and fluxes, a secondary goal is to present the 14 year mean and interannual variability of the energy fluxes and NEE measured at the Niwot Ridge Subalpine Forest AmeriFlux site. These results will serve as an update to the original set of papers (e.g., Monson et al., 2002; Turnipseed et al., 2002) that examined the ecosystem fluxes from the Niwot Ridge AmeriFlux site over ten years ago and were based on two years of measurements.
2 Data and methods

2.1 Site description

Our study uses data from the Niwot Ridge Subalpine Forest AmeriFlux site (site US-NR1, more information available at http://ameriflux.lbl.gov) located in the Rocky Mountains about 8 km east of the Continental Divide. The US-NR1 measurements started in November 1998. The site is on the side of an ancient moraine with granitic-rocky-podzolic soil (typically classified as a loamy sand in dry locations) overlain by a shallow layer (≈ 10 cm) of organic material (Marr, 1961; Scott-Denton et al., 2003). The subalpine forest near the tower was established in the early 1900s following logging operations, and is primarily composed of subalpine fir (Abies lasiocarpa var. bifolia) and Englemann spruce (Picea engelmannii) to the west with lodgepole pine (Pinus contorta) to the east. Smaller patches of aspen (Populus tremuloides) and limber pine (Pinus flexilis) are also present. The tree density near the US-NR1 Tower is around 4000 trees ha\(^{-1}\) with a leaf area index (LAI) of 3.8–4.2 m\(^2\) m\(^{-2}\) and tree heights of 12–13 m (Turnipseed et al., 2002; Monson et al., 2010). Recent analysis of tree ring cores near the US-NR1 tower has revealed a significant presence of remnant trees which are older (over 200 years old) and larger than the trees that became established after logging in the early 1900s (R. Alexander, F. Babst, and D. J. P. Moore, University of Arizona, unpublished data).

At the US-NR1 subalpine forest, ecosystem processes are closely linked to the presence of snow (Knowles et al., 2014), which typically arrives in October or November, reaches a maximum depth in early April (snow water equivalent (SWE) ≈ 30 cm), and melts by early June. Sometime in March or April, the snowpack becomes isothermal (Burns et al., 2013) and liquid water becomes available in the soil, which initiates the photosynthetic uptake of CO\(_2\) by the forest (Monson et al., 2005). The long-term mean annual precipitation at the site is around 800 mm with about 40% of the total from warm-season rain, which typically occurs every 2–4 days and has an average daily total of around 4 mm (Hu et al., 2010a). According to the Köppen–Geiger climate clas-
sification system (Kottek et al., 2006) the site is type Dfc which corresponds to a cold, snowy/moist continental climate with precipitation spread fairly evenly throughout the year. The forest could also be classified as climate type H which is sometimes used for mountain locations (Greenland, 2005). The summer precipitation timing is primarily controlled by the mountain-plain atmospheric dynamics and thus usually occurs in the afternoon when upslope flows trigger convective thunderstorms (Brazel and Brazel, 1983; Parrish et al., 1990; Whiteman, 2000; Turnipseed et al., 2004; Burns et al., 2011; Zardi and Whiteman, 2013).

2.2 Surface energy balance, measurements, and data details

The terms in the surface energy balance (SEB) are,

\[ R_{\text{net}} - G_z - S_{\text{soil}} - S_{\text{canopy}} = H + LE + E_{\text{adv}}, \]  

where \( R_{\text{net}} \) is net radiation, \( G_z \) is soil heat flux measured at depth \( z \), and the two storage terms account for the heat stored in the soil (\( S_{\text{soil}} \)) and in the biomass and airspace between the ground and the turbulent flux measurement level (\( S_{\text{canopy}} \)). All terms in Eq. (1) have units of \( \text{W m}^{-2} \). Positive \( R_{\text{net}} \) indicates radiative warming of the surface, whereas a positive sign for the other terms in Eq. (1) indicate surface cooling. \( S_{\text{canopy}} \) and \( S_{\text{soil}} \) are typically less than 10% of \( R_{\text{net}} \) (Oncley et al., 2007). The horizontal advection of heat and water vapor (\( E_{\text{adv}} \)) requires spatially distributed measurements, and is thought to be a primary reason that Eq. (1) does not balance at most flux sites (Leuning et al., 2012). The heat flux at the soil surface (\( G \)) was determined from \( G_z \) with 4–5 soil heat flux plates (REBS, model HFT-1) dispersed near the tower at a depth of 8–10 cm. Turnipseed et al. (2002) showed that the storage terms and \( G_z \) at US-NR1 were small (less than 8% of \( R_{\text{net}} \)). Therefore, we neglect \( S_{\text{canopy}} \) and \( S_{\text{soil}} \) and assume the surface heat flux is close to our measured soil heat flux (i.e., \( G \approx G_z \)). In our discussions, the simple SEB closure fraction refers to the ratio of the sum of the turbulent fluxes to the available energy, i.e., \((H + LE)/(R_{\text{net}} - G)\).
$R_{\text{net}}$ was measured at 25 m above ground level (a.g.l.) with both a net (REBS, model Q-7.1) and four-component (Kipp and Zonen, model CNR1) radiometer. $R_{\text{net}}$ from the Q-7.1 sensor is about 15% closer to closing the SEB than with the CNR1 sensor (Turnipseed et al., 2002; Burns et al., 2012). Since the Q-7.1 radiometer operated during the entire 14 year period, it is the primary $R_{\text{net}}$ sensor in our study. The turbulent fluxes $H$ and LE were measured at 21.5 m a.g.l. using standard eddy covariance flux data-processing techniques (e.g., Aubinet et al., 2012) and instrumentation (a 3-D sonic anemometer (Campbell Scientific, model CSAT3), krypton hygrometer (Campbell Scientific, model KH2O), and closed-path infrared gas analyzer (IRGA; LI-COR, model LI-6262)). Further details on the specific instrumentation and data-processing techniques are provided elsewhere (Monson et al., 2002; Turnipseed et al., 2002, 2003; Burns et al., 2013). Additional measurements used in our study are described in Appendix A1 while further details about updates to the US-NR1 flux calculations are in Appendix A2.

Turnipseed et al. (2002) studied the energy balance at the US-NR1 site and found that during the daytime the sum of the turbulent fluxes accounts for around 85% of the radiative energy input into the forest. At night, under moderate turbulent conditions, simple SEB closure was comparable to the daytime; however, when the night-time conditions were either calm or extremely turbulent, $H$ and LE only accounted for 20–60% of the net longwave radiative flux. Burns et al. (2012) has recently shown that the lack of SEB closure for wind speeds larger than around 8 m s$^{-1}$ was, at least partly, due to an issue with the CSAT3 sonic anemometer firmware. In the summer at US-NR1, wind speeds are rarely larger than 8 m s$^{-1}$ so the empirical correction for $H$ was not used in our study. When the winds are light (below about 3–4 m s$^{-1}$), horizontal advection is believed to be the primary reason for the lack of SEB closure.

### 2.3 Analysis methods

Precipitation is notoriously difficult to study because of its intermittent, binary nature (e.g., it will often start, stop, re-start, and falls with varying intensity) which leads to
non-normal statistical properties (e.g., Zawadzki, 1973). To study the impact of rain, we followed a methodology similar to that of Turnipseed et al. (2009) and tagged days when the daily rainfall exceeded 3 mm as “wet” days. Table 1 shows the number of wet days for each year and warm-season month within our study. The choice to use 3 mm as the wet-day criteria was a balance between effectively capturing the effect of precipitation and providing enough wet periods to improve the wet-day statistics. Diel patterns for “dry days following a dry day” (designated as Dry1 days), “wet days following a dry day” (designated Wet1 days), “wet days following a wet day” (designated Wet2 days), and “dry days following a wet day” (designated Dry2 days) were analyzed to determine the effect of a precipitation on the weather and climate as well as the fluxes. If the term “wet days” is used it includes both Wet1 and Wet2 days whereas the term “dry days” includes both Dry1 and Dry2 days. In addition to these categories, we further separated the Dry1 days into sunny (Dry1-Clear) and cloudy (Dry1-Cloudy) days. These techniques are similar to the clustering analysis used by Berkelhammer et al. (2013).

Since not every variable was continuously measured for all 14 years, some variables were necessarily analyzed over shorter periods than others. A summary of the variables studied, the number of days each variable falls into each precipitation category, and gap-filling statistics of selected variables is provided in Table 2. Unless noted otherwise, the data analysis used in our study are based on 30 min statistics.

In addition to analyzing the mean diel cycle, we also examined the day-to-day variability in the diel cycle by calculating the standard deviation of the 30 min data within each composited time-of-day bin. This statistic will be designated the SD-Bin or variability in our discussion and plots. To further quantify and summarize the main results of our analysis, the diel cycle was broken up into three distinct periods: mid-day (10:00–14:00 MST), late evening (19:00–23:00 MST), and nighttime (00:00–04:00 MST). Motivation for breaking up the night into two distinct periods is provided by Burns et al. (2011) who showed that the variability of the turbulence activity (expressed by the SD-Bin of the standard deviation of the vertical wind) increased by about a factor of two at
around 23:00 MST (see their Fig. 4d). Other flux sites with sloped terrain have shown distinct differences in the CO₂ storage before and after midnight (e.g., Aubinet et al., 2005) which provides additional motivation for separating the night into two periods.

Additional information related to the diel cycle was provided by estimating the top of the atmosphere incoming solar radiation ($Q_{\text{SW,TOA}}$). The sun position was calculated for the US-NR1 tower latitude and longitude with the SEA-MAT Air-Sea toolbox (Woods Hole Oceanographic Institution, 2013) which uses algorithms based on the 1978 edition of the Almanac for Computers (Nautical Almanac Office, U.S. Naval Observatory).

In order to select the warm-season period, the smoothed seasonal cycle of NEE and the turbulent energy fluxes were calculated using a 20 day mean sliding window applied to the 30 min data. Smoothing removes the effect of large-scale weather patterns (and precipitation) which typically have a period of 4–7 days. Interannual variability was calculated by taking the standard deviation among the 14 yearly smoothed time series. Since our interest is in the diel cycle, these statistics were determined for mid-day (10:00–14:00 MST), nighttime (00:00–04:00 MST), and the full (24 h) time series.

The ecosystem respiration $R_{\text{eco}}$ was estimated for each 30 min time period based on measured nocturnal NEE (both with and without the $u_*$ filter applied), as well as two flux-partitioning algorithms that separate NEE into $R_{\text{eco}}$ and gross primary productivity GPP (Stoy et al., 2006). One algorithm takes into account the seasonal temperature-dependence of $R_{\text{eco}}$ (Reichstein et al., 2005), and the other uses light-response curves (Lasslop et al., 2010). Reichstein and Lasslop $R_{\text{eco}}$ were calculated with on-line flux-partitioning software (Max Planck Institute for Biogeochemistry, 2013). Further discussion of partitioning NEE at the US-NR1 site is provided elsewhere (Zobitz et al., 2008; Bowling et al., 2014).

Near the ground, the bulk Richardson number $Ri_b$ is often used to characterize stability. Large negative $Ri_b$ indicates unstable “free convection” conditions and large positive $Ri_b$ indicates strong stability (e.g., Kaimal and Finnigan, 1994). In more stable conditions, less mixing is expected and larger vertical scalar gradients should exist (e.g., Schaeffer et al., 2008a; Burns et al., 2011). We calculated $Ri_b$ between the highest
(\(z_2 = 21.5\) m, around twice canopy height) and lowest (\(z_1 = 2\) m) measurement level using:

\[
\text{Ri}_b = \frac{g}{\overline{T}_a} \frac{(\theta_2 - \theta_1)(z_2 - z_1)}{U^2},
\]

where \(g\) is acceleration due to gravity, \(\overline{T}_a\) is the average air temperature of the layer, \(\theta\) is potential temperature, and \(U\) is the above-canopy horizontal vectorial mean wind speed (i.e., \(U = (u^2 + v^2)^{1/2}\) where \(u\) and \(v\) are the streamwise and crosswise planar-fit horizontal wind components). We did not use \(U\) near the ground because this level is deep within the canopy where \(U\) is small (less than \(0.5\) m s\(^{-1}\)) due to the momentum absorbed by the needles, branches and boles of the trees. In this respect, the shear-generated turbulence is related to above-canopy wind speed whereas the buoyancy is related to the temperature difference between near the ground and the overlying air. Because \(\text{Ri}_b\) is a ratio of two variables, it can become less useful when either the numerator or denominator becomes very small.

3 Results and discussion

3.1 Typical seasonal cycle and variability

We chose to define the start of the warm-season as the date when diurnal changes in the soil temperature first occurred (i.e., the date of near-complete snowpack ablation). For the 14 years of our study, the warm-season start dates ranged from mid-May to mid-June with an average start date of around 1 June (as shown in Fig. 1a and listed in Table 1). Though snow can occur during this period, it is a rare event and usually melts quickly. The start of the growing-season (based on NEE, as described in Hu et al., 2010a) typically preceded the start of the warm-season by 2–4 weeks (Fig. 1a). The warm-season start date was also around the time that the volumetric
soil moisture content (VWC) reached a maximum (Fig. 1b), and the month following the disappearance of the snowpack was usually when the soil dried out (though there were exceptions, such as 2004). In the warm-season, large precipitation events led to a sharp increase in VWC followed by a gradual return (over several days or weeks) to drier soil conditions. We chose 30 September as the end of the warm-season for reasons described below.

The typical smoothed seasonal cycles of above-canopy NEE, LE and $H$ are shown in Fig. 2a. For NEE, the dormant period (i.e., when the forest was inactive) was exemplified by almost no difference between the daytime and nighttime NEE, which lasted from roughly early November to mid-April. When daytime NEE switches from positive to negative, it indicates the start of the growing season. The snowmelt period exhibited strong CO$_2$ uptake because soil respiration was suppressed due to low soil temperature (Fig. 2a). In February–March, daytime $H$ reached a maximum because net radiation increased and transpiration was small. Nighttime $H$ stayed at around $-50$ Wm$^{-2}$ throughout the entire year. One might expect nocturnal $H$ in winter to be different than summer, but in winter most of the above-canopy $H$ was due to heat transfer between the forest canopy and atmosphere, not the atmosphere and snow-covered ground (Burns et al., 2013). Related to LE, there are two interesting observations in Fig. 2a. First, outside the growing season, daytime LE was larger than nighttime LE. This is presumably because air temperature is higher during the daytime which increases the saturation vapor pressure and results in a larger sublimation/evaporation rate (e.g., Dalton, 1802). Second, nighttime LE in winter was around $25$ Wm$^{-2}$ which decreased to $10$ Wm$^{-2}$ in summer. Despite warmer summer temperatures, we suspect the larger nocturnal LE in winter was due to the ubiquitous presence of a snowpack that serves as a source of sublimation/evaporation for 24 h every day (compared to summer when the ground periodically dries out). Also, winds are much stronger in winter which would promote higher evaporation. In the spring and summer LE increased during the day from around 50 to 150 Wm$^{-2}$ due to increased forest transpiration. In July–August, as the soil dried out and warmed up, soil microbial activity increased (e.g., Scott-Denton et al., 2006),
and NEE moved closer to having photosynthetic uptake of CO$_2$ balanced by respiration.

When winds are light and mechanical turbulence is small, decoupling between the air near the ground and above-canopy air can occur (e.g., Baldocchi et al., 2000; Baldocchi, 2003). The nocturnal NEE data shown in Fig. 2a have been calculated using the friction velocity ($u_*$) filtering technique (Goulden et al., 1996) which replaces NEE during periods of weak ground-atmosphere coupling ($u_* < 0.2$ m s$^{-1}$) with an empirical relationship between NEE and soil temperature. This leads to the question of whether the application of the filtering by $u_*$ created the apparent increase in nocturnal NEE (or respiration) during the summer months. In Supplement Fig. S1, we include both the non-$u_*$ filtered NEE along with ecosystem respiration calculated from the algorithm of Reichstein et al. (2005) and Lasslop et al. (2010). Though the $u_*$ filter enhanced the value of ecosystem respiration by around 0.5 µmol m$^{-2}$ s$^{-1}$ compared to unfiltered NEE, the mid-summer increase was present in both. Ecosystem respiration calculated from the algorithm of Lasslop et al. (2010) was slightly larger than that from Reichstein et al. (2005) which was closer to the measured nocturnal values. Recent research in the ecosystem-flux community has suggested that the standard deviation of the vertical wind $\sigma_w$ (e.g., Acevedo et al., 2009; Oliveira et al., 2013; Alekseychik et al., 2013; Thomas et al., 2013) or the Monin–Obukhov stability parameter (e.g., Novick et al., 2004) are better measures of decoupling than $u_*$; however, the results we show are not going to be strongly affected by which variable is used to determine the coupling state.

The daytime interannual variability of NEE, LE and $H$ was larger than the nighttime interannual variability (Fig. 2b) due to the wide range of daytime surface solar conditions (e.g., clear or cloudy days). The peak in the interannual variability of daytime NEE during April and May was due to year-to-year differences in the timing of snowmelt and initiation of photosynthetic forest uptake of CO$_2$ at the site (Monson et al., 2005; Hu et al., 2010a). Though NEE interannual variability peaked at this time, there was no corresponding peak in LE or $H$ variability.
The average start of the warm season occurred when daytime NEE uptake was strong (greater than 8 µmol m\(^{-2}\) s\(^{-1}\)) and immediately followed the peak in NEE inter-annual variability (Fig. 2b). There was not a similar increase in NEE variability to mark the end of the warm season; however, the date when daytime NEE decreased sharply was the end of September. For this reason, we chose the end of September as the end of the warm-season. By choosing the end of September we also avoid periods in October when snowfall occurs. On average, the period we chose for the warm season started on 1 June and ended on 30 September as indicated by the vertical lines in Fig. 2.

Based on eight years of precipitation data from a nearby U.S. Climate Reference Network (USCRN) site, April had the most precipitation (with a mean of around 120 mm, most all of it falling as snow) followed by July with 90 mm of precipitation (Fig. S2a). April and July were also the months with the largest variability between years and the variations between years were about 50% of the mean value (Fig. S2b). These trends generally agree with the long-term precipitation measurements from the LTER C-1 (1953–2012) station where the effect of undercatch by the LTER gauge is noticeable during the winter months. Further discussion on the precipitation measurements used in our study are in Appendix A1.

### 3.2 The effect of wet conditions on the diel cycle

After each day was organized into the precipitation categories described in Sect. 2.3, we observed a peak in precipitation during the early afternoon on wet days as would be expected for a mountain-plain type weather system (Fig. 3b1). Over the 14 years of our study, the average length of time for a dry period was around 2.5 days with a standard deviation of 3 days. Two days in a row with above-average rain (i.e., Wet2 days) was recorded around 90 times out of 1740 total warm-season days between 1999 and 2012 (Table 2). These rare events were typically the result of large-scale synoptic weather systems which explains why significant morning precipitation occurred on Wet2 days (i.e., Fig. 3b1).
One obvious complication with the precipitation-related analysis is that the open-path instrumentation (e.g., sonic anemometers) are affected by water droplets, and do not work properly during heavy precipitation events which is why the percent of gap-filling periods for the fluxes increases on the wet days (Table 2). Though we do not have a way around this issue, we can only point out that the scalar measurements were not affected by precipitation and can provide some degree of insight. When we restricted the analysis to time periods without any gap-filled flux data, the results are similar to what we are showing here.

Over the next several sections we will examine how the diel cycle of the measurements (winds, soil properties, radiation, scalars, and fluxes) were affected by these different precipitation states. Because Dry1 conditions were the most common, we will typically describe the changes or differences relative to the Dry1 state.

### 3.2.1 Wind, turbulence, and near-ground stability

As mentioned in Sect. 2.1, the above-canopy wind direction at the site is primarily controlled by the large-scale mountain-plain dynamics resulting in directions that were typically either upslope (from the east) or downslope (from the west). At night, the above-canopy winds were almost exclusively downslope with very little effect from precipitation except for a small occurrence of upslope flow during Wet2 conditions (i.e., Fig. 3a1). There was a more consistent flow direction in the early morning hours as demonstrated by the higher peak in the frequency distribution of Fig. 3a1 compared to Fig. 3a3. This suggests that the drainage flow became more persistent and consistent as the night progresses. During mid-day, wet conditions had a more frequent occurrence of upslope winds than downslope winds, whereas during dry days there was nearly an equal number of upslope and downslope winds (Fig. 3a2). This is to be expected because the upslope winds can trigger convection which (potentially) leads to precipitation.

The diel cycle of horizontal wind speed during dry conditions was characterized by a dip of about 1 m s\(^{-1}\) during the morning and evening transitions, with the evening
transition having the lowest wind speed values (Fig. 3c1). On Dry1 and Dry2 days the wind speed overnight (on average) increased from a minimum of around 2.5 m s⁻¹ at 19:00 MST to a maximum of 4 m s⁻¹ at 04:00 MST. During wet conditions the dip in wind speed during the transition periods did not exist and the mean wind speed on Wet2 days was typically smaller than other conditions throughout the diel cycle. Mechanical turbulence (characterized by the friction velocity $u_*$) generally follows the pattern of wind speed at night, however, during the daytime, the buoyancy generated by surface heating enhanced $u_*$ relative to nocturnal values (Fig. 3d1). In Dry1 conditions the maximum variability in $U$ and $u_*$ was in the early morning (at around 06:00 MST) with less variability in the late afternoon and evening.

Near-ground vertical air temperature differences are considered because these help control the near-ground stability (Fig. 4d–f). In Wet2 conditions, the vertical air temperature difference was at a minimum during all times of the day. This is expected during the daytime because solar radiation, which warms the canopy and ground to create the air-surface temperature differences, was reduced on Wet2 days (radiation will be discussed in Sect. 3.2.3). In Dry2 conditions during daytime, the mid-canopy was about 1 °C warmer than the air near the ground (Fig. 4e). This stable layer in the lower canopy did not exist in any other conditions and we presume this state was due to a combination of strong net radiation (which warmed the canopy) combined with evaporation near the ground (which cooled the ground surface). The soil during a Dry2 day would have recently experienced rain, providing a source of liquid water for evaporation within the soil. We also note that temperature differences during Dry1 days were the largest of all precipitation states for the three periods shown in Fig. 4d–f.

To combine the effects of wind speed and temperature differences on atmospheric stability, the bulk Richardson number $Ri_b$ is also considered (Fig. 3e1). Following the evening transition, dry conditions tended to result in a more stable atmosphere ($Ri_b > 0.2$) than that of wet conditions ($Ri_b < 0.1$). This suggests that there should be larger vertical scalar differences (i.e., less vertical mixing) during the late evening period of dry days.
3.2.2 Atmospheric scalars ($T_a$, $q$, CO$_2$), soil temperature, soil moisture, and soil heat flux

We now consider how air temperature and other scalars change over the diel cycle. Dry1 conditions were associated with slightly higher barometric pressure (Fig. 5a1), relatively warmer air temperatures (Fig. 5b1), a drier atmosphere (Fig. 5c1), warmer and drier soils (Fig. 5d1 and e1), and larger soil heat fluxes (Fig. 5f1). Barometric pressure had a mid-morning and evening peak that existed for all precipitation states which are created by thermal tides within the atmosphere (e.g., Lindzen and Chapman, 1969). The variables for Dry1 days generally had smaller variability compared to any of the other conditions (Fig. 5a2–f2) with the one exception being a high variability in VPD during the Dry1 afternoon and evening period (Fig. 5c2). In contrast to Dry1 days, mean conditions during Wet2 days were associated with (relatively) lower barometric pressure and cooler, wetter conditions in the atmosphere and soil.

For Wet2 days, the soil moisture content (VWC) increased by over 50% and $T_{soil}$ dropped by around 2°C relative to Dry1 conditions (Table 3 and Fig. 5d1 and e1). The timing of precipitation within the diel cycle is important. For example, on the morning of Wet1 days, $T_{soil}$ was about 1°C larger than in other conditions because on Wet1 days the rain occurred primarily in the afternoon, not the morning (i.e., Fig. 3b1). In fact, 21.5 m air temperature on the morning of Wet1 days was slightly above that of Dry1 days (Fig. 5b1). The main effect of precipitation on the soil heat flux was between the hours of 11:00 and 18:00 MST, where $G$ in Dry1 conditions had a peak of 20 W m$^{-2}$ while in Wet2 conditions the peak was less than 10 W m$^{-2}$ (Fig. 5f1). At night, $G$ was similar for all precipitation states suggesting that either the soil was protected from the effect of changes in nocturnal net radiation by the overlying canopy or else the changes in $R_{net}$ were small enough that the soil temperature was not dramatically affected. This result also implies that increased liquid water in the soil pore space did not significantly affect the soil thermal conductivity. Though the soil heat flux peaked at around mid-day the soil temperature peaked two hours later at around 14:00 MST.
If plots for each precipitation condition are arranged in the order of Dry1, Wet1, Wet2, and Dry2 days the characteristics of a composite summertime cold-front passing the tower can be approximated (Fig. 6). Classical cold-front systems over flat terrain are associated with pre-frontal wind shifts and pressure troughs (e.g., Schultz, 2005). Mountains, however, have a large impact on the movement of air masses and can considerably alter the classical description of frontal passages (e.g., Egger and Hoinka, 1992; Whiteman, 2000). Our classification of the composite plots as a “frontal passage” is simply because there was colder air present at the site during the Wet1 and Wet2 periods. For example, during Dry1 days the 21.5 m air temperature was around 5°C greater than $T_{\text{soil}}$ (Fig. 6b1). As the composite “front” passed by the tower (i.e., Wet1 and Wet2 days) 21.5 m $T_a$ dropped to near $T_{\text{soil}}$ (Fig. 6b2 and b3) and specific humidity increased by $\approx 50\%$ (Fig. 6c2 and c3). After the frontal passage (i.e., Dry2 days), the 21.5 m air temperature returned to being higher than the soil temperature (Fig. 6b4). During Wet2 days, CO$_2$ dry mole fraction $\chi_c$ within the canopy was elevated relative to the other conditions (Fig. 6d3). Specific numerical values and a summary of the atmospheric conditions for each precipitation state are provided in Table 3.

Taking a closer look at CO$_2$, we found that above-canopy $\chi_c$ was largest during Wet2 conditions and lowest in Dry1 conditions with a fairly consistent difference of around 2–3 µmol mol$^{-1}$ across the entire diel cycle (Fig. 7a). We initially considered this to be an artifact of dilution due to boundary layer height differences (e.g., Culf et al., 1997), however we ruled this out because the difference was fairly consistent throughout the day and night when boundary layer heights change dramatically. We confirmed that similar differences between precipitation states existed using CO$_2$ from a nearby Rocky Raccoon site above tree-line on Niwot Ridge (Stephens et al., 2011) (results not shown). Since our analysis uses a composite which approximates a cold-front passage, there is an influence of large-scale weather systems on the overall atmospheric CO$_2$ magnitude (e.g., Miles et al., 2012; Lee et al., 2012). This suggests that the dependence of above-canopy $\chi_c$ on the precipitation state was due to either the composition of large-scale air masses or subsidence/convergence caused by high/low barometric pressure.
Within the canopy, this same precipitation-dependent pattern existed in the morning and during the daytime, however, in the evening, $\chi_c$ in dry conditions was about 5–8 µmol mol$^{-1}$ larger than $\chi_c$ in wet conditions (Fig. 7b–c). These differences clearly show up in a vertical $\chi_c$ profile (Fig. 8c). To avoid the confounding factor of synoptic weather systems, the lower panels in Fig. 8 show the vertical $\chi_c$ differences ($\Delta \chi_c$) relative to the top tower level (21.5 m a.g.l.). The mid-day $\Delta \chi_c$ profile (Fig. 8e) shows a photosynthetic deficit of around 1 µmol mol$^{-1}$ in the mid-canopy due to vegetative uptake of CO$_2$ which is consistent with previous studies at the site (Bowling et al., 2009; Burns et al., 2011). In the nighttime hours (00:00–04:00 MST) the different precipitation states did not affect the $\Delta \chi_c$ profile (Fig. 8d) which contrasts with the late evening $\Delta \chi_c$ profile that shows a difference of around 5–9 µmol mol$^{-1}$ between wet and dry conditions within the lower canopy (Fig. 8f).

Synoptic barometric pressure changes have recently been suggested as a mechanism for enhancing the exchange of deep-soil CO$_2$ with the atmosphere, whereas the upper soil CO$_2$ is more influenced by processes such as soil respiration and pressure-pumping (e.g., Sánchez-Cañete et al., 2013). In light of the differences in near-ground stability during the evening (discussed in Sect. 3.2.1), it seems likely that atmospheric stability was playing a more important role than barometric pressure in controlling the observed nocturnal $\Delta \chi_c$ differences. A close examination of Fig. 8f reveals that the late evening wet conditions had near-ground to above-canopy $\Delta \chi_c$ differences that were around 35 µmol mol$^{-1}$. In contrast, for all conditions in Fig. 8d and dry conditions in Fig. 8f the $\Delta \chi_c$ differences were greater than 40 µmol mol$^{-1}$ (also see Table 3). The larger $\Delta \chi_c$ differences in dry conditions are consistent with the near-ground atmospheric stability being larger during dry conditions. We also note that between 00:00–04:00 MST Ri$\text{b}$ was generally near or above 0.2 for both wet and dry conditions while in the evening period the wet days had Ri$\text{b}$ ≈ 0.1. As shown in previous work at the US-NR1 site (e.g., Schaeffer et al., 2008a; Burns et al., 2011), $\Delta \chi_c$ differences have a transition region between weakly stable and strongly stable conditions that occurs at Ri$\text{b}$ ≈ 0.25 which is nominally related to the change from a fully turbulent to non-
turbulent flow. It appears that the stability in the early evening on wet days is such that the atmosphere was slightly unstable which enhanced the vertical mixing and reduced the vertical $\Delta \chi_c$ differences. Furthermore, the controls on the stability between Wet1 and Wet2 days were slightly different. On Wet1 evenings, wind speed was slightly elevated (Fig. 3d1) which resulted in less stable conditions. In contrast, on Wet2 evenings it was the reduced vertical temperature differences (Fig. 4f) that was the primary controlling factor in reducing the stability.

3.2.3 Net radiation, turbulent energy fluxes, and net ecosystem exchange of CO$_2$ (NEE)

The full diel cycle of net radiation, the turbulent energy fluxes, and NEE are shown in Fig. 9 for mean values (a1–d1) and variability or SD-Bin (a2–d2). In order to better quantify the impact of precipitation on the fluxes, we have arranged the fluxes by Dry1, Wet1, Wet2, and Dry2 conditions similar to what was shown previously with the scalar measurements (i.e., Fig. 6). This summary, however, only includes mean mid-day (Fig. 10, left-column) and late evening and nighttime values (Fig. 10, right-column). Choosing these specific periods avoids the evening and morning transition periods which are complicated by the fluxes and scalar gradients becoming small and/or changing sign (e.g., Lothon et al., 2014). To make interpretation of the quantitative changes more accessible, each panel in Fig. 10 shows the fractional change from the maximum (or minimum) value within that panel. In addition to the figures, the mean values for each precipitation state are listed in Table 3.

When precipitation occurred, cloudiness increased and net radiation at mid-day was reduced (Fig. 9a1). Dry1 days had a mean mid-day value of nearly 600 Wm$^{-2}$ which decreased by around 50% to 300 Wm$^{-2}$ during Wet2 days, then recovered on Dry2 days to nearly 550 Wm$^{-2}$ (i.e., about 10% smaller than $R_{net}$ during Dry1 conditions) (Fig. 10a1). The variability of $R_{net}$ was similar for all precipitation conditions, though Dry1 conditions typically had the smallest variability during the morning hours (Fig. 9a2).
At night, though the absolute value of the mean net radiation was an order of magnitude smaller than the daytime values, the fractional changes and pattern of nocturnal $R_{\text{net}}$ due to different precipitation states (Fig. 10a2) were similar to those of mid-day $R_{\text{net}}$ (Fig. 10a1). If we assume that wet nights were cloudier than dry nights, the radiative surface cooling on clear nights was around $-70 \text{ Wm}^{-2}$ while cloudy nights was closer to $-30 \text{ Wm}^{-2}$. The reduction of the magnitude of $R_{\text{net}}$ on wet nights was primarily due to changes in cloud cover as well as changes to the turbulent fluxes.

Sensible heat flux during mid-day had a similar pattern to net radiation, with a large decrease in $H$ (by $\approx 70\%$) between Dry1 and Wet2 conditions, followed by an increase toward Dry1 $H$ on Dry2 days (Fig. 10d1). In contrast, latent heat flux followed a slightly different pattern – the largest mean mid-day LE occurred on a Dry2 day with a value of around $200 \text{ Wm}^{-2}$, which was around 15% larger than mid-day LE on Dry1 days (Fig. 10c1). The extra energy used by LE (coupled with slightly lower $R_{\text{net}}$ values on Dry2 days) explains why mid-day $H$ only recovered to within $80 \text{ Wm}^{-2}$ (or 30%) of Dry1 $H$ (Fig. 9d1) as dictated by the SEB equation (1).

The increased LE values on Dry2 days was presumably due to evaporation of the intercepted liquid water present on vegetation and in the soil. Because of the effect of temperature on saturation vapor pressure (and thus VPD) one cannot assume that nocturnal LE is representative of daytime evaporation (e.g., Brutsaert, 1982). To further explore this issue, we have plotted LE vs. VPD in Fig. 11 where we observe that nocturnal LE in dry conditions was $\approx 10 \text{ Wm}^{-2}$ with a weak dependence on VPD. This is consistent with our assumption that there was a small, consistent baseline level of evaporation in dry conditions. Therefore, in Dry1 conditions we can estimate that evaporation was $\approx 10 \text{ Wm}^{-2}$ and evapotranspiration was $\approx 170 \text{ Wm}^{-2}$ (based on mid-day LE, Fig. 10c1). This suggests that, on average, evaporation comprised about 6% of evapotranspiration in dry conditions. Since net radiation in Dry1 and Dry2 conditions was similar, we can get a rough estimate of daytime evaporation from the LE difference during Dry1 and Dry2 conditions (shown as a black line in Fig. 11a2). As the atmosphere becomes drier the LE difference increased from near $15 \text{ Wm}^{-2}$ to around
50 Wm$^{-2}$ where it flattens out in drier conditions (for VPD > 1.2). Previous research at the US-NR1 site has shown large differences in transpiration between the dominant tree species (Hu et al., 2010b), but the general relationship between ecosystem-scale transpiration and VPD is similar to what is shown in Fig. 11a2 (Turnipseed et al., 2009). Therefore, following a rain event, daytime evaporation was somewhere between 15–50 Wm$^{-2}$ (black line in Fig. 11a2) while mid-day evapotranspiration increased from 100–225 Wm$^{-2}$ (Dry2 line in Fig. 11a2). If we take the overall average of this ratio, it suggests that evaporation comprised about 20% of evapotranspiration in wet conditions.

We also observed that increased LE lasted throughout a Dry2 day until around 18:00 MST when LE came within around 10% of LE in Dry1 conditions (Figs. 9c1 and 11a3). This suggests that the evaporative effect lasted at least 18 h following a significant precipitation event. Central to our calculations is the assumption that LE at night was primarily evaporation. Some evidence exists that the needle stomates opening at night combined with cuticular water loss could lead to small amounts of nocturnal transpiration (e.g., Novick et al., 2009). If this occurred at US-NR1, it is likely a small effect which is further discussed by Turnipseed et al. (2009). We should also emphasize that our results are mean estimates and the variability around these mean values are large (i.e., as shown in Fig. 11b1–b4). Some of this variability is due to the random nature of turbulence in the atmosphere, whereas some can be explained by differences in net radiation, atmospheric stability, air temperature, and stomatal control.

The modeling study of Moore et al. (2008) based on sap flow measurements at the US-NR1 site found that transpiration in the warm-season accounted for about 30% of total evapotranspiration, whereas our findings suggest that transpiration accounted for between 80% (wet conditions) to 94% (dry conditions) of evapotranspiration. The large discrepancy between these estimates and the model results might be due to the simplicity of the model used by Moore et al. (D. J. P. Moore, personal communication, 2015). Compared to eddy-covariance techniques, sap flow sensors have typically underestimated transpiration and there are scaling issues to contend with as well as other
measurement challenges (e.g., Hogg et al., 1997; Wilson et al., 2001; Staudt et al., 2011). The trend toward less evaporation in Dry1 conditions is consistent with a large resistance to evaporation being present when the soil/litter surface under a canopy is dry (Baldocchi and Meyers, 1991). Based on lysimeter measurements of evaporation, it was found that transpiration comprised about 95% of total evapotranspiration during the growing season in a boreal aspen forest (Blanken et al., 2001). The partitioning of evapotranspiration for a forest is strongly dependent on the vegetation density and modeling efforts by Lawrence et al. (2007) suggest that, for a canopy density similar to that of the US-NR1 forest (i.e., LAI \approx 4), transpiration should be around 80% of evapotranspiration. The spruce forest studied by Staudt et al. (2011) with LAI \approx 4.8 found that transpiration accounted for about 90% of total evapotranspiration (in generally dry conditions).

On a larger (global) scale it has recently been suggested from isotope measurements that transpiration contributes 80–90% to the total annual terrestrial evapotranspiration (Jasechko et al., 2013). This result appears consistent with our estimate of transpiration for the warm-season months; however, similar to the GLEES Rocky Mountain forest site described by Schlaepfer et al. (2014), the US-NR1 forest only has active transpiration for 4–5 months of the year (e.g., Fig. 2a) so the annual contribution of transpiration is much reduced and sublimation of snow plays a significant role.

At night, latent heat flux cooled the surface and was strongly affected by changes in the precipitation state (Fig. 10c2) following a pattern similar to that of nocturnal $R_{\text{net}}$ (Fig. 10a2). Nocturnal sensible heat flux changed by around 30–40% during the different precipitation states but the pattern did not clearly follow that of either $R_{\text{net}}$ or LE (Fig. 10d2). At night, $H$ generally warms the surface (including the forest vegetation and other biomass) following the air-surface temperature gradient (i.e., similar to the vertical temperature differences shown in Fig. 4d and f). In this way, $H$ acts to compensate for air-surface temperature differences that might be generated by the surface cooling effects of $R_{\text{net}}$ and LE. Even though the vertical air temperature differences were largest during Dry1 conditions (Fig. 4d and f) the largest sensible heat flux occurred
during Dry2 periods between 00:00–04:00 MST (Fig. 10d2). This is exactly when LE was at a maximum (so evaporative cooling would be expected) and a close look at Fig. 4f reveals that the temperature difference between the air just above the ground and soil was larger in Dry2 conditions than Dry1 conditions. We should also note that what is shown in Fig. 4d and f are vertical air temperature differences which serve as a surrogate for the actual difference between air temperature and the surface elements (i.e., tree branches, needles, boles, and the soil surface) (e.g., Froelich et al., 2011).

As one would expect, daytime NEE was reduced during wet conditions due to decreased photosynthetically active radiation (PAR) which is shown as a decrease in $R_{\text{net}}$ in Fig. 9a1. The ratio between mid-day PAR and $R_{\text{net}}$ was similar for all precipitation states (Table 3) and we will use $R_{\text{net}}$ as a surrogate for PAR in our discussion. The Dry2 days were when the forest was most effective at assimilating CO$_2$ and NEE increased by over 3 µmol m$^{-2}$ s$^{-1}$ ($\approx$ 30 %) between Wet2 and Dry2 days (Fig. 10b1).

Nocturnal NEE was not affected very much (less than 10 %) by changes in the precipitation state and any effect was overshadowed by the difference between NEE in the late evening compared to the early morning (Figs. 9b1 and 10b2). The models of respiration by Reichstein and Lasslop produced results similar to the measured nocturnal NEE. The good agreement between the 14-year smoothed nighttime NEE measurement and $R_{\text{eco}}$ calculated from the flux-partitioning (i.e., Fig. S1 nocturnal ecosystem respiration signal was, at least for the seasonal-scale, captured at the 21.5 m measurement level.

The striking difference between the effect of precipitation on the transport of CO$_2$ (NEE) compared to water vapor (LE) is perplexing because one would expect the turbulence to transport water vapor and CO$_2$ in a similar manner. A few possible reasons for this difference are: (1) soil respiration at the US-NR1 site was not strongly affected by precipitation, (2) long dry periods are rare enough that the Birch effect (i.e., CO$_2$ pulse following precipitation) did not have a large impact on the overall warm-season NEE statistics, (3) the measurement of NEE at 21.5 m was not accurately describing the soil respiration at the soil surface due to surface decoupling and/or other prob-
lems related to stable conditions (e.g., Staebler and Fitzjarrald, 2004; Finnigan, 2008; Aubinet, 2008; Thomas et al., 2013; Alekseychik et al., 2013), or (4) the difference in vertical location of these two scalar sources (e.g., liquid water evaporates from the vegetation surfaces as well as at the ground whereas respiration of CO₂ occurs almost exclusively at the ground) caused differences in the sensitivity to precipitation (Edburg et al., 2012). Previous measurements (mostly during the daytime) of soil respiration $R_{\text{soil}}$ at US-NR1 with a manual chamber system by Scott-Denton et al. (2003, 2006) found that the dependence of soil respiration on soil moisture over a given summer was small. It has also been suggested by Huxman et al. (2004, 2003) that ecosystem respiration at the US-NR1 site is subject to controls from temperature and radiation as much as from precipitation (in contrast to an arid or semi-arid ecosystem such as a desert grassland where $R_{\text{eco}}$ is strongly dependent on precipitation). The CO₂ pulse related to the Birch effect has been detected by eddy-covariance at a wide variety of ecosystems that are listed in the introduction. For the current study, the relevant results are: (i) the 21.5 m nocturnal NEE measurements were able to detect the increase in nocturnal ecosystem respiration over the warm-season (Fig. 2a), and (ii) the nocturnal NEE was not strongly affected by precipitation (Fig. 10b2). This suggests that, at the seasonal/annual time-scale, precipitation plays a minor role in modifying the contribution of ecosystem respiration to the above-canopy NEE for this subalpine ecosystem.

So far we have primarily discussed the mean changes to the ecosystem fluxes due to precipitation. Since these flux calculations are affected by turbulent atmospheric motions that have a large random component (e.g., Baldocchi, 2003; Vickers et al., 2009) and there is natural day-to-day (and seasonal) variability during a particular time of day, the variability (SD-Bin) around the mean flux value is large (Fig. 9a2–d2). Typically, SD-Bin for the flux is on the order of 50% of the mean flux. The variability also provides some insight into the various physical processes taking place. For example, Dry1 conditions resulted in the smallest variability for mid-day NEE and LE, but not for $H$. Furthermore, in the morning hours (07:00–10:00 MST), the variability of both NEE and LE was largest for Wet2 conditions (Fig. 9b2–c2). This shows the connec-
tion that NEE and LE have through the opening of stomates that provide pathways for both transpiration and photosynthesis. The fact that the variability for LE was elevated during Dry2 conditions (both between 00:00–04:00 MST and throughout the day) was due to the extra evaporation that occurs in Dry2 conditions as discussed above. These changes to LE also increased the Dry2 variability of sensible heat flux between 00:00–04:00 MST, but not in the evening hours. For models of ecosystem processes, the mean is often emphasized, but we point out that it is also important to understand the day-to-day variability in diel composites.

### 3.3 Asymmetry in the diel cycle of net radiation and turbulent fluxes

One other interesting aspect of the diel cycle is related to the timing of fluxes relative to solar noon. As one would expect, the top of the atmosphere radiation reached a maximum near 12:00 MST (Fig. 9a1). In contrast, the maximums for composited $R_{net}$, LE, and $H$ occurred at about 11:00 MST on dry days and 10:00 MST on wet days (Fig. 9a1, c1–d1). For NEE, the peak uptake of CO$_2$ was between 09:00–10:00 MST on both wet and dry days (Fig. 9b1). The fact that the peak in the energy fluxes was different for wet and dry conditions suggests that clouds were affecting the composited diel cycle.

In Fig. 12 we further examine the role of clouds on the diel cycle by sub-dividing the Dry1 days into clear sky (Dry1-Clear) and cloudy (Dry1-Cloudy) days. Clear skies occurred on about 18% of the Dry1 days and this is reflected by the fact that the Dry1 statistics closely follow those of Dry1-Cloudy statistics. The peak in $R_{net}$, LE, and $H$ during Dry1-Clear days were all near 12:00 MST which was consistent with the timing of the maximum top of the atmosphere radiation.

On Dry1-Clear days, $R_{net}$ was enhanced by an additional 30% compared to cloudy days (Fig. 12a1). This enhanced incoming radiation was reflected by larger turbulent energy (LE and $H$) fluxes on Dry1-Clear days (Fig. 12c1–d1). Consistent with the findings by Monson et al. (2002), NEE was slightly smaller on days with clear skies suggesting that the forest was taking up more CO$_2$ when clouds were present (Fig. 12b1). This result is partially due to CO$_2$ uptake by vegetation reaching a saturation point.
with increasing radiation (e.g., Ruimy et al., 1995), as well as research that has shown diffuse radiative conditions are more conducive to photosynthetic uptake of CO$_2$ by vegetation (e.g., Gu et al., 1999, 2002; Law et al., 2002; Wang et al., 2008). (Further discussion is in Monson et al., 2002). If LE was completely controlled by stomates, one would expect that LE would follow NEE and be larger on Dry1-Cloudy days. However, the effect of much higher $R_{\text{net}}$ on clear days also affects LE (through the SEB equation) and drives it to slightly higher levels on Dry1-Clear days.

The variability of net radiation during Dry1-Clear days closely approximated the variability of the top of the atmosphere radiation (Fig. 12a2) which suggests we successfully selected the clear days. It is also of note that the variability of mid-day sensible heat flux (Fig. 12a2) was strongly affected by clouds (similar to $R_{\text{net}}$), whereas the variability of mid-day NEE and especially LE were only slightly changed by clouds. This is an example of the unique connections between $R_{\text{net}}$ and $H$ compared to those between NEE and LE.

### 3.4 The surface energy balance (SEB) closure

Though the individual components in the SEB balance equation (i.e., Eq. 1) were dramatically affected by precipitation (i.e., Fig. 10), the overall mean simple SEB closure fraction during mid-day was fairly consistent at around 0.7–0.8 (Fig. 13a1). The missing 20 % in the energy closure is similar to that observed by previous studies at the site (e.g., Turnipseed et al., 2002; Burns et al., 2012). This suggests that the turbulent fluxes were consistently measured for each precipitation state and whatever is causing the missing 20 % is likely unrelated to precipitation.

The nighttime simple surface energy balance closure during the evening hours (19:00–23:00 MST) was at around 40–50 % while closure during the early morning hours (00:00–04:00 MST) was closer to 60–70 %. Any effect of precipitation on the SEB at night was overshadowed by these large differences related to the time of day. The effect of drainage flows on horizontal CO$_2$ advection at US-NR1 have been summarized in previous studies (e.g., Sun et al., 2007; Yi et al., 2008) and our objective
is to point out that the SEB was most affected in the late evening and improved after midnight, presumably because the wind speed and variability of mechanical turbulence increased. This result is consistent with the findings of Burns et al. (2011) that there is increased turbulence variability in the nocturnal boundary layer after around 23:00 MST. However, we have also reported (in Sect. 3.2.1) that stability tends to get stronger as the night progresses, especially in Dry1 conditions. Though outside the scope of the current study, our suspicion is that as the stability and wind speed increase during the night it leads to the formation of intermittent turbulent events caused by increased wind shear. In terms of precipitation, it is clear that the pattern of stability was disrupted by the rain event (affecting both the wind speed and vertical temperature gradients) and the dry periods tended to be more stable ($R_i > 0.2$) at night than the wet periods ($R_i < 0.2$) as shown in Fig. 13c2. The decreased stability in wet conditions is especially prevalent in the early evenings as discussed previously in relation to the vertical CO$_2$ profiles (Sect. 3.2.2). Changes in VPD were closely related to changes in air temperature as reflected in how mean VPD changed with the precipitation state (Fig. 13b1 and b2). It is interesting that the pattern for nocturnal VPD (Fig. 13b2) was similar to that of stability (Fig. 13c2).

4 Summary and conclusions

Based on fourteen years of 30 min measurements, the typical seasonal cycle and interannual variability of turbulent fluxes of sensible and latent heat and NEE from just-above a high-elevation subalpine forest were presented. We used the snowpack ablation date to determine the start of the warm-season and related this to the smoothed annual fluxes. The warm-season was further analyzed to determine how precipitation perturbed the ecosystem fluxes on a diel (i.e., hourly) time-scale. A simple, novel conditional sampling method based on whether the mean daily precipitation was greater than 3 mm day$^{-1}$ was used which essentially created a 4 day composite of a cold front passing by the tower (the dry days prior to the cold front, a day when the precipitation
started, a day with precipitation on the preceding day, and the day following the precipitation event). Though the wet days comprised only 17% of the warm-season days, they accounted for around 85% of the total precipitation.

The results showed what might be expected for a cold-front passage in a mountainous location: an afternoon peak in precipitation, a 6°C drop in air temperature, and a 50% increase in specific humidity. Changing from dry conditions to the wet, cool period of the composite front, we found the following changes during mid-day: net radiation decreased from around 585 to 275 W m⁻² (over 50%), sensible heat flux decreased from 280 to 85 W m⁻² (around 70%), latent heat flux was reduced from 170 to 125 W m⁻² (around 25%), and NEE was reduced from −7.8 to −5.4 µmol m⁻² s⁻¹ (around 30%). Despite these dramatic changes to the individual component energy fluxes, the simple surface energy balance (SEB) closure during the daytime remained between 70–80% throughout the 4 day composite frontal passage (Fig. 13a1). This level of SEB closure is consistent with previous studies at the site (e.g., Turnipseed et al., 2002; Burns et al., 2012) and suggests that whatever is causing the closure imbalance is a phenomena unrelated to precipitation and clouds.

For a typical day following a rain event, net radiation and sensible heat flux both recovered to slightly below dry-day values. Latent heat flux, however, increased from a dry-day value of 170 W m⁻² to nearly 200 W m⁻². Because LE also increased at night we conclude that LE increased due to evaporation of liquid water from the wet vegetation surfaces and ground. The enhanced LE due to evaporation lasted at least 18 h, after which time it returned to a value similar to that of dry conditions (Fig. 9c1). Another example of the effect of increased evaporation was the creation of a mid-day stable temperature layer within the forest sub-canopy (Fig. 4e). We conclude that the stable layer formed due to a combination of the vegetation being warmed by solar radiation and evaporative cooling near the ground. For NEE, we found that the subalpine forest at the US-NR1 site was most effective in assimilating CO₂ on the day following a significant rain event. A closer look at the diel cycle reveals that increased NEE occurred during the afternoon of a day following rain (Fig. 9b1).
Any effect of precipitation on nocturnal NEE and SEB closure was overshadowed by the influence of low winds and drainage flows. Precipitation also disrupted the typical dry-day diel pattern in several distinct ways: (1) it eliminated the dip of $\approx 1 \text{ m s}^{-1}$ in above-canopy horizontal wind speed during the morning and evening transitions (Fig. 3c1), (2) it generally led to lower overall levels of mechanical turbulence (Fig. 3c2), and (3) it decreased the magnitude of subcanopy/above-canopy vertical air temperature differences (Fig. 4). These effects resulted in weakly stable conditions in the late evening during wet periods ($\text{Ri}_b \approx 0.1$) compared to the more strongly stable dry periods ($\text{Ri}_b \approx 0.2$). These stability differences contributed to smaller CO$_2$ vertical differences (relative to above-canopy CO$_2$) in the wet (less stable) conditions. After midnight, stability increased for both wet and dry conditions which created CO$_2$ vertical differences that were similar in both wet and dry conditions. Despite the stronger stability after midnight there was also increased wind speed and mechanical turbulence (especially in dry conditions) which should result in increased vertical mixing. Further examination of these nighttime phenomena are beyond the scope of the current study but are recommended for future investigations.

By comparing cloudy and cloud-free days during dry periods we found that clouds shifted the diel maximum in sensible and latent heat fluxes from 12:00 MST on clear days to around 11:00 MST on cloudy days. Also, mid-day net radiation and sensible heat flux were enhanced by about 20% on clear days relative to cloudy days. In contrast, the timing of the peak in NEE (at around 10:00 MST) was unaffected by clouds and the forest was more efficient at assimilating CO$_2$ on cloudy days than clear days (Fig. 12b1).

Our study has provided an example of one way to look at the complex interconnections between variables that make modeling ecosystems so challenging. We have centered our study on precipitation, but these techniques could easily be adapted to focus on some over variable. Furthermore, this type of analysis could be used to evaluate models at the hourly time-scale (e.g., Matheny et al., 2014). We have shown that precipitation is intrinsically linked to changes in air temperature, pressure, and at-
mospheric humidity. Our focus was on the local near-ground and source effects on the scalars and fluxes relative to precipitation. The atmospheric boundary layer, and specifically the boundary layer height and entrainment, will also have an impact on the near-surface scalar concentrations and fluxes (e.g., Culf et al., 1997; van Heerwaarden et al., 2009; Pino et al., 2012). Characteristics such as boundary-layer height are linked to the larger-scale flows at the mountainous US-NR1 research site and will be considered in a future study.

Appendix A: Additional data details

A1 Additional measurements

At US-NR1, the mean temperature and humidity profiles were measured with three mechanically aspirated, slow-response temperature-humidity sensors (Vaisala, model HMP35-D) installed at 2, 8, and 21.5 m a.g.l.. The vertical resolution of the temperature measurements was enhanced by a set of twelve unaspirated 0.254 mm diameter type-E chromel-constantan thermocouples distributed between the ground and 21.98 m a.g.l..

Precipitation was measured on the US-NR1 tower at 11.5 m (canopy top) with a tipping bucket rain gauge (Campbell Scientific, Met One Model 385) starting in late summer of 1999. Two nearby precipitation-measurement sites were used to check the Met One data quality and for gap-filling. One station was part of the U.S. Climate Reference Network (USCRN; Diamond et al., 2013) (site: CO Boulder 14 W, Mountain Research Station, Hills Mill) located about 700 m northeast of US-NR1. These measurements started in 2004 using a Geonor T-200B precipitation gauge with a Small Double Fence Intercomparison Reference (SDFIR) type of wind shield around the gauge. The second precipitation site was operated by the Niwot Ridge Long Term Ecological Research (LTER) Mountain Climate Program who used both a Geonor T-200B gauge (unshielded) and, for the longer-term record dating back to 1953, a Belfort precipita-
tion gauge strip-chart recorder for daily precipitation amounts (e.g., Greenland, 1989; Williams et al., 1996). The LTER sensors were located about 550 m northeast of the US-NR1 tower. Though in winter the unshielded Met One gauge grossly underestimated total precipitation due to snow blowing by the tipping bucket gauge (e.g., Rasmussen et al., 2012), the warm-season cumulative precipitation between the USCRN and Met One gauges were typically within about 20 cm of each other (with a typical mean value of 250 cm). However, starting in summer of 2011, the Met One gauge started showing much greater precipitation amounts which we suspect was due to the “points” which hold the tipping bucket becoming worn and loose (in winter of 2013, the sensor failed completely). Therefore, the precipitation data used for the summers of 2011 and 2012 were exclusively from the USCRN sensor. Because the US-NR1 Met One sensor was not installed until late summer of 1999, the LTER Geonor data were used for the 1999 warm season. However, prior to year 2000, only daily precipitation was measured by LTER so hourly precipitation data were not available for 1999 which allows for the determination of a wet day, but not the diel cycle of precipitation.

Carbon dioxide dry mole fraction was measured on the US-NR1 tower with a tunable diode laser (TDL) absorption spectrometer (Campbell Scientific, model TGA100A) as described by Bowling et al. (2005); Schaeffer et al. (2008b). Measurements were made in summer of 2003 and continuously from fall of 2005 to the present. For our study, nine TDL inlets between 0.1 and 21.5 m a.g.l. were used to evaluate the CO$_2$ profile. The precision of TDL CO$_2$ mole fraction is estimated to be about 0.2 µmol mol$^{-1}$ (Schaeffer et al., 2008b). For calculating the storage term in NEE, an independent CO$_2$-profile system with a closed-path IRGA (LI-COR, model LI-6251) was used as described in Monson et al. (2002). The TDL CO$_2$ data were downloaded on 7 January 2013 from http://biologylabs.utah.edu/bowling/.

A2 Updates to US-NR1 AmeriFlux data

The version of the US-NR1 AmeriFlux data used in our study (ver.2011.04.20) includes a correction for an error in the closed-path IRGA CO$_2$ flux calculation where a water-
vapor correction was applied twice: first, as a sample-by-sample dilution correction and second by including the Webb–Pearman–Leuning (WPL) term in the CO₂ flux (e.g., Ibrom et al., 2007). After the error was discovered in Fall of 2010, the CO₂ flux (and NEE) for all years were re-calculated from the raw 10 Hz data with only the dilution correction applied and the updated/fixed data set was released on 20 April 2011 (http://urquell.colorado.edu/data_ameriflux/). Though the point-by-point difference between the correct and incorrect 30 min NEE values appears small, when accumulated over a year, the correctly-calculated NEE approximately doubled the annual uptake of CO₂ by the US-NR1 forest. The accumulation of a systematic measurement error over time is a well-known issue in the flux community (Moncrieff et al., 1996). Several side-by-side instrument comparisons by the AmeriFlux QA/QC team (e.g., Schmidt et al., 2012) have found the US-NR1 measurements to be of high quality (and also helped to assess the calculation error of the CO₂ flux).

The Supplement related to this article is available online at doi:10.5194/bgd-12-8939-2015-supplement.
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Table 1. Precipitation statistics for the US-NR1 AmeriFlux site. The number of days with a daily precipitation greater than 3 mm day\(^{-1}\) for each year and month is shown. These are defined as “wet” days in the analysis (see text for details). If the warm-season started in June, then the May column is filled with “NA”. The total cumulative precipitation from the wet days is given immediately below the number of days. In the two right-hand columns the cumulative precipitation from the wet days only and from all days within the warm season are provided. Precipitation units are mm.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Day of Year</th>
<th>May</th>
<th>June</th>
<th>July</th>
<th>August</th>
<th>September</th>
<th>Cumulative Precipitation (Wet Days)</th>
<th>Cumulative Precipitation (Warm Season)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>214.0</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>58.8</td>
<td>321.8</td>
<td>353.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>49.9</td>
<td>72.5</td>
<td>27.8</td>
<td>56.6</td>
<td>206.8</td>
<td>230.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>64.8</td>
<td>53.8</td>
<td>63.5</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>186.2</td>
<td>211.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>54.6</td>
<td>38.1</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>37.6</td>
<td>133.9</td>
<td>175.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>31.7</td>
<td>134.9</td>
<td>49.9</td>
<td>216.5</td>
<td>241.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>74.9</td>
<td>57.9</td>
<td>32.8</td>
<td>176.3</td>
<td>211.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>120.9</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>54.9</td>
<td>203.2</td>
<td>245.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>48.5</td>
<td>36.1</td>
<td>45.6</td>
<td>30.7</td>
<td>160.9</td>
<td>191.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>111.3</td>
<td>89.6</td>
<td>61.7</td>
<td>56.2</td>
<td>323.4</td>
<td>365.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Start&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>May</td>
<td>June</td>
<td>July</td>
<td>August</td>
<td>September</td>
<td>(Wet Days)</td>
<td>(Warm Season)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>24.2</td>
<td>32.1</td>
<td>52.7</td>
<td>17.9</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>126.9</td>
<td>161.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>32.3</td>
<td>37.6</td>
<td>43.7</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>63.5</td>
<td>222.7</td>
<td>249.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>21.3</td>
<td>98.0</td>
<td>81.5</td>
<td>44.9</td>
<td>253.4</td>
<td>301.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>65.8</td>
<td>42.1</td>
<td>53.3</td>
<td>65.3</td>
<td>242.0</td>
<td>268.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>18.0</td>
<td>106.0</td>
<td>73.7</td>
<td>43.0</td>
<td>240.7</td>
<td>290.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>306</td>
<td>1744</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>149.7</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>37.2</td>
<td>75.3</td>
<td>52.3</td>
<td>44.0</td>
<td>215.6</td>
<td>249.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a</sup> This column indicates the day of year the warm season started based on diel changes in the soil temperature as shown in Fig. 1.

<sup>b</sup> For 2011 and 2012, precipitation from the NOAA U.S. Climate Reference Network (USCRN; Diamond et al., 2013) MRS “Hills Mills” station was used due to instrument problems with the tipping bucket at the AmeriFlux tower (see text for details).

<sup>c</sup> For 1999, precipitation from the LTER C-1 site was used.
Table 2. Variables, symbols, units, and height above ground of measurements along with the number of days each variable falls within each precipitation category. Where appropriate, the percentage gap-filled 30 min data for each particular variable is shown. If any variable is missing for a 30 min period, then all variables within that particular group are excluded.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Sensor Height [cm]</th>
<th>Total Number of Days and Percentage of Gap-filled Values</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Dry1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measurements between 1999–2012</td>
<td>1209</td>
<td>194</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Radiation</td>
<td>$R_{\text{net}}$ W m$^{-2}$</td>
<td>2550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Photosynthetically Active Radiation</td>
<td>PAR µmol m$^{-2}$ s$^{-1}$</td>
<td>2550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barometric Pressure</td>
<td>$P$ kPa</td>
<td>1050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Air Temperature, Relative Humidity, Specific Humidity</td>
<td>$T_a$, RH percent</td>
<td>2150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soil Temperature</td>
<td>$T_{\text{soil}}$ °C</td>
<td>2150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wind Speed, Wind Direction</td>
<td>$U$, WD m s$^{-1}$, deg from true N</td>
<td>2150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friction Velocity</td>
<td>$u^*$ m s$^{-1}$</td>
<td>2150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sensible Heat Flux</td>
<td>$H$ W m$^{-2}$</td>
<td>2150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latent Heat Flux</td>
<td>LE W m$^{-2}$</td>
<td>2150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Ecosystem Exchange of CO$_2$</td>
<td>NEE µmol m$^{-2}$ s$^{-1}$</td>
<td>2150</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2. Continued.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Symbol</th>
<th>Units</th>
<th>Sensor Height [cm]</th>
<th>Total Number of Days and Percentage of Gap-filled Values</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Measurements between 2000–2012</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Dry1</td>
<td>Wet1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Precipitation</td>
<td>Precip</td>
<td>mm (30 min)$^{-1}$</td>
<td>1050</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measurements between 2002–2012</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volumetric Water Content</td>
<td>VWC</td>
<td>m$^3$m$^{-3}$</td>
<td>−5</td>
<td>0.01%</td>
<td>0.01%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soil Heat Flux</td>
<td>$G_z$</td>
<td>W m$^{-2}$</td>
<td>−10</td>
<td>0.02%</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measurements between 2006–2012</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CO$_2$ Dry Mole Fraction</td>
<td>$\chi_c$</td>
<td>μmol mol$^{-1}$</td>
<td>2150</td>
<td>37.3%</td>
<td>34.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thermocouple Temperature</td>
<td>$T_{tc}$</td>
<td>°C</td>
<td>2198</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A: In October 2005, a soil moisture sensor (Campbell Scientific, model CS616) and soil temperature sensor (Campbell Scientific, model CS107) were installed horizontally at a depth of 5 cm within 50 m of the Ameriflux tower. The CS107 thermistor was calibrated against a NIST-standard temperature sensor at the National Center for Atmospheric Research (NCAR) Integrated Surface Flux System (ISFS) calibration facility. These sensors were incorporated in the US-NR1 dataset starting in January 2006. Prior to this, an average of 5 soil temperature sensors (REBS, model STP-1) and 8 soil moisture sensors (Campbell Scientific, model CS615) were used to determine the soil properties. The CS615 sensors were inserted into the soil at a 45° angle providing an average moisture content over the upper 15 cm of the soil.

B: Whenever possible, $U$ and WD were gap-filled with a prop-vane sensor at 25 m on US-NR1 tower. Otherwise, gap-filling was performed using $U$ and WD from the LTER C-1 climate station (as described in Appendix A1) which have been adjusted to US-NR1 winds using a linear relationship.

C: NEE includes both the $u_2$ filter and storage term gap-filling. The flux data have been screened such that around 2% of the extreme values have been removed.

D: Gap-filling for the Met One tipping bucket on the US-NR1 tower is shown. The gap-filling flags for precipitation were incorrect prior to year 2003. Therefore, the gap-filling values listed here are for years 2003–2010. After year 2010, USCRN data were used (see Appendix A1 for details).

E: Between years 2008 to 2010, the CO$_2$ was sampled hourly rather than half-hourly. During periods with hourly measurements a linear interpolation was used to create data with half-hourly time stamps. The upper values shows the number of 30 min values missing prior to interpolation, while the lower numbers shows the number of missing values after interpolation.
Table 3. Daytime and nighttime statistics of selected variables for different precipitation conditions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Sensor Height [cm]</th>
<th>Night (00:00–04:00 MST)</th>
<th>Daytime (10:00–14:00 MST)</th>
<th>Evening (19:00–23:00 MST)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dry1</td>
<td>Wet1</td>
<td>Dry1</td>
<td>Wet1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Precipitation</td>
<td>1050</td>
<td>0.002</td>
<td>0.017</td>
<td>0.201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Radiation</td>
<td>2550</td>
<td>–71.7</td>
<td>–53.0</td>
<td>–33.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Photosynthetically Active Radiation</td>
<td>2550</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAR</td>
<td>2550</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barometric Pressure</td>
<td>1050</td>
<td>70.97</td>
<td>70.92</td>
<td>70.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Air Temperature</td>
<td>2150</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thermocouple</td>
<td>2150</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>7.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temperature</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vertical Difference</td>
<td>(2198–40)</td>
<td>4.65</td>
<td>3.46</td>
<td>2.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soil Temperature</td>
<td>–5</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>6.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soil Heat Flux</td>
<td>–10</td>
<td>–5.6</td>
<td>–4.2</td>
<td>–4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volumetric Water Content</td>
<td>VWC</td>
<td>–5</td>
<td>0.118</td>
<td>0.122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wind Speed</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>2150</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CO₂ Dry Mole Fraction</td>
<td>Xc</td>
<td>2150</td>
<td>385.3</td>
<td>385.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calculated Variables</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specific Humidity</td>
<td>q</td>
<td>2150</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vapor Pressure Deficit</td>
<td>VPD</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friction Velocity</td>
<td>u*</td>
<td>2150</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>0.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulk Richardson Number</td>
<td>Rlb</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>0.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sensible Heat Flux</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>2150</td>
<td>–48.9</td>
<td>–39.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latent Heat Flux</td>
<td>LE</td>
<td>2150</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>8.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Ecosystem Exchange</td>
<td>NEE</td>
<td>2150</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 1. (a) Soil temperature and (b) soil moisture for years 1999 to 2012. In (b), the black dots indicate wet days and the number of wet days for each year is shown to the right of the panel underneath the year. The warm-season start date was chosen based on the date that the soil temperature diurnal changes started to occur as indicated by the vertical green lines. The vertical mauve lines for years 1999–2007 are the start date of the growing season as determined by Hu et al. (2010a). Starting with year 2006, a single set of soil sensors at a depth of 5 cm were used (see Table 2 for details).
Figure 2. Fourteen-year (a) mean and (b) interannual standard deviation ($n = 14$ years) of (top) CO$_2$ net ecosystem exchange NEE, (middle) latent heat flux LE, and (bottom) sensible heat flux $H$. To remove the effects of short-term changes due to weather each 30 min yearly time series is averaged with a 20 day mean sliding window. In all panels, the statistics are calculated for all hours, daytime (10:00–14:00 MST), and nighttime (00:00–04:00 MST) periods following the legend in (b). These data were collected between 1 November 1998 and 31 October 2012. Vertical lines with the arrows indicate the average warm-season period used for our study.
**Figure 3.** Frequency distributions of wind direction WD for different precipitation states for (a1) nighttime (00:00–04:00 MST) (a2) mid-day (10:00–14:00 MST), and (a3) late evening (19:00–23:00 MST) periods. Because there are a different number of 30 min periods within each precipitation state, the frequency distributions were created by randomly selecting 800 values for each precipitation state. Below (a1–a3), the mean (left column) and standard deviation (SD-Bin, right column) of the warm-season diel cycle of (b1, b2) precipitation, (c1, c2) horizontal wind speed $U$ at 21.5 m, (d1, d2) friction velocity $u_*$, and (e1, e2) bulk Richardson number $Ri_b$ are shown. SD-Bin represents the amount of day-to-day variability within the diel cycle. These composites are from 30 min data during the warm-season between years 1999–2012. For all panels, each line represents a different precipitation state as shown in the legend of panel (b1).
Figure 4. Vertical profiles of mean warm-season thermocouple air temperature $T_{tc}$ for (left) nighttime (00:00–04:00 MST), (middle) mid-day (10:00–14:00 MST), and (right) late evening (19:00–23:00 MST). The upper row is the absolute $T_{tc}$ while the bottom row is the $T_{tc}$ difference relative to the highest level (21.98 m). Each line represents a different precipitation state as shown in the legend. These measurements are from the warm-season in years 2006–2012.
Figure 5. The mean (left column) and standard deviation (SD-Bin, right column) of the warm-season diel cycle of (a1, a2) barometric pressure, (b1, b2) air temperature $T_a$ at 21.5 m, (c1, c2) vapor pressure deficit VPD, (d1, d2) soil temperature $T_{soil}$, (e1, e2) soil moisture VWC, and (f1, f2) soil heat flux $Q_{soil}$. SD-Bin represents the amount of day-to-day variability in the diel cycle. Each line represents a different precipitation state as shown in the legend.
Figure 6. The warm-season mean diel cycle of: (a1–a4) net radiation $R_{\text{net}}$, (b1–b4) air and soil temperature $T_a$, $T_{\text{soil}}$, (c1–c4) specific humidity $q$ and barometric pressure $P$, and (d1–d4) CO$_2$ mole fraction $\chi_c$. Within each column the data are separated into diel periods based on whether significant rain occurred on that day. A “wet” day has a total daily precipitation of at least 3 mm (see text for further details). The legend in the 2nd column applies to all panels within each row.
Figure 7. The warm-season mean diel cycle of CO$_2$ mole fraction $\chi_c$ at three different heights above the ground. Each line represents a different precipitation state as shown in the legend. These measurements are from the warm-season in years 2006–2012.
Figure 8. Mean vertical profiles of CO$_2$ mole fraction $\chi_c$ for (left) nighttime (00:00–04:00 MST), (middle) mid-day (10:00–14:00 MST), and (right) late evening (19:00–23:00 MST). The upper row is absolute $\chi_c$ while the bottom row is the $\chi_c$ difference relative to the highest level (21.5 m). Each line represents a different precipitation state as shown in the legend. These measurements are from the warm-season in years 2006–2012.
Figure 9. The mean (left column) and standard deviation (SD-Bin, right column) of the warm-season diel cycle of (a1, a2) net radiation $R_{net}$, (b1, b2) net ecosystem exchange of CO$_2$ NEE, (c1, c2) latent heat flux LE, and (d1, d2) sensible heat flux $H$. Each line represents a different precipitation state as shown in the legend. In (a1, a2), incoming shortwave radiation at the top of the atmosphere ($Q_{SW}^{\downarrow}$)TOA is shown as a black line (using the right-hand axes in a1). The diel cycle is calculated from 30 min measurements between years 1999–2012.
Figure 10. Mean values for (left side) daytime (10:00–14:00 MST) and (right side) night (00:00–04:00 MST) and evening (19:00–23:00 MST) periods of: \(a_1, a_2\) net radiation \(R_{net}\); \(b_1, b_2\) net ecosystem exchange of \(CO_2\) NEE; \(c_1, c_2\) latent heat flux LE; and \(d_1, d_2\) sensible heat flux \(H\). The values are arranged from left-to-right in the order of Dry1, Wet1, Wet2, and Dry2 conditions. The vertical black lines represent the mean absolute deviation (MAD) of the 30 min data within that particular category and time period. The numerical values shown between the daytime and nighttime panels represent the fractional change relative to the largest (or smallest) data value within the panel.
Figure 11. The (left column) binned 21.5 m latent heat flux LE vs. 8 m vapor pressure deficit VPD for (a1) night (00:00–04:00 MST), (a2) daytime (10:00–14:00 MST), and (a3) evening (19:00–23:00 MST) periods. Each line represents a different precipitation state as shown in the legend. In (a2), the difference in LE between Dry2 and Dry1 conditions is shown as a black line. As an example of the variability in the binned data, the right-column panels show the 30 min daytime data used to create the binned daytime lines (i.e., corresponding to what is shown in panel a2) where the right-column panels are for (b1) Dry1, (b2) Wet1, (b3) Wet2, and (b4) Dry2 periods.
Figure 12. Similar to Fig. 9, except only Dry1 conditions are shown where the data have been further separated into Dry1-Clear and Dry1-Cloudy conditions as specified by the legend. For further details see the caption of Fig. 9.
Figure 13. As in Fig. 10, showing (a1, a2) the surface energy balance closure fraction \(\frac{(LE + H)}{(R_{\text{net}} - G)}\); (b1, b2) vapor pressure deficit VPD; and (c1, c2) bulk Richardson number \(R_{i_b}\).