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The project "Evaporation Estimation Comparison" was carried out in 1995 and 1996 in a joint effort by the Department of Water Resources of the Wageningen Agricultural University (WAU), The Netherlands and the Water Research Institute (WRI) at Bratislava, Slovakia. The contacts between the two groups go back to 1977, when ir. Han Stricker first visited the meteorological station in Ziharec. During the following period contacts were strengthened by mutual visits, including two study stays of dr. Pavel Petrovic at the WAU in 1983 and 1988.

The financial support for the project was provided by the Dutch Ministry of VROM and the Slovakian Ministry of Environment. We would like to thank especially dr. K. Krijt and the Slovak Department of Water Protection for their help and interest. Furthermore, the stay of two Dutch students in Slovakia was partly financed from the EU Tempus program. Also the contribution of the International Agricultural Centre (IAC) by financing a one-month stay of dr. Petrovic in Wageningen and practical arrangements made by Mrs. Van Agen during this period are highly appreciated.

During the field experiment in the summer of 1995 the meteorological station in Ziharec served as home base for maintenance of equipment and primary data analysis. The station staff offered great help in solving practical problems but moreover their enormous hospitality for Dutch students and staff is unforgettable. Also Gijs van den Abeele of the WAU was very helpful with his technical assistance during the preparations and start-up of the experiment. Several Slovakian students took part in the field work, their help in experimental and personal affairs was very constructive.

The results of this project include a comprehensive data set which may be used in future for a number of studies concerning the soil-vegetation-atmosphere system. In principle, this data set is at free disposal for scientific purposes of groups in both Slovakia and The Netherlands.
1. INTRODUCTION

The water budget at the land surface constitutes an important factor in the overall hydrological cycle and as such has a strong impact on the climatic system and agricultural crop production. An improved understanding of the involved meteorological and hydrological processes may therefore lead to more adequate decisions when designing for instance water management projects. Comprehensive field experiments may contribute to this improved understanding and offer the data sets needed to calibrate and validate soil-water-plant-atmosphere models.

In the project "Evaporation estimation comparison", the vertical water budget at the land surface was monitored during the 1995 summer season for a maize crop growing on heavy clay in southern Slovakia. A similar experiment was performed earlier in 1985 on a sandy soil near Renkum, The Netherlands [7, De Boer, 1988]. The different climatic conditions and soil characteristics will offer an interesting possibility to compare experimental and model results. The original intention of the Slovakian experiment was also to study the impact of the Danube Gabčíkovo Dam on water regime and crop production in the surrounding area. In this report, however, no special attention is given to this aspect.

The field measurements and data analysis performed within the framework of this project were carried out to meet the following objectives:

- Monitoring of meteorological processes, hydrological processes and crop development of maize during a growing season.

- Calculation of the separate vertical water budget terms, of which evapotranspiration by different methods, and evaluation of results.

- Validation of the conceptual model DAIR by means of the collected data set.

- Validation of the physically based model SWAP93 by means of the collected data set, including the implementation of a recently developed crack module.

- Intercomparison of model results.

To meet the objectives, the setup of the field experiment included measurements of several meteorological parameters like radiation, temperature, wind
speed and precipitation, monitoring of soil moisture, ground water level and crop
development and additional laboratory measurements to characterize soil physical
properties. During the experiment a regular primary data analysis was performed
to correct for errors in the experimental setup.

After finishing the field experiment, a thorough analysis of all collected data
was performed. A final data set including 30 minute values of evapotranspiration,
precipitation, daily ground water level and weekly soil moisture profiles as well
as characteristic stages in crop development and soil physical properties resulted.
The actual evapotranspiration was calculated by the standard flux profile method
and Bowen ratio method. To obtain potential evapotranspiration several methods
were applied: Penman, Priestley-Taylor, Makkink, Thom-Oliver and Monteith-
Rijtema. The measurements of soil moisture in the upper soil layer were influenced
by crack formation during part of the field experiment for which was corrected in
the final data set.

The data set was used to validate the models DAIR and SWAP93. The
conceptually based DAIR model was developed at the Water Research Institute in
Bratislava. Validation results include calculated actual evapotranspiration and
ground water level. The model SWAP93 is a physically based, one-dimensional
model which yields water budget terms like simulated actual evapotranspiration
and surface runoff, soil moisture and pressure head profiles. The main factor in
the comparison of model results is therefore the reduction of potential to actual
evapotranspiration.

This report documents the field activities, the resulting data set and model
validation results. In chapter 2, the setup of the field experiment and primary
data analysis as performed during the experiment is described. The theory and
data analysis concerning calculation of actual evapotranspiration, potential evapo-
transpiration and characterization of soil hydraulic properties is given in chapter
3. Also included is a comparison of the water budget terms evapotranspiration
and soil moisture depletion.

In chapter 4 the structure of the models DAIR and SWAP93 is described,
validation results are presented in chapter 5. Conclusions and recommendations
are finally given in chapter 6.

Due to practical limitations, it appeared impossible to perform model runs and
analysis in a joint effort by both institutes involved in this project. The DAIR
description and simulations were obtained at the WRI in Bratislava (4.2 and 5.1),
whereas the SWAP93 simulations were carried out at the Department of Water
Resources, WAU (4.3 and 5.2).
2. FIELD EXPERIMENT: METHODS AND MATERIAL

2.1. General description of experimental site

The experimental site was situated near the village Ziharec in the south-eastern part of Slovakia. At this site the water budget components and maize crop development were monitored during the 1995 growing season. The maize crop was planted at April 24 and harvested midst October, the measurements started at June 3 and ended at September 12. The field was selected for its large surface area, hence ensuring a sufficient fetch for the micrometeorological measurements during the entire season (Fig. 2.1).

The site was situated in a typical fluvial landscape with a slight but well visible relief causing wet spots in the lower parts of the field. The soil profile consisted of a loose top layer (≈ 20 cm) with a high organic matter content, still including raw material. Under the top layer a dark heavy clay soil was found with an average depth to 1 meter. This heavy clay layer was under line by a more sandy layer with a colour changing gradually from yellow to light gray and containing manganese fragments.

At the nearby standard meteorological station in Ziharec a number of meteorological parameters, including precipitation and temperature, has been measured during the past 40 years. The average monthly precipitation and air temperature calculated over the period 1954 to 1994 during the growing season and the data obtained at the measurement site in 1995 are presented in Table 2.1. Obviously the months of June and August 1995 were relatively wet, whereas in July the precipitation amount was extremely low with high air temperatures.

The measurement program included monitoring of micrometeorological and hydrological processes, monitoring of crop development and characterization of soil physical properties. The micrometeorological measurements were concentrated at and around two masts and provided the following data: temperature, wind speed, radiation, sunshine duration, soil heat flux, wind direction, precipitation and intercepted rainfall.

The hydrological measurements included monitoring of vertical soil moisture profiles, soil water suction, groundwater level and incidently bare soil evaporation.
Crop development was characterized by incidental measurements of crop height, leaf area index, dry matter production, rooting depth and root density profiles. A restricted set of soil physical data was obtained from combined field and laboratory measurements, including clay mineral type, soil water retention data and grain size distribution.

Table 2.1: Monthly precipitation $P$ [mm] and air temperature $T_a$ [$^\circ$C] average of 1954-1994 and the 1995 growing season

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month</th>
<th>$P$ 54-94</th>
<th>$P$ 1995</th>
<th>$T_a$ 54-94</th>
<th>$T_a$ 1995</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>June</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>18.4</td>
<td>17.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>19.9</td>
<td>22.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>19.3</td>
<td>19.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>15.3</td>
<td>14.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.2. Micrometeorological measurements

2.2.1. Collected data

The micrometeorological monitoring program consisted of measurements of wind speed at two levels, wind direction, net and short-wave incoming and reflected radiation, dry and wet bulb temperature at two levels, sunshine duration, soil heat flux and precipitation, all stored at a temporary resolution of 30 minutes. Fast temperature fluctuations (resolution 1 s) were also measured but not analyzed within the framework of this project. The equipment was installed at or in the vicinity of two height-adjustable masts and connected to a computer and data-logger storing 30 minutes averages or accumulated values. Additionally methods were explored to measure throughfall and "stemflow" after a rainfall event in order to estimate the interception.

The main mast with a maximum height of about 6 meters was equipped with the following instruments at different levels $z$:

- **dry bulb temperature** $T_{d1}$ at $z_{1h}$ (temperature sensor)
- **dry bulb temperature** $T_{d2}$ at $z_{2h}$ (temperature sensor)
- **wet bulb temperature** $T_{w1}$ at $z_{1h}$ (temperature sensor, natural ventilation)
- **wet bulb temperature** $T_{w2}$ at $z_{2h}$ (temperature sensor, natural ventilation)
- **wind speed** $u_1$ at $z_{1m}$ (cupanemometer)
- **wind speed** $u_2$ at $z_{2m}$ (cupanemometer)
- **fast temperature fluctuations** (1 second) at $z_m$ (thermocouple)
- **sunshine duration** (Haenni solarimeter).

The wet bulb temperature sensors $T_{w1}$ and $T_{w2}$ could also be used to measure dry bulb temperature. The second, lower mast was equipped with the remaining instruments:

- **incoming shortwave radiation** $R_{a1}$ (Kipp radiometer)
- **reflected shortwave radiation** $R_{a2}$ (Kipp radiometer)
- **net radiation** $R_n$ (CSIRO net radiometer)
- **wind direction** (wind vane).

The soil heat flux was measured with 3 flux plates installed at 5 cm depth in the area covered by the radiation measurements. The soil temperature was measured with a temperature sensor installed partly below the soil surface but through conductance the sensor was assumed to measure surface temperature. Precipitation was measured with a tipping bucket rain gauge (accuracy 0.2 mm) placed at about 10 meters from the main mast and kept 30 cm above crop height. To estimate the interception a regular grid of 40 bottles was installed to determine the average direct throughfall after a rainfall event from the collected water volume in the bottles. Additionally an attempt was made to estimate the amount of
rainfall flowing along the stem of plants to the ground. This stemflow was collected in PVC cylinders surrounding the lower stem part of 10 plants.

For a correct analysis of evapotranspiration data the upper and lower measurement of wind speed and temperature at levels \(z_1\) and \(z_2\) need to be taken within the surface boundary layer adjusted to the monitored site (Fig. 2.2). The development of the surface boundary layer over the field depends upon crop height and distance to the field edge leading to the following rules for minimum and maximum sensor heights \(z_{\text{min}}\) and \(z_{\text{max}}\) [29, Reitsma, 1978]:

\[
\begin{align*}
    z_{\text{min}} &= 10 \times z_0 + d \\
    z_{\text{max}} &= f \times \text{fetch} + z_0 + d
\end{align*}
\]  \tag{2.1}

in which \(z_0\) is surface roughness length [m], \(d\) zero-plane displacement height [m] and \(f\) growth factor of adapted surface layer [m m\(^{-1}\)]. The factor \(f\) is taken to be 1 m growth of boundary layer height per 100 m fetch according to Reitsma [29, 1978], which is a rather safe criterion. The minimum fetch of the selected field for all wind directions was 300 m (see Fig. 2.3). The roughness length for momentum \(z_{\text{om}}\) and zero-plane displacement height \(d\) were calculated from mean crop height \(h_c\) according to [8, De Bruin, 1995]:

\[
\begin{align*}
    z_{\text{om}} &= 0.11 \times h_c \quad \tag{2.2} \\
    d &= 0.67 \times h_c \quad \tag{2.3}
\end{align*}
\]

The height of the main mast with anemometers and temperature sensors was increased regularly during the growing season to fulfill the requirements expressed by (2.1). The lower mast and rain gauge were also adjusted in height, keeping the short-wave and net radiometers at approximately 2 m above the crop surface throughout the growing season.

![Figure 2.2: Growth of surface boundary layer above a homogeneous surface (source: Brutsaert, 1982)](image-url)
2.2.2. Data control and correction

The stored data were checked critically during the field campaign hence causes of suspicious results could be quickly detected and corrected if possible. Missing 30 minutes intervals caused by maintenance of instruments were completed in the final data set based upon known data of the same day. Long term missing data due to a computer breakdown were completed using daily averaged data from the standard meteorological station in Ziharec (August 22-28 and September 4).

Dry and wet bulb temperature

The sensors measuring wet bulb temperature in the standard setup were used to measure dry bulb temperature for two 5 day periods, yielding a duplicate measurement of vertical dry bulb temperature difference $\Delta T_d$. The difference of $\Delta T_d$ values should be within 0.02 °C to obtain correct evapotranspiration results from calculations with the Bowen ratio method (see 3.2.2). Measured differences exceeded this limit especially around noon at several days (difference of $\Delta T_d$ up to 0.08 °C), but no structural cause was detected.

The wet bulb temperatures were sufficiently accurate to calculate the relative humidity $r$ as the ratio of actual water vapour pressure $e$ [mbar] and saturated vapour pressure $e_w$ [mbar] according to [6, Brutsaert, 1982]:

$$r = \frac{e}{e_w(T_d)}$$  \hspace{1cm} (2.4)

The vapour pressure was calculated using the psychrometer equation:

$$e = e_w(T_d) - \gamma(T_d - T_w)$$  \hspace{1cm} (2.5)

with $\gamma$ the psychrometer 'constant' (0.66 mbar °C$^{-1}$), $T_d$ and $T_w$ are vertically averaged 30 min values of dry and wet bulb temperature [°C]. The saturated vapour pressure was approximated by [8, De Bruin, 1995]:

$$e_w(T) = e_w(T_0) \ast 10^{aT/b}$$  \hspace{1cm} (2.6)

in which $e_w(T_0)$ is the saturated vapour pressure at 0 °C (6.107 mbar), $a$ and $b$ are empirical constants (7.5 and 237.3 °C respectively).

Wind speed and direction

Wind speed measurements might be influenced by the mast itself due to the construction and setup of the main mast with equipment. To prevent this, the mast was turned when necessary in order to adjust the position of the sensors according...
to the wind direction. Furthermore, structural errors incidentally caused a measured inverse wind profile at wind speeds below 1.5 [ms⁻¹] (pers. comm. J.N.M. Strieker). In this range (\(u_1 < 1.5\)) the wind profile used for the evapotranspiration calculations (see 3.2) was replaced by the measurement of the upper sensor \(u_2\) and a wind speed \(u_1 = 0\) at height \(d + z_{0m}\).

The roughness length for momentum \(z_{0m}\) and displacement height \(d\) are calculated from registered crop height \(h_c\) according to (2.2) and (2.3). The crop height, however, varied considerably over the field ranging from sections with \(h_c = 120-140\) cm to 200-220 cm in August. Hence the values of \(z_{0m}\) and \(d\) might be related to wind direction, but in the final data set used for further calculations the field average crop height was used to determine \(z_{0m}\) and \(d\).

Soil heat flux

The soil heat flux \(G\) was measured with 3 flux plates at 5 cm depth. To obtain \(G\) at the soil surface the measured value has to be corrected for difference in thermal conductivity \(\lambda\) of the flux plates and the soil and for heat storage in the soil layer above the plates. The correction for thermal conductivity differences was made according to Philip [27, 1961]:

\[
\frac{G_{plate}}{G_{corr}} = \frac{\xi}{1 + (\xi - 1) H'}
\]

(2.7)

in which \(G_{plate}\) and \(G_{corr}\) are measured and corrected soil heat fluxes at 5 cm depth respectively [W m⁻¹], \(H'\) is a factor depending upon the plate geometry (0.93) and \(\xi\) is the ratio of plate and soil thermal conductivity \(\lambda_{plate}/\lambda_{soil}\). The soil thermal conductivity \(\lambda_{soil}\) depends upon soil type and soil moisture content \(\theta\). Values of \(\lambda_{soil}\) were estimated from literature data [8, De Bruin, 1995] and \(\theta\) measured by TDR at 5 cm depth.

To obtain the soil heat flux \(G\) at the surface, a second correction concerns compensation for heat storage in the upper 5 cm of soil [6, Brutsaert, 1982]:

\[
G = G_{corr} + \int_0^z C_s(z) \frac{\Delta T}{\Delta t} \Delta z
\]

(2.8)

in which \(T\) is the estimated soil temperature at 2.5 cm depth [K], \(t\) is time [s], \(C_s\) is volumetric soil heat capacity [JK⁻¹ m⁻³] and \(z\) is plate depth [m]. The value of \(C_s\) at 2.5 cm depth was calculated from the volume fractions of mineral soil \(\theta_m\), organic matter \(\theta_c\), water \(\theta_w\) and air \(\theta_a\) [6, Brutsaert, 1982]:

\[
C_s = C_m \theta_m + C_c \theta_c + C_w \theta + C_a \theta_a
\]

(2.9)

where the \(C\) terms are the volumetric heat capacities [JK⁻¹ m⁻³] of the different fractions as indicated by the subscripts. The water fraction \(\theta\) was estimated from
TDR measurements at 5 cm depth, the organic matter fraction $\theta_c$ was estimated at 0.10 [cm$^3$ cm$^{-3}$] and the mineral fraction was estimated at 0.41 [cm$^3$ cm$^{-3}$] by taking the porosity equal to measured saturated moisture content.

The soil temperature at 2.5 cm depth was calculated by assuming that the temperature gradient remained constant over the upper 5 cm soil layer. The temperature gradient at 5 cm depth over a 30 min time interval was obtained from:

$$ G_{corr} = -\lambda \frac{\partial T_{5cm}}{\partial z} $$

Next the temperature at 2.5 cm depth was calculated from $\partial T/\partial z$ and surface temperature $T_s$. The measured surface temperature $T_s$, however, fluctuated too strongly to be representative for the temperature change in the 5 cm soil compartment. Therefore the measured $T_s$ was smoothed using a moving average with a time interval chosen according to:

$$ \Delta t = \frac{C_z}{\lambda} (\Delta z)^2 $$

where $\Delta t$ is the characteristic time scale of temperature change for a soil layer with depth $\Delta z$ ($\Delta t \approx 80$ [min]).

Interception

The throughfall and stemflow volumes were measured immediately after 6 rainfall events throughout the growing season from which the interception $I$ [mm] was calculated via plant density. The interception in most cases amounted approximately 70% of precipitation $P$ which is much higher than values reported in literature, which indicate an average interception of 30% for a maize crop in the growing season [33, Schmidt and Mueller, 1991].

During the field experiment regularly leakage from the experimental stemflow meters was registered which explains the too low measured throughfall + stemflow amounts causing high interception percentages. After each event, however, attempts were made to improve the quality of the construction. The last monitored rainfall event at September 4, being the single event for which no leakage was registered at any stemflow meter, yielded an interception of 27%. Hence the explored method might be useful for interception measurements but the construction should be more solid to obtain reliable data. For further data analysis the empirical formula presented by Schmidt and Mueller [33, 1991] was used to calculate the interception $I$ [mm] from precipitation $P$ [mm] and leaf area index $LAI$ [m$^2$ m$^{-2}$]:

$$ I = -0.521 + 0.528LAI + 0.214P - 0.066LAI^2 - 0.003P^2 + 0.033LAI P $$
2.3. Soil measurements

2.3.1. General setup

The main part of the soil monitoring program included daily registration of ground water level (3 locations) and measurements of soil water content by Time Domain Reflectometry (TDR) and neutron probe. These measurements were performed on a weekly base but more frequently following a rainfall event: the first, third and sixth day after rain, then again once a week. Neutron probe access tubes were installed at 14 plots to 200 cm depth, except 4 spots where depth was only 140 cm. Since neutron probe measurements close to the soil surface are unreliable, the moisture content of the surface layer was measured by TDR. TDR probes were installed horizontally at 5 and 10 cm depth near 12 neutron probe access tubes. Additionally TDR probes were installed at 40-50 and 100-110 cm depth (vertically) around 3 access tubes which provided data for calibrating the neutron probe measurements.

In combination with vertical TDR probes at 40-50 cm depth tensiometers were installed to measure soil water suction \( h \) at 45 cm depth. Tensiometers and TDR were monitored simultaneously hence providing single points of the soil water retention curve \( \theta(h) \). Additional tensiometers were installed at 25 cm depth. Since suction measurements with tensiometry become invalid above approximately 850 cm suction, which situation occurred rather early in the field experiment due to severe drought in July, monitoring of tensiometers finished at July 24.

Incidentally, soil evaporation was measured using micro-lysimeters and soil samples for additional laboratory analysis were collected. This included measurement of saturated soil moisture content, grain size distribution and clay mineral type. The general measurement layout and the setup of a plot equipped fully with neutron probe access tube, horizontal and vertical TDR and tensiometers are shown in Figure 2.3 and 2.4.

2.3.2. Calibration of neutron probe and time domain reflectometry

The TDR technique is based on the large dielectric constant value of water (80) compared to air (1) and soil particles (\( \approx 4 \)), which means that the soil moisture content can be related to bulk soil dielectric constant. The travel time of an electromagnetic signal, transmitted into the soil along a probe and reflected back to the recording instrument at the end of the probe, is measured from which the dielectric constant \( \varepsilon_s \) can be calculated according to [31, Roth et al., 1990]:

\[
\varepsilon_s = \left(\frac{c_0 t}{2L}\right)^2
\]  

(2.13)
One neutron probe access tube (2 m) + horizontal TDR (5 and 10 cm)
X neutron probe access tube (1.4 m) + horizontal TDR (5 and 10 cm)
(x) neutron probe access tube (1.4 m)
O vertical TDR (40-50 and 100-110 cm) + tensiometers (25 and 45 cm)
### interception measurements
mast meteorological masts and rain gauge

Figure 2.3: Schematic layout of equipment installation at the experimental site (≈ 1 : 10000)

Figure 2.4: Standard layout of fully equipped plot with central the neutron probe access tube, □ is TDR sensor, • is tensiometer (depths in cm) and -- plant rows
in which $c_0$ is light speed in vacuum [m s$^{-1}$], $t$ travel time of TDR signal [s] and $L$ probe length [m].

The instrument used was manufactured by Easy Test Ltd, Poland (FOM/m) with a built-in standard $\theta(\varepsilon_s)$ curve. Since the relation between dielectric constant $\varepsilon_s$ and soil moisture content $\theta$ at heavy clay soils can vary considerably from standard empirical relationships, 22 samples were collected to determine a calibration curve for this specific site. The sample dielectric constant was measured by TDR and the volumetric water content determined by weighing and oven-drying of a known soil volume. Through the measured points a logarithmic curve was fitted with a maximum absolute error of 0.059 % (Fig. 2.5):

$$
\theta(\varepsilon_s) = 0.181 \ln(0.596\varepsilon_s + 1.01) - 0.102 \quad \text{for } \theta \geq 0.10 \quad (2.14)
$$

In the range $\theta < 0.15$ [cm$^3$ cm$^{-3}$] no reliable TDR measurements were possible due to crack formation. Equation (2.14) is also assumed to be valid for the more sandy layer starting at about 1 m depth since it was not possible to collect calibration samples in this layer.

TDR measurements were performed at plots 1 to 12 at 5 and 10 cm depth in duplicate (horizontally) and at plots 6, 8 and 10 at depths 40-50 cm and 100-110 cm (vertically) at 3 sides of the neutron probe access tubes (Fig. 2.4). The latter were used for calibration of neutron probe measurements.

---

**Figure 2.5:** Logarithmic TDR calibration curve (solid) fitted through measured points (+)
Fast moving neutrons, emitted into soil from a radioactive source, are predominantly reduced in energy by hydrogen. Therefore, the number of detected low-energy neutrons is related to the moisture content of the surrounding soil volume. In order to calculate the moisture content from count number, the neutron probe has to be calibrated for a particular soil. In general the ratio of measured counts and number of counts in a standard medium is calibrated.

The count ratio was calibrated against TDR measurements according to a method presented by Greacen [12, 1981] which compensates for bias in θ. This correction for sampling errors is obtained from the 3 replicates of measured soil moisture which are available for each single count ratio at 45 and 105 cm depth (3 TDR sensors per depth) and provides a more accurate calibration than classic linear regression. Although the TDR calibration curve (2.14) was only derived for the upper soil layer, a separate curve was fitted for neutron probe data in the layer 0-100 cm and 100-200 cm depth. The resulting calibration curves of count ratio n versus volumetric moisture content θ are given by (Fig. 2.6):

\[
\theta(n) = 0.200n + 0.0166 \quad \text{layer 0-100 cm}
\]
\[
\theta(n) = 0.132n + 0.127 \quad \text{layer 100-200 cm}
\]

Neutron probe access tubes were installed at 14 plots to a depth of 2 m except for plots 6, 10, 13 and 14 which reached only 1.4 m (Fig. 2.3). Measurements were taken at 20, 30, 45, 65, 85, 105, 120, 140, 160, 180 and 200 cm depth, standard counts were measured twice a week in air. Measurements at 20 and 30 cm became unreliable during dry periods because of soil cracking.

2.3.3. Soil evaporation

Evaporation from bare soil was measured using several pairs of pvc microlysimeters (length 12 and 17 cm, inner diameter 8 cm). These cylinders were carefully pushed into the soil and taken out to seal the bottom of the cylinder in order to prevent water movement between the underlying soil and the sample. After weighing the microlysimeter it was placed back in a preformed hole and taken out every day, weighed and replaced. Evaporation in between measurements was calculated from difference in mass.

The experiment started 3 days after a rainfall event, thereby assuming that downward movement of water would not occur beyond that period. Upward movement of water would also cause a deviation between evaporative loss from the microlysimeter and the surrounding soil. Therefore microlysimeters were installed in pairs of different length assuming that the short lysimeters deviated from true evaporation rate sooner than long ones [3, Boast and Robertson, 1982], hence
Figure 2.6: Neutron probe calibration curves for 0-100 cm (a) and 100-200 cm (b) fitted through bias corrected soil moisture data (+)

data were reliable when mass loss from both microlysimeters was similar. Finally a 5-day set of evaporation data from 6 microlysimeter pairs was obtained (August 11-15) for a fully developed vegetation.

2.4. Vegetation

Four vegetation parameters were registered: crop height \( h_c \), leaf area index (LAI), dry matter production and root development. Crop height measurements were used to determine the level of wind and temperature sensors and to calculate the roughness length \( z_0 \) and zero-plane displacement height \( d \) according to (2.2) and (2.3). The time interval for measurements was chosen according to crop development hence measurements were taken less frequent after the crop reached its final height in the beginning of August.

The leaf area index was measured every two weeks till the plants reached maturity. The LAI of a crop sample (minimum 5 plants) was derived by drawing and cutting the leaf contours from paper of known specific weight, weighing the paper and calculating the leaf surface area via the paper surface-weight relationship. Finally LAI was determined using the average field plant density (7.4 plants m\(^{-2}\)).

Dry matter production of the LAI samples was measured by weighing the plants immediately after sampling. From the LAI sample a smaller sample was taken and weighed before and after ovendrying at 85 °C during 24 hours. From this the dry matter weight of the original sample was calculated. Since dry matter production was still going on after the plants reached maturity these measurements
continued till the end of the field experiment.

During the field experiment an estimate of rooting depth was determined three times by observations in auger holes. The root density profile was determined in the laboratory from samples collected in August near plot 12, which was considered to be representative for the field. The sampling depth was 0-70 cm depth at one location within a plant row and one location in between the rows. After preparing the samples in a salt bath the root length per volume of soil was determined by the root counting technique [18, Koorevaar, 1995].
3. THEORY AND DATA ANALYSIS

3.1. The energy and water budget at the land surface

Evaporation of water is one of the main phases in the hydrological cycle and is the connecting link between the water budget and energy budget at the land surface. The water budget expressing the conservation of mass in a lumped hydrological system over a certain period can be described by [6, Brutsaert, 1982]:

\[(P - ET_{cum})A + Q_i - Q_o = \Delta S_w\]  \hspace{1cm} (3.1)

in which \(P\) is precipitation [cm], \(ET_{cum}\) cumulative evapotranspiration [cm], \(A\) the surface area \([\text{cm}^2]\), \(Q_i\) and \(Q_o\) are surface and groundwater inflow or outflow respectively \([\text{cm}^3]\) and \(\Delta S_w\) is the change of water storage in the system \([\text{cm}^3]\).

The energy needed for evaporation of water is provided by the net radiation \(R_n\) reaching the land surface. The net radiation consists of four components:

\[R_n = R_{si} - R_{sr} + R_{li} - R_{lt}\]  \hspace{1cm} (3.2)

where \(R_{si}\) and \(R_{sr}\) \([\text{Wm}^{-2}]\) are incoming and reflected short-wave radiation respectively and \(R_{li}\) and \(R_{lt}\) \([\text{Wm}^{-2}]\) are incoming and outgoing long-wave radiation. The main components of the energy budget equation besides the evapotranspiration or latent heat flux \(L_vE\) are the sensible heat flux \(H\) and soil heat flux \(G\):

\[R_n = L_v E + H + G\]  \hspace{1cm} (3.3)

with all energy fluxes in \([\text{Wm}^{-2}]\) and \(L_v\) the latent heat of vaporization \([\text{Jkg}^{-1}]\).

In this study the actual evapotranspiration is calculated at 30 minute intervals by the standard flux profile method and Bowen ratio method. Both are energy balance methods in which the components \(R_n\), \(H\) and \(G\) are determined from measured micrometeorological parameters and \(L_v E\) is calculated based upon (3.3) (see 3.2). The actual evapotranspiration can also be calculated on a longer term base from soil water measurements using the water budget equation (3.1), when assuming that the runoff components \(Q_i\) and \(Q_o\) are negligible. A comparison of results obtained by both approaches is presented in 3.8.

For modelling purposes or prediction of water requirements often the concept of potential evapotranspiration is used. Potential evapotranspiration refers to
the maximum rate of evapotranspiration from a large area completely covered by an actively growing vegetation sufficiently supplied by water. Several methods to calculate the daily potential evapotranspiration $ET_{pot}$ were applied: Penman, Priestley-Taylor, Makkink, Monteith-Rijtema and Thom-Oliver (see 3.3). In order to use the methods of Monteith-Rijtema and Thom-Oliver a canopy and aerodynamic resistance have to be specified, which is treated separately in 3.4.

3.2. Actual evapotranspiration

3.2.1. Standard flux profile method

The sensible heat flux $H$ and the momentum flux can be obtained from measured wind and dry bulb temperature profiles using the similarity relations for the surface boundary layer. These similarity relations are based on the Monin and Obukhov [21, 1954] similarity theory, which assumes stationarity and horizontally homogeneous conditions. From dimensional analysis it can be shown that for the description of vertical transport processes in the surface boundary layer the relevant quantities are the height above the surface $z$, the mean potential temperature $\theta$, the air density $\rho$, the gravity acceleration $g$, the momentum flux or shear stress $\tau$, the sensible heat flux $H$ and the evaporation rate $ET_r$. Referring to momentum, heat and water vapour transport the following scales can be defined:

$$u_* = \sqrt{\frac{\tau}{\rho}}$$  \hspace{1cm} (3.4)
$$\theta_* = \frac{H}{\rho_c c_p u_*}$$  \hspace{1cm} (3.5)
$$q_* = \frac{ET_r}{\rho_c u_*}$$  \hspace{1cm} (3.6)

in which $u_* [m s^{-1}]$, $\theta_* [K]$ and $q_* [g_{water} m^{-1}]$ are the friction velocity or velocity scale, temperature scale and specific humidity scale respectively, $c_p$ is the specific heat at constant pressure $[J kg^{-1} K^{-1}]$ and $ET_r$ is the evaporation rate $[kg m^{-2} s^{-1}]$.

With the Monin-Obukhov theory the non-dimensional quantities expressed in (3.4), (3.5) and (3.6), which play a dominant role in the vertical transport of momentum, heat and water vapour in the surface boundary layer, can be written as functions of the dimensionless parameter $\zeta = z/L$ characterizing the atmospheric stability. The Obukhov-length $L$ is defined by:

$$L = \frac{\rho_c c_p T u_*^3}{\kappa g H}$$  \hspace{1cm} (3.7)
with $L$ in [m] and $\kappa$ the Von Karman constant (0.41). By definition $L > 0$ for stable conditions and $L < 0$ for an unstable boundary layer. The set of functions is given by:

$$\frac{\partial \theta_T \kappa z}{\partial z} = \phi_h \left( \frac{z}{L} \right)$$  \hspace{1cm} (3.8)

$$\frac{\partial q \kappa z}{\partial z} q_a = \phi_e \left( \frac{z}{L} \right)$$  \hspace{1cm} (3.9)

$$\frac{\partial u \kappa z}{\partial z} u_a = \phi_m \left( \frac{z}{L} \right)$$  \hspace{1cm} (3.10)

The nature of the universal $\phi$-functions has been the subject of much theoretical and experimental research and there are still remaining questions concerning the behaviour of these $\phi$-functions [6, Brutsaert, 1982], [8, De Bruin, 1995].

For practical purposes it is more convenient to work with the integrated version of equations (3.8), (3.9) and (3.10) [23, Paulson, 1970]. Integrating between the surface and a height $z$ or between two levels above the surface for the temperature and velocity scale yields:

$$\theta_* = \frac{\kappa (\theta_{T2} - \theta_{T1})}{\ln \frac{z_{x2} - d_x}{\Psi_m \frac{z_{x2} - d_x}{L} + \Psi_h \frac{z_{x1} - d_x}{L}}}$$  \hspace{1cm} (3.11)

$$u_* = \frac{\kappa (u_2 - u_1)}{\ln \frac{z_{x2} - d_m}{\Psi_m \frac{z_{x2} - d_m}{L} + \Psi_m \frac{z_{x1} - d_m}{L}}}$$  \hspace{1cm} (3.12)

in which $z_{x1}$ and $z_{x2}$ are sensor heights [m] (momentum $x = m$, temperature $x = h$), $d_x$ displacement height [m], $\theta_{T1}$ and $\theta_{T2}$ potential temperature [K] at level $z_{h1}$ and $z_{h2}$, $u_1$ and $u_2$ wind speed [m s$^{-1}$] at level $z_{m1}$ and $z_{m2}$ and $\Psi_h$ and $\Psi_m$ are surface layer stability correction terms [-] for momentum and heat respectively.

The surface layer stability corrections ($\Psi$-functions) under stable conditions ($z/L > 0$) can be expressed by [13, Holtslag, 1987]:

$$\Psi_m = \Psi_h = -A \frac{z_{x,i} - d_x}{L} + B \left( \frac{z_{x,i} - d_x - C \frac{x}{D}}{L} \right) \exp \left( -D \frac{z_{x,i} - d_x}{L} \right) + \frac{BC}{D}$$  \hspace{1cm} (3.13)

with $A = 0.7$, $B = 0.75$, $C = 5.0$ and $D = 0.35$. For unstable atmospheric conditions ($z/L < 0$) the $\Psi$-functions are given by [23, Paulson, 1970]:

$$\Psi_h = 2 \ln \frac{1 + x^2}{2}$$  \hspace{1cm} (3.14)

$$\Psi_m = 2 \ln \frac{1 + x^2}{2} + \ln \frac{1 + x^2}{2} - 2 \arctan (x) + \frac{\pi}{2}$$  \hspace{1cm} (3.15)
with \( x = \left(1 - 16 \frac{z_0}{L} \right)^2 \) [-].

From (3.5) it follows that the sensible heat flux \( H \) is related to the temperature scale (3.11) and friction velocity (3.12) according to:

\[
H = -\rho_a c_p u_\ast \theta_\ast
\]

(3.16)

A similar expression can be derived for the evaporation rate \( \bar{E}T_r \) if humidity profiles are measured in the surface boundary layer. It is more convenient however to calculate the latent heat flux \( L_v E \) using the energy budget equation (3.3). In the standard flux profile method, the sensible heat flux \( H \) is calculated from (3.11), (3.12) and (3.16) and measured wind speed and dry bulb temperature profiles. Since the net radiation \( R_n \) and soil heat flux \( G \) are also measured the latent heat flux \( L_v E \) can be obtained from (3.3).

### 3.2.2. Bowen ratio method

This method assumes that the turbulent conductivity or turbulent exchange coefficient \( K \) of heat and water vapour are identical [6, Brutsaert, 1982]:

\[
K_h = K_v
\]

(3.17)

In that case the Bowen ratio \( \beta \), which expresses the ratio between sensible heat flux \( H \) and latent heat flux \( L_v E \), can be calculated from temperature and vapour pressure measurements at two levels above the surface:

\[
\beta = \frac{H}{L_v E} = \frac{c_p \rho \Delta T_d}{\epsilon L_v \Delta e} = \frac{\Delta T_d}{\Delta e}
\]

(3.18)

where \( \Delta T_d \) is the vertical temperature difference [K], \( \epsilon \) the ratio of molecular weights of water vapour and dry air (0.622), \( p \) atmospheric pressure [mbar], \( \Delta e \) the vertical water vapour pressure difference [mbar] and \( \gamma \) the psychrometric "constant" [0.66 mbar K\(^{-1}\)]. The value of \( \Delta e \) can be obtained using the vertical wet bulb temperature difference \( \Delta T_w \):

\[
\Delta e = (s + \gamma) \Delta T_w - \gamma \Delta T_d
\]

(3.19)

in which \( s \) is the slope of the saturation pressure curve at the vertically averaged temperature \( T_w \) [mbar K\(^{-1}\)].

Combining the energy budget equation (3.3) and the Bowen ratio (3.18) yields the following relations for the sensible and latent heat flux:

\[
H = \frac{\beta}{1 + \beta} (R_n - G)
\]

(3.20)

\[
L_v E = \frac{1}{1 + \beta} (R_n - G)
\]

(3.21)
The essential principle of the Bowen ratio method is that turbulence is "eliminated" hence no wind speed measurements are needed. The advantage of this method is the proper physical basis, namely the conservation of energy expressed in the energy budget equation. The accurate determination of $\beta$, however, is very sensitive to small errors in $\Delta T_W$ and $\Delta T_d$. For $\beta = -1$ both (3.20) and (3.21) are undetermined which situation only occurs at the transition from unstable to stable atmospheric conditions (around sunrise and sunset).

3.2.3. Results flux profile and Bowen ratio method

The actual evapotranspiration was calculated from measured data using both the standard flux profile method and Bowen ratio method. Daily (24 h) evapotranspiration results, net radiation, incoming and outgoing short-wave radiation and soil heat flux measured during the field experiment are given in appendix A.

To compare the results of the standard flux profile method and Bowen ratio method the period between sunrise and sunset (800-1800) was taken. Figure 3.1 shows that there is a considerable difference between the resulting latent heat fluxes $L_V$. This is especially true for very sunny days (171, 172, 179-182, 202-213, 218, 250). At days 169 and 203 the Bowen ratio $\beta$ is negative which yields a negative value of $L_V$ at day 169 and a latent heat flux exceeding the net radiation at day 203. Apparently the Bowen ratio method and flux profile only yield comparable results during partly cloudy, not very sunny periods (day 228-233).

In 2.2.2 the duplicate measurements of dry bulb temperature differences were described. This difference should be within 0.02 °C to obtain sufficiently accurate $\beta$-values when measuring both wet and dry bulb temperature profiles. Since this limit was exceeded regularly during the day, for which no structural cause was detected, the results of the Bowen ratio method are considered unreliable. For the model verification presented in chapter 5 the 24 h results obtained by the standard flux profile method are used.

3.3. Potential evapotranspiration methods

3.3.1. Penman method

The equation published by Penman in 1948 [24] was originally intended for evaporation from an open water surface. His formulation is often used, however, to calculate indirectly the potential evapotranspiration for a vegetated land surface. The Penman method has become very popular in hydrological and agricultural practice because only standard meteorological observations are required.
Figure 3.1: Actual evapotranspiration calculated during day time (800-1800) by the flux profile method (solid) and Bowen ratio method (dotted). Daynr 154 = June 3, daynr 254 = Sept 11

The Penman equation is a combination of the energy budget equation (3.3) and the equations of vertical transfer of heat and momentum from a wet surface:

\[ H = \frac{\rho a c_p}{r_a} \frac{T_s - T_a}{\gamma} \]  
\[ L_v E = \frac{\rho a c_p e_s(T_s) - e_a(T_a)}{r_a} \]  

where \( T_s \) and \( T_a \) are surface and air temperature respectively [K], \( e_s(T_s) \) saturated vapour pressure at the surface [mbar], \( e_a(T_a) \) vapour pressure of the air at \( T_a \) [mbar] and \( r_a \) is the aerodynamic resistance [s m\(^{-1}\)]. It is assumed that the aerodynamic resistance \( r_a \) is identical for heat and momentum.

In order to solve (3.22) and (3.23) Penman made the following assumption [8, De Bruin, 1995]:

\[ e_s(T_s) \approx e_s(T_a) + s(T_s - T_a) \]  

Substituting (3.24) in (3.23) and combining with the energy budget equation (3.3) now yields:

\[ L_v E = \frac{s(R_o - G) + \frac{\rho a c_p}{r_{a\text{penman}}} \Delta e}{s + \gamma} \]  
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in which \( r_{a\text{penman}} \) is the aerodynamic resistance of a smooth water surface \([\text{sm}^{-1}]\) and \( \Delta e = e_a(T_a) - e_a(T_d) \) [mbar]. To convert the latent heat flux \( L_vE \) [W m\(^{-2}\)] to the evapotranspiration rate \( ET \) [mm day\(^{-1}\)] commonly used in hydrology, one must multiply by a factor \( \frac{86400}{2.45 	imes 10^6} \approx 0.0352 \).

Penman’s original equation was based on the empirical wind function structure \( f(u) \) introduced by Dalton in 1895 [6, Brutsaert, 1982]:

\[
ET = \frac{0.0352 s (R_n - G) + \gamma f(u) \Delta e}{s + \gamma}
\]  
(3.26)

with the wind function \( f(u) = 0.26 (0.5 + 0.54 u_{2m}) \) in which \( u_{2m} \) is the wind speed at a height of 2 meter. The term \( \frac{\gamma f(u) \Delta e}{s + \gamma} \) represents the drying power of the overlying air. The relation between (3.25) and (3.26) is given by:

\[
f(u) = \frac{\rho_a c_p}{\gamma r_{a\text{penman}}} 0.0352 \approx \frac{250}{r_{a\text{penman}}}
\]  
(3.27)

The use of (3.26) with the empirical wind function \( f(u) \) is adequate to calculate mean values of \( ET \) over periods of a day or longer. For shorter term periods the effect of atmospheric stability which is not included may be quite important [6, Brutsaert, 1982].

3.3.2. Monteith-Rijtema method

Originally the Penman equation was derived for evaporation from an open water surface but appeared very useful in practice to estimate indirectly the evapotranspiration from a moist surface completely covered by vegetation. In order to extend this approach, both Rijtema [30, 1965] and Monteith [22, 1965] developed a more general equation which can also be used for a vegetated surface under potential and non-potential conditions. In this formulation a bulk surface resistance parameter \( r_s \) was introduced effectively accounting for the stomatal resistance \( r_t \) and a resistance depending upon the covered soil fraction \( r_c \):

\[
L_vE = \frac{s (R_n - G) + \rho_a c_p \Delta e}{s + \gamma \left(1 + \frac{r_s}{r_a}\right)}
\]  
(3.28)

This Monteith-Rijtema formulation is applicable for all kinds of crops but the bulk resistance \( r_s \) and aerodynamic resistance \( r_a \) have to be known in order to use (3.28). For potential evapotranspiration conditions for a fully soil covering vegetation normally a bulk minimum resistance value is introduced.
3.3.3. Thom-Oliver method

A certain inconsistency is incorporated in the use of the Penman equation (3.26) for vegetated land surfaces, since the aerodynamic term with the empirical wind function \( f(u) \) is derived from land surface data, while the energy balance term is valid for an open water surface. Therefore, Thom and Oliver [35, 1977] generalized the aerodynamic term in Penman's formula while maintaining the use of the empirical wind function.

Thom and Oliver formulated the aerodynamic resistances under neutral conditions \( r_{an} \) and non-neutral conditions \( r_a \) for any surface as:

\[
\begin{align*}
    r_{an} &= \frac{\left[ \ln \left( \frac{x}{z_0} \right) \right]^2}{\kappa^2 u} \\
    r_a &= \frac{\left[ \ln \left( \frac{x}{z_{0h}} \right) - \Psi_h \left( \frac{x}{L} \right) + \Psi_h \left( \frac{x}{z_{0m}} \right) \right] \left[ \ln \left( \frac{x_{0h}}{z_{0m}} \right) - \Psi_m \left( \frac{x_{0h}}{L} \right) + \Psi_m \left( \frac{x_{0m}}{L} \right) \right]}{\kappa^2 u}
\end{align*}
\]

with the \( \Psi \)-functions as formulated in 3.2.1. The effect of buoyancy only due to low wind speeds on the aerodynamic resistance is expressed by the ratio \( \frac{r_{an}}{r_{an penman}} \).

Penman's resistance \( r_{an penman} \) introduced in (3.25) is theoretically defined under neutral conditions as:

\[
    r_{an penman} = \frac{\left[ \ln \left( \frac{x}{z_{0p}} \right) \right]^2}{\kappa^2 u}
\]

in which \( z_{0p} \) is the open water surface aerodynamic roughness (1.37 mm). The ratio between \( r_{an} \) and \( r_{an penman} \) is assumed to be also valid for \( r_a \) and \( r_{a penman} \):

\[
    \frac{r_{an}}{r_{an penman}} = \frac{\left[ \ln \left( \frac{x}{z_0} \right) \right]^2}{\left[ \ln \left( \frac{x}{z_{0p}} \right) \right]^2} = m^{-1} = \frac{r_a}{r_{a penman}}
\]

With \( r_{a penman} = \frac{250}{f(u)} \), as follows from (3.27) and assuming that the roughness length for heat \( z_{0h} \) and momentum \( z_{0m} \) are identical, \( r_a \) can be written as:

\[
    r_a = m^{-1} r_{a penman} = \frac{\left[ \ln \left( \frac{x}{z_0} \right) \right]^2}{\left[ \ln \left( \frac{x}{z_{0p}} \right) \right]^2} \frac{250}{f(u)}
\]

Thom and Oliver included the 'strong' wind function \( f(u) = 0.26 \left( 1 + 0.54u_2m \right) \) instead of the 'weak' wind function (3.27) used by Penman [6, Brutsaert, 1982]. Since \( \frac{250}{\left[ \ln(x/z_{0p}) \right]^2} \) is 4.72, the aerodynamic resistance is finally expressed by:

\[
    r_a = 4.72 \frac{\left[ \ln \left( \frac{x}{z_0} \right) \right]^2}{1 + 0.54u}
\]
After rearranging the original Penman formulation and including a basic (= minimum) bulk surface resistance similar to the Monteith-Rijtema approach, the Thom-Oliver expression is given by [35, Thom and Oliver, 1977]:

\[ ET = \frac{0.0352 s (R_n - G) + m \gamma E_{ap}}{s + \gamma \left(1 + \frac{\tau_a}{\tau_s}\right)} \]  

(3.35)

in which \( E_{ap} \) represents the drying power of the air mentioned in 3.3.1.

3.3.4. Priestley-Taylor method

When air has been in contact with a wet surface over a very long fetch, it may hypothetically tend to become vapour saturated so that the drying power of the air expressed in the Penman formula (3.26) should tend to zero. Hence the radiation term in (3.26) may be considered to represent a lower limit to evaporation from moist surfaces which is called the equilibrium evaporation [6, Brutsaert, 1982].

Priestley and Taylor [28, 1972] have taken equilibrium evaporation as the basis for an empirical relationship giving evaporation from a wet surface under conditions of minimal advection:

\[ L_v E = \alpha \frac{s}{s + \gamma} (R_n - G) \]  

(3.36)

with \( \alpha \) the Priestley-Taylor coefficient. For large saturated land and 'advection-free' water surfaces Priestley and Taylor concluded that the best estimate for \( \alpha \) was 1.26. This value was supported by later studies for well watered grass, potatoes and shallow lakes [6, Brutsaert, 1982]. The \( L_v E \) obtained from (3.36) may be considered as a reference value which needs to be multiplied by a certain factor for crops other than grass. However this is no standard practice.

The empirical Priestley-Taylor formulation fails to be valid under circumstances for which the evapotranspiration is mainly determined by large-scale advection and less by radiation. For instance under Dutch conditions, it can only be used from April/May till October.

3.3.5. Makkink method

Makkink's empirical formula relates the potential evapotranspiration of a reference grass crop to the global radiation \( R_{s1} \) [36, TNO, 1988]:

\[ L_v ET_{grass} = 0.65 \frac{s}{s + \gamma} R_{s1} \]  

(3.37)

The reference grass evapotranspiration \( ET_{grass} \) [mm day\(^{-1}\)] is officially used by the Royal Dutch Meteorological Institute. To calculate the evapotranspiration for a
specific crop, the reference $E_{\text{grass}}$ has to be multiplied by a crop factor $f_c$:

$$E_{\text{crop}} = f_c E_{\text{grass}}$$  \hfill (3.38)

The formulation of Makkink (3.37) is directly related to the Priestley-Taylor equation (3.36) in situations where the global radiation $R_g$ on a daily base is twice the net radiation $R_n$ [36, TNO, 1988]. The Makkink method is applied during the whole year, however without a clear explanation.

3.4. Determination of resistance parameters

3.4.1. Aerodynamic resistance

The quantity $r_a$ expresses the aerodynamic resistance to the turbulent diffusion of water vapour from the evaporating surface through the air to a reference height. In order to calculate the potential evapotranspiration $ET_{\text{pot}}$ with the method of Monteith-Rijtema (3.28) or Thom-Oliver (3.35), the aerodynamic resistance has to be determined. In this study two approaches were applied to calculate the aerodynamic resistance.

The first approach is based upon the formulation of $r_a$ under non-neutral conditions (3.30). Above a high crop, the mechanical turbulence is often much larger than the turbulence produced by buoyancy unless the wind speed is weak. In that case, (3.30) can be simplified by neglecting the stability functions of heat $\Psi_h$ and momentum $\Psi_m$:

$$r_a = \frac{\ln \left( \frac{z-d}{z_{0m}} \right) \ln \left( \frac{z-d}{z_{0a}} \right)}{\kappa^2 u(z)}$$  \hfill (3.39)

with $z_{0h} \approx 0.25 z_{0m}$ [m].

The second approach was developed by Thom and Oliver [35, 1977] as described in 3.3.3. The resulting expression for the aerodynamic resistance $r_a$ is given by equation (3.34). Instead of using different roughness lengths for heat and momentum like in (3.39), it was assumed that $z_{0m} = z_{0h}$ to derive (3.34). Furthermore, the Thom-Oliver method takes implicitly the stability of the atmosphere into account whereas stability effects are neglected in (3.39).

3.4.2. Bulk surface resistance

The bulk resistance $r_s$ expresses the resistance to vapour diffusion from the evaporating surface to the air. For a fully covering crop $r_s$ is mainly composed of the bulk stomatal resistance of the leaves in parallel ('big leaf' approach). When the crop does not fully cover the surface, however, the bulk surface resistance $r_s$ is
composed of the stomatal resistance \( r_t \) and a resistance \( r_c \) depending upon the covered soil fraction and very difficult to determine.

Inversely, the energy balance method [34, Szeicz and Long, 1969] can be used to determine \( r_s \) departing from the formulation for potential evapotranspiration from a wet surface \( ET_{\text{wet}} \):

\[
ET_{\text{wet}} = 0.0352 \frac{s R_n + \rho_a \Delta e}{s + \gamma} \tag{3.40}
\]

Using (3.28) and (3.35) now as expressions for actual \( ET \) (which can be potential) the bulk resistance \( r_s \) can be calculated according to:

\[
r_s = r_a \left( 1 + \frac{s}{\gamma} \right) \left( \frac{ET_{\text{wet}}}{ET_{\text{act}}} - 1 \right) \tag{3.41}
\]

The aerodynamic resistance \( r_a [\text{sm}^{-1}] \) is obtained from equation (3.34) or (3.39) and the actual evapotranspiration \( ET_{\text{act}} \) is calculated by the standard flux profile method (see 3.2.1).

### 3.5. Potential evapotranspiration results

The potential evapotranspiration calculated by the methods of Penman, Priestley-Taylor and Makkink (no crop factors included) is shown in Figure 3.2. It can be seen that the Priestley-Taylor method yields slightly higher values than the Makkink method during the growing season. This is caused by the fact that the ratio of net radiation \( R_n \) and global radiation \( R_g \) is not identical for a grass covered surface \( \left( \frac{0.65}{0.26} \approx 0.52 \right) \) and a maize crop \( \left( \frac{R_n}{R_g} \approx 0.58 \right) \). At some days the Penman formulation yields relatively high \( ET_{\text{pot}} \)-values. This is due to a strong wind on those days, causing a significant effect of the advection term which is ignored in the methods of Priestley-Taylor and Makkink.

The aerodynamic resistance \( r_a \) was calculated by (3.39) for the Monteith-Rijtema method and (3.34) for the Thom-Oliver method, in both cases for the period between 800-1800 hours. Results are shown in Figure 3.3. During the growing season \( r_a \) for both methods shows a general decrease when the crop height \( h_c \) increases. Comparing the two equations, it appears that the discrepancies in the results of \( r_a \) can mainly be attributed to the difference of expressions in the denominator. Therefore, (3.34) should be given more credit than (3.39) because it accounts for buoyancy effects at low wind speed.

Since most of the evapotranspiration takes place during daytime, data averaged from 800-1800 were used to calculate values of \( ET_{\text{wet}} \) in (3.40) and \( r_s \) in (3.41). The resulting values of the bulk resistance \( r_s \) are shown in Figure 3.4. During the
Figure 3.2: Potential evapotranspiration calculated by the methods of Penman (xx), Makkink (oo) and Priestley-Taylor (solid)

dry periods in the growing season, when the water supply in the soil lags behind the evaporation demand, the leaf-water potential decreases hence $r_a$ increases. Similarly it can be seen that $r_s$ decreases after a rainy day or wet period.

In Figure 3.5 the course of bulk and aerodynamic resistance during one day (day number 184) is shown. For this case all the expressions have been applied for 30 min intervals. During most of the day $r_s$ remains more or less constant with a gradual increase in the late afternoon. This suggests that the water supply mainly keeps pace with the evaporation demand. The aerodynamic resistance remains constant during the day with an increase in the early morning and late afternoon when the wind speed decreases. This agrees with results obtained by Jacobs [14, 1989] who found a similar pattern for a maize crop in The Netherlands.

When applying the Monteith-Rijtema and Thom-Oliver method, however, a remaining question is whether the calculated $ET$ in this study will represent a 'true' value of potential evapotranspiration due to problems encountered in determining the resistance parameters. The first point is, whether data averaged between 800-1800 are representative for a whole day. Secondly, the actual evapotranspiration is used in (3.41) to calculate $r_s$. Due to these problems, the minimum bulk stomatal resistance throughout the growing season cannot be specified adequately. Therefore, the evapotranspiration calculated by both the methods of
Figure 3.3: The aerodynamic resistance of maize calculated by equation (3.34) (solid) and (3.39) (oo).

Monteith-Rijtema and Thom-Oliver is not considered to be a true potential value and ET$_{pot}$-results are not presented here.

Daily values of potential evapotranspiration ET$_{pot}$ calculated by the methods of Priestley-Taylor, Penman and Makkink are given in Appendix B.

Figure 3.4: The bulk surface resistance of maize calculated by the energy balance method using $r_a$ obtained by (3.34) (solid) or (3.39) (oo).
Figure 3.5: The daily course of the aerodynamic (oo) and bulk resistance (***) on day number 184

3.6. Soil related measurements

3.6.1. Ground water level

The ground water level was measured daily at 3 locations (Fig. 2.3). The course of the average ground water level during the field experiment and the precipitation amounts are shown in Figure 3.6. During the first part of the field experiment the ground water level was quite shallow (-30 to -65 cm) due to a wet period in June. Next, the level gradually decreased to -120 cm during a very dry period in July and August. From day number 220 till the end of the field experiment the ground water level only varied between -110 and -130 cm due to regular rainfall during this period.

3.6.2. Soil properties

Hydraulic characteristics

The soil water retention and hydraulic conductivity curves $\theta(h)$ and $k(h)$ can be described analytically according to [37, Van Genuchten, 1980]:

$$\theta(h) = \theta_r + \frac{\theta_s - \theta_r}{(1 + |a_g h|^n)^m}$$

$$k(h) = k_s \frac{[(1 + |a_g h|^n)^m - |a_g h|^{n-1})^2}{(1 + |a_g h|^n)^m}$$
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Figure 3.6: Measured daily ground water level and precipitation during the growing season

Table 3.1: Parameters characterizing the soil water retention and hydraulic conductivity curve

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$a_g$ [cm$^{-1}$]</th>
<th>$n$ [-]</th>
<th>$\theta_s$ [cm$^3$ cm$^{-3}$]</th>
<th>$\theta_r$ [cm$^3$ cm$^{-3}$]</th>
<th>$k_s$ [cm d$^{-1}$]</th>
<th>$l$ [-]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.0532</td>
<td>1.081</td>
<td>0.489</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15.46</td>
<td>-8.823</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

in which $\theta$ is the volumetric moisture content [cm$^3$ cm$^{-3}$], $\theta_s$ and $\theta_r$ saturated and residual moisture content respectively [cm$^3$ cm$^{-3}$], $h$ soil matric head [cm], $k$ hydraulic conductivity [cm d$^{-1}$], $k_s$ saturated hydraulic conductivity [cm d$^{-1}$] and $a_g$ [cm$^{-1}$], $n$ and $l$ [-] are empirical parameters with $m = 1 - \frac{1}{n}$.

During the field experiment combined measurements of $\theta$ by TDR and $h$ by tensiometry were made at 3 plots (Fig. 2.3). The saturated moisture content $\theta_s$ of 20 undisturbed 100 cm$^3$ samples was determined in the laboratory yielding a field average value of 0.489 [cm$^3$ cm$^{-3}$]. The resulting set of $\theta(h)$ data, however, provided insufficient information over the entire moisture content range to fit the empirical parameters in (3.42). Therefore, values found in literature [39, Wösten et al., 1994] for clay soils were used to describe $\theta(h)$ and $k(h)$ (Table 3.1). By adjusting only for $\theta_s$, the chosen retention curve fitted well (visually) through the measured $\theta(h)$ data from the experimental site.

Grain size distribution

During installation of the ground water and neutron probe access tubes, disturbed samples were collected to a depth of 200 cm. The grain size distribu-
tion of some samples was analyzed according to the standard procedure used by the BGG ("Bedrijfs laboratorium voor Grond- en Gewasonderzoek", Oosterbeek, The Netherlands). This procedure includes sieving of mineral fractions > 50 μm whereas fractions < 50 μm are separated by a technique based upon differences in sedimentation speed for particles of different size.

In total 4 samples were analyzed, being mixed samples of different locations from depth 30 - 40 cm, 70 - 90 cm, 130 - 150 cm and 190 - 200 cm. The resulting mass fractions are given in Table 3.2. Obviously the clay and silt percentage (fraction < 2 μm and 2-50 μm respectively) gradually decrease with depth while the percentage sand (50-2000 μm) increases. The textural soil class of the layers according to Table 3.2 changes from clay to sandy clay loam, sandy loam and finally loamy sand [19, Koorevaar et al., 1983].

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>fraction [μm]</th>
<th>0-2</th>
<th>2-16</th>
<th>16-50</th>
<th>50-105</th>
<th>105-150</th>
<th>150-210</th>
<th>210-300</th>
<th>300-2000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-2</td>
<td>54.3</td>
<td>17.2</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-16</td>
<td>30.8</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td>5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-50</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>15.9</td>
<td>23.3</td>
<td>23.5</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-105</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>15.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>105-150</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>150-210</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>23.3</td>
<td>23.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>210-300</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td>20.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>300-2000</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 3.2: Average grain size distribution at experimental site**

**Shrinking characteristic**

The behaviour of a clay soil with respect to swelling and shrinkage during wetting and drying, described by the shrinking characteristic, strongly depends upon the clay mineral types found in a specific soil. The clay type found at the experimental site in the upper layer to ≈ 60 cm depth was determined qualitatively in the laboratory by X-ray analysis and consisted mainly of montmorillonite (at least 50%) with smaller percentages of kaolinite and illite. The shrinking characteristic was chosen according to results presented in literature for a similar soil, namely heavy river clay from Bruchem, The Netherlands [5, Bronswijk, 1991].

In the general shrinkage characteristic four shrinkage stages are distinguished: structural, normal, residual and zero phase. The shrinkage characteristic shown in Figure 3.7 is described by [15, Kim, 1992]:

\[ e(\nu) = \alpha \exp(\beta \nu) + \gamma \nu \]  

(3.44)
in which $e$ and $\nu$ are void ratio and moisture ratio respectively, described by $e = \frac{V_p}{V_w}$ and $\nu = \frac{V_s}{V_p}$ where $V_p$, $V_s$ and $V_w$ are total pore volume, solid volume and water volume [cm$^{-3}$] respectively. The parameters $\alpha$, $\beta$ and $\gamma$ describe the shrinkage characteristic in the residual shrinkage phase. Values of the dimensionless fitting parameters $e_0$, $\nu_1$ and $\nu_s$, which determine the transition between the different shrinkage stages, are given in Table 3.3 for the Bruchem river clay. Additional parameters which are needed for model validation are the depth $S_c$ at which the crack area $A_c$ for surface infiltration is calculated, a geometry factor $R_s$, a rate coefficient for bypass flow to drains or ditches $k_d$ and a polygon diameter $D$ (see 4.3.5).

![Diagram](image)

Figure 3.7: The general shrinking characteristic with the parameters $e_0$, $\nu_1$ and $\nu_s$.

Table 3.3: Dimensionless fitting parameters and model parameters describing the shrinking characteristic of the Bruchem heavy river clay

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$e_0$ [-]</th>
<th>$\nu_1$ [-]</th>
<th>$\nu_s$ [-]</th>
<th>$S_c$ [cm]</th>
<th>$R_s$ [-]</th>
<th>$D$ [cm]</th>
<th>$k_d$ [s$^{-1}$]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-5.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.6.3. Soil evaporation

Measurements of soil evaporation resulted in a data set of evaporation from 6 microlysimeter pairs for the period of August 11 to 15 and fully grown maize. The cumulative evaporation during this period is plotted in Figure 3.8. From this data set the constants used in two different models to calculate soil evaporation can be calculated.

The Black model [2, Black et al., 1969] was one of the earliest parametric models to estimate the bare soil evaporation. The model describes the cumulative actual evaporation as:

\[ \sum E_{act} = \alpha_B t^{\frac{1}{2}} \]  

(3.45)

in which \( \alpha_B \) is a parameter characterizing the evaporation process [mm d\(^{-0.5}\)] and \( t \) is time after preceding rainfall [d]. Black obtained an \( \alpha_B \) value of 5 mm d\(^{-0.5}\). Klaghofer [16, 1974] obtained a value of 7 mm d\(^{-0.5}\). From the experimental data over the period August 11 to 15, a value of 4.7 mm d\(^{-0.5}\) is obtained.

The disadvantage of the Black model is that the value of \( \alpha_B \) depends implicitly upon the potential evaporation \( E_{pot} \) which may vary for instance between 1 and 6 mm d\(^{-1}\) in The Netherlands. Therefore, Boesten and Stroosnijder [4, 1986] developed a new model in which the constant \( \beta \) does not depend on \( E_{pot} \). This parametric model is described by:

\[ \begin{align*}
\sum E_{act} &= \sum E_{pot} & \text{for } \sum E_{pot} \leq \beta^2 \\
\sum E_{act} &= \beta (\sum E_{pot})^{\frac{1}{2}} & \text{for } \sum E_{pot} > \beta^2
\end{align*} \]  

(3.46)

in which \( \beta \) [mm\(^{0.5}\)] is an evaporative soil parameter determined experimentally. Boesten and Stroosnijder [4, 1986] found a value of 1.7 mm\(^{0.5}\). From the data of our experimental site a value of 1.9 mm\(^{0.5}\) was obtained.

3.7. Crop development

The field average crop height \( h_c \) was difficult to determine because the variation over the field was quite large, varying from 1.5 to 2.5 m by the end of the growing season. The finally estimated average value, used to determine the roughness length \( z_0 \) and displacement height \( d \) according to (2.2) and (2.3), is shown in Figure 3.9. Also presented in Figure 3.9 is the leaf area index LAI which reached its maximum in the middle of August.

The increase of rooting depth during the growing season was difficult to determine due to practical problems with the hard dry soil in July. However, at three days an estimate of rooting depth was obtained yielding a rooting depth of 20 cm at June 15, 50 cm at June 23 and 110 cm at August 15. The course of
the rooting depth over the growing season was estimated by linear interpolation between these data. Since the maximum ground water level was only 130 cm below the soil surface, it is assumed that the crop did not suffer any severe water shortage during the field experiment.

The root density profile was determined in the laboratory from samples taken in August over 0-84 cm depth. One sampling profile was taken between plants within a row and a second profile in between rows. The number of roots found in the first profile was significantly higher than in the second, in both cases the vertical root density distribution was rather irregular. For modelling purposes it was assumed that roots are distributed vertically uniform over the soil profile.

3.8. Water budget comparison

The vertical soil moisture profiles can be used to calculate the change of water storage in the soil profile. According to (3.1) this soil moisture depletion $\Delta S_w$ may be compared with actual evapotranspiration $ET_{act}$ over a drying period when assuming that the inflow $Q_i$ and outflow $Q_o$ to the field are negligible. Results for several periods with no precipitation are given in Table 3.4. The field average value of $\Delta S_w$ was calculated over the zone from the soil surface to about 20 cm below measured ground water level in order to eliminate the effect of fluctuations in neutron probe measurements.

Apparently the soil moisture depletion over short term periods yields values which are generally lower than $ET_{act}$ over the same period. However, the determination of $\Delta S_w$ over these short periods is not considered very accurate. Changes
Figure 3.9: Average crop height (*) and leaf area index (o) during the growing season

of soil moisture content $\theta$ in the top soil layer (0-30 cm) contribute for a great deal to $\Delta S_w$ while measurements in this layer are not very reliable due to crack formation. Over the entire experimental period, however, the profile from 0 to about 140 cm depth contributes to the changes in soil moisture content and the separate water budget terms should be comparable. Considering this period, the difference between $\Delta S_w$ and cumulative $ET_{act}$ yields 219 mm which is indeed very close to the total amount of precipitation ($P = 206$ mm).

Table 3.4: Comparison of actual evapotranspiration and soil moisture depletion during drying periods and over the entire growing season

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>period</th>
<th>$\Delta S_w$ [mm]</th>
<th>$ET_{act}$ [mm]</th>
<th>$ET_{act} - \Delta S_w$ [mm]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>June 14 - 17</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 17 - 20</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 28 - 30</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 30 - July 4</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 4 - 10</td>
<td>18.1</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>-4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 17 - 24</td>
<td>18.8</td>
<td>22.6</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 24 - Aug 7</td>
<td>23.7</td>
<td>37.4</td>
<td>13.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aug 14 - 18</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>7.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 3 - Sept 8</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>275</td>
<td>219</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4. Model Description

4.1. Introduction

Models are valuable tools to study and predict terms of the vertical water budget. Simulation of transpiration and crop production in an agricultural system indicates for instance whether supplemental irrigation is justified under specified conditions. Both models tested within this project are one-dimensional models developed to study processes in the ground water-soil-vegetation-atmosphere system.

The model DAIR (DAily IRrigation) was originally developed in 1981 by the Department of Mathematical Modelling in Hydrology, WRI, Bratislava. Part of the model subroutines were improved in 1983 during a study stay at the Wageningen Agricultural University [25, Petrovic, 1984]. Within the framework of the Danubian lowland study in the Gabcikovo dam area, an adjusted version of the model called DINUND (Danube INUNDation) was developed to include also floodplain vegetation and hydrological conditions.

The model SWAP93 (Soil Water Atmosphere Plant, version 1993) is an improved version of the physically based model SWATRE [11, Feddes et al., 1978]; [1, Belmans et al., 1983]. The main changes relevant to this study are an improvement of the discretization and solution scheme of the Richards' equation, adjusted top boundary conditions during infiltration and implementation of the Van Genuchten parameters to calculate the soil hydraulic functions [38, Work group SWAP, 1994]. Recently a crack module was added to the model which calculates the effect of swelling and shrinkage in clay soils on the water budget terms.

DAIR is a conceptual, quasi steady state model operating internally with a one day time-step. SWAP is a physically based model, hence it contains fewer assumptions regarding the physics of unsaturated flow. Therefore the internal time-steps are much smaller, depending upon changes in the system. Both models use daily potential evapotranspiration as input at the upper boundary condition. At the bottom boundary SWAP needs input like daily ground water level or pressured head values, in DAIR the ground water level at the bottom boundary is the result of computed fluxes and water balance.
4.2. Model DAIR

4.2.1. Composition of the model

The input data of DAIR consist of three groups:

- formal parameters

- parameters describing soil-physical properties, irrigation regime and vegetation cover development (with a possibility to choose crop rotation for 4 to 8 agricultural plant types)

- daily meteorological input data (precipitation, air temperature and humidity).

Based upon the daily meteorological input the model calculates the potential evapotranspiration $ET_{pot}$, the actual evapotranspiration $ET_{act}$, total soil moisture in the selected soil layer $SM$, seepage as a contribution to the ground water reservoir $Q_{seep}$, the ground water level $h_{gw}$, capillary rise from ground water level to the unsaturated soil profile $Q_{cap}$ and contribution of the model areal unit to the runoff from the area $Q_{o}$ as a function of ground water level. The evaluation of all calculated data is running simultaneously for a natural moisture regime of the area and for a regime with supplementary irrigation.

The present version of the model can work all year round for a maximum of 50 years. Formal limitations force the model to start at January 1, computations can stop at any time. Since in this study only data collected during the growing season is available for model validation, the model description is limited to parts relevant for this period. A brief model description was given previously in several publications [25, Petrovic, 1984]; [26, Petrovic, 1989]; [17, Koopmans, 1990].

4.2.2. Upper boundary condition

At the upper boundary the potential evapotranspiration is calculated according to Budyko’s method. After a long term study this method was simplified to a set of nomograms for different geo-botanical zones by the Russian State Hydrological Institute [32, 1976]. The nomograms yield monthly values of potential evapotranspiration for individual or in some cases combined months. Based upon the mean climatic characteristics, the nomogram for a forest-steppe is most suitable for the Slovakian lowlands in which the field experiment was situated (Fig. 4.1). The monthly $ET_{pot}$-values obtained from this nomogram by digitalization were divided by the number of days in each month, yielding daily values of $ET_{pot}$ as a function of vapour pressure deficit $VPD$ in tabular form.
To eliminate non-homogeneous jumps caused by crossing the boundary between two months or two given values of VPD, the model uses planar interpolation. By assuming that the curve of $ET_{pot}$ versus $VPD$ is valid exactly in the middle of a specific month the interpolation between neighbouring months according to the date is processed. A similar interpolation is done to obtain the exact value of $VPD$ at a specific day. This procedure allows to estimate the value of $ET_{pot}$ for every day individually. The resulting values which are used in the model are given in Appendix C.

Figure 4.1: Monthly potential evapotranspiration as a function of saturation deficit according to Budyko's method for a forest steppe

4.2.3. Soil moisture, seepage and capillary rise

In DAIR, the total precipitation amount is supposed to infiltrate into the modelled soil column with depth $D$. Interception is neglected by assuming that all intercepted rainfall evaporates but uses practically the same energy like water
transpired by the crop, hence the total amount of evapotranspiration is not influenced by interception.

The hydraulic characteristics needed are the retention and hydraulic conductivity curves \( \theta(h) \) and \( k(h) \). From these characteristics the values of porosity \( \phi \), field capacity \( SM_{fc} \), wilting point \( SM_{wp} \) and available soil moisture \( SM_{av} \) are determined. The soil moisture \( SM \) is considered to be the total amount of water stored in the simulated soil column. After a rainfall event, the value of \( SM \) is increased by the amount of infiltrating precipitation. In case that the calculated value of \( SM \) exceeds the field capacity, all surplus water is considered to be seepage contributing to the ground water reservoir.

Capillary rise is included in DAIR for ground water levels less than 2 m below the reference level (which is usually the root zone depth) and soil moisture values less than \( SM_{fc} \). Since usually only a limited range of ground water levels and \( SM \)-values are simulated, it is assumed that the saturated capillary rise \( Q_{cap1} \) [mm d\(^{-1}\)] can be calculated according to:

\[
Q_{cap1} = \begin{cases} 
\frac{DEF + ET_{act}}{R_{DEF}} & \text{for roots in saturated zone} \\
0 & \text{for } DGR > 2 \text{ m or } Q_{cap1} < 0.001
\end{cases}
\]

in which \( DGR \) is depth of ground water level below the root zone and values of \( gf1co1 \) and \( gf1co2 \) can be evaluated by the least squares method from laboratory data of upward flow of water for a specific soil layer or by special processing of the \( \theta(h) \) curve for the expected range of ground water levels.

Analysis of the matrix of capillary rise for Ziharec obtained by solving the upward flux depending upon the soil moisture content and depth of ground water level showed that the combined drafting force and soil drying processes can be simplified as:

\[
DEF = SM_{fc} - SM \\
R_{DEF} = \begin{cases} 
1 & \text{for } DEF \geq 0.4SM_{av} \\
2.5 \frac{DEF}{SM_{av}} & \text{for } DEF < 0.4SM_{av}
\end{cases} \\
Q_{cap2} = Q_{cap1} R_{DEF} & \text{for roots in saturated zone for } DGR > 0
\]

### 4.2.4. Actual evapotranspiration

The evaluation of the actual evapotranspiration for the simulated crop consists of two steps. The first step concerns the calculation of crop potential evapotranspi-
ration, in the second step the actual evapotranspiration is calculated depending upon crop potential evapotranspiration and actual soil moisture.

According to the FAO [9, Doorenbos and Pruitt, 1977] the potential evapotranspiration obtained by the method described in 5.1 can be considered as the comparable evapotranspiration $ET_0$. The potential evapotranspiration for a specific crop can be calculated according to:

$$ET_{crop} = k_c ET_0$$  \(4.5\)

in which $k_c$ is a crop factor. Values of $k_c$ are given for nearly 40 crop types by Doorenbos and Pruitt [9, 1977].

The use of a simple calendar based relationship between the actual day in a growing season and stage of the plant development does not account for the yearly meteorological variability, especially in long time series processing. To eliminate the effects of such a variability, which is significantly dependent upon the meteorological history in a specific growing season, the sum of positive daily air temperatures was introduced as a parameter quantifying the crop development process. This parameter is used to obtain the actual value of the crop factor $k_c$, root zone depth $d$, and for irrigation purposes a lower limit of critical soil moisture.

The actual evapotranspiration depends on the soil moisture $SM$ according to:

$$ET_{act} = f(ET_{crop}, SM) = ET_{crop}f(SM)$$  \(4.6\)

in which $f(SM)$ represents a reduction factor by recomputing the actual evapotranspiration from crop potential evapotranspiration and actual soil moisture or relative soil moisture deficit.

Petrovic [25, 1984] showed that there is a large variability in the estimation of (4.6). Therefore, the relationship shown in Figure 4.2 was included in DAIR and is given by:

$$ET_{act} = \begin{cases} 
ET_{crop} & \text{for } SM \geq SM_{crit} \\
ET_{crop} \frac{SM_{max}}{SM_{aw}} & \text{for } SM_{wp} < SM < SM_{crit} \\
0 & \text{for } SM \leq SM_{wp}
\end{cases}$$  \(4.7\)

$$SM_{res} = SM - SM_{wp}$$  \(4.8\)

with $SM_{crit}$ within the range of the possible boundary between readily and not readily available soil moisture ($2.8 < pF < 2.0$) and $SM_{res}$ is the total soil moisture above wilting pointing. The critical soil moisture $SM_{crit}$ (in Fig. 4.2 shown as CRISMC) represents the value below which a next decrease of soil moisture will cause a decrease of $ET_{act}$ and can change within the growing season and from plant to plant type. It is than the lower boundary of readily available soil moisture and is one of the parameters which can be used for fine tuning of the model. As a rule, $SM_{crit}$ is equal to $SM_{fc}$ in the first run of the model.
4.2.5. Ground water level and runoff

The ground water level and runoff in DAIR are results of the simulated vertical hydrological balance. It is supposed that the runoff from the area $Q_o$ exceeds the flow to the area $Q_i$, hence the calculated runoff represents just the contribution of the model areal unit to the runoff from the region.

Seepage contributes to the ground water reservoir, resulting in a ground water level rise whereas capillary rise uses water from this reservoir and causes a decrease of the ground water level $h_{gw}$. To evaluate changes of $h_{gw}$ in the soil layer with given porosity equal to $\theta_o$, the penetration coefficient was introduced. In the present application the penetration coefficient $C_{pen}$ [m mm$^{-1}$] represents the change of ground water level $h_{gw}$ expressed in meters caused by an equivalent of 1 mm water layer of seepage or capillary rise (hysteresis is neglected). As a first approximation the $C_{pen}$ can be described by:

$$C_{pen} = \frac{0.1}{\theta_o}$$ (4.9)

The initial or step by step computed ground water level is the base for runoff estimation. During the development of DAIR the application of three basic relations to compute runoff was proposed. Each of these functions may either be used separately or as a weighed contribution to simulated runoff. The most simple
approach calculates runoff as a linear function of ground water level:

\[ Q_o = a + b h_{gw} \]  \hspace{1cm} (4.10)

in which \( a \) and \( b \) are tuning parameters which can be different for separate soil layers. The second approach is based on the bucket concept and is expressed by:

\[ Q_o = c 10^{d h_{gw}} \]  \hspace{1cm} (4.11)

with \( c \) and \( d \) again tuning parameters which are constant over the entire ground water level range. The final approach is based on the antecedent precipitation index (API) concept. A modification was made to delimit the expected range of ground water levels by defining the relative ground water level \( h_{gwref} \):

\[
\frac{h_{gwref} - h_{gw\text{max}}}{h_{gwmax} - h_{gw\text{min}}}, \quad h_{gw\text{max}} \text{ deeper than } h_{gw\text{min}} \hspace{1cm} (4.12)
\]

The runoff is then computed according to:

\[ Q_o = C_{API} API \cdot h_{gwref} \]  \hspace{1cm} (4.13)

in which \( C_{API} \) is again a tuning coefficient.

The contribution of the model areal unit to the runoff is composed as a linear combination of the possible approaches (4.10), (4.11) and (4.13). The computed runoff causes a decrease of ground water level estimated in a manner like for seepage and capillary rise.

4.2.6. Additional options in DAIR

From a hydrological research point of view, it is worthwhile to mention that the DAIR model contains a snow routine, including snow pack accumulation, evaporation and melting processes. Furthermore, there is an option to simulate preferential flow through vertical soil cracks.

Evaluation of irrigation and the natural regime are performed completely parallel. There is a relatively large possibility to describe parameters for supplementary irrigation dosage and time scheduling. During a computation run it is assumed in the model that an irrigation dose is applied immediately when needed.

Processing of long term data series allows evaluation of trends of different variables like potential and actual evapotranspiration or needed amounts of supplementary irrigation. This aspect is very interesting when studying the impact of climatic change under continental conditions.
4.3. Model SWAP93

4.3.1. The basic flow equation

The flow of water in a heterogeneous soil-root system can be described by the one-dimensional Richards’ equation extended by a sink term $S$ for plant water uptake:

$$\frac{\partial \theta}{\partial t} = \frac{\partial}{\partial z} \left[ k(\theta) \left( \frac{\partial h}{\partial z} + 1 \right) - S(h, ET_{pot}) \right]$$  \hspace{1cm} (4.14)

in which the vertical coordinate $z$ [cm] is taken positive downward. The sink term $S$ [cm d$^{-1}$] represents the water uptake by plant roots. The integral of the sink term over the rooting depth $z_r$ yields the actual transpiration $T_{act}$ or water uptake rate:

$$T_{act} = \int_{x=0}^{x=z_r} S \, dz$$  \hspace{1cm} (4.15)

Several authors have attempted to describe the function of $S$ in terms of Ohm’s law. In that case the water uptake rate is assumed to be directly proportional to the pressure head difference between the soil and the root interior, the soil hydraulic conductivity and a root “effectiveness” function [10, Feddes et al., 1974]. One of the major difficulties, however, remains the determination of this root effectiveness function. Therefore a more simplistic description was developed in which the water uptake is a direct function of pressure head, assuming that there is no difference between water uptake of the different roots over the entire root profile.

The general shape of the sink term $S$ used in the model SWAP is shown in Figure 4.3. The assumptions made in the description of $S$ are: under conditions wetter than the anaerobiosis point $h_1$ and conditions dryer than the wilting point $h_4$, water uptake by roots quickly reaches zero. The water uptake is maximal between the pressure head values $h_2$ and $h_3$ of which $h_3$ is the value below which roots cannot extract water optimally anymore. The position of $h_3$ depends upon the evaporative demand of the atmosphere, being $h_{3H}$ for a high evaporative demand equal to 0.5 cm d$^{-1}$ and $h_{3L}$ for a low evaporative demand of 0.1 cm d$^{-1}$.

The term $\alpha$ in Figure 4.3 is described according to:

$$\alpha(h) = \frac{S(h)}{S_{\text{max}}}$$  \hspace{1cm} (4.16)

Combining (4.15) and (4.16) yields:

$$T_{act} = \int_{x=0}^{x=z_r} \alpha(h) S_{\text{max}} \, dz$$  \hspace{1cm} (4.17)
Under conditions of potential transpiration the root water uptake is maximal hence $\alpha = 1$, yielding:

$$ T_{pot} = S_{\max} \int_{z=0}^{z=r} dz \iff S_{\max} = \frac{T_{pot}}{z_r} \quad (4.18) $$

The Richards' equation (4.14) is a highly non-linear differential equation since $k(\theta)$ and $S(\theta(\theta), ET_{pot})$ depend upon the actual solution $\theta(z,t)$. Therefore, (4.14) can only be solved numerically for which the soil hydraulic properties $\theta(h)$ and $k(h)$, the initial conditions and boundary conditions at top and bottom of the soil system are needed.

![Figure 4.3: General shape of the sink term $S$ as a function of pressure head and evaporative demand used in SWAP93 [Feddes et al., 1974]](image)

4.3.2. Initial conditions and soil physical properties

In SWAP the hydraulic properties $\theta(h)$ and $k(h)$ are described analytically by the Van Genuchten equations (3.42) and (3.43). The hydraulic properties can be specified for different layers with a maximum of 5. The hysteresis option included in the model is not used in this study, hence only parameters for the drying or desorption curve are given ($a_{\text{desorption}} = a_{\text{adsorption}}$).

The initial conditions can be specified as either the volumetric soil moisture content $\theta$ or pressure head $h$ at each nodal point. A third option is to start with pressure head values calculated by the model as being in equilibrium with the initial ground water level.
4.3.3. Bottom boundary conditions

Several options are available to describe the boundary conditions at the bottom of the modelled soil system. When the lower part of the soil column remains saturated during the entire calculation period the input can be given as a prescribed daily ground water level, a prescribed flux from the saturated zone or as a flux calculated by the model to a deep aquifer or the saturated zone. In case that the soil column remains unsaturated over the entire simulated depth during the calculation period, the bottom boundary can be described as a prescribed pressure head, a zero flux condition or free drainage.

4.3.4. Upper boundary conditions

At the upper boundary the model SWAP calculates the potential evapotranspiration $ET_{pot}$ from daily values of meteorological input data like net radiation, air temperature, air humidity and wind velocity at 2 m height. Which input data are needed depends upon the chosen method: Priestley-Taylor, Penman, Monteith-Rijtema or Makkink (see 3.3). Furthermore, the input includes daily values of precipitation or, in case the clay module is used, 30 minute values of precipitation.

Based upon the potential evapotranspiration $ET_{pot}$ and precipitation $P$ the maximum possible flux through the canopy $T_{pot}$ and through the surface $q_s$ are determined. The following relationship was adopted to calculate $T_{pot}$:

$$T_{pot} = ET_{pot} - E_{pot}$$  \quad (4.19)

in which $E_{pot}$ is the potential soil evaporation.

Originally $E_{pot}$ in the SWAP model can be calculated according to two methods. In the version used for this study, however, only the method described by Belmans et al. [1, 1983] was used:

$$E_{pot} = ET_{pot} \exp (-0.6LAI)$$  \quad (4.20)

Once values of $ET_{pot}$ and $E_{pot}$ are known, $T_{pot}$ is calculated according to (4.19) and used to determine the maximum possible root water uptake $S_{max}$ in (4.18). The actual evapotranspiration $ET_{act}$ is calculated as the sum of actual transpiration $T_{act}$ given by (4.17) and actual evaporation $E_{act}$. The latter is obtained by applying either the reduction model of Black (3.45) or Boesten (3.46).

The maximum possible flux through the soil surface consists of two components:

$$q_s = E_{act} - (P - I)$$  \quad (4.21)
in which \( I \) is the intercepted rainfall [mm d\(^{-1}\)]. The flux \( q_a \) is positive in case of evaporation and negative during infiltration. The difference between rainfall and intercepted rainfall is that part of the rainfall that eventually reaches the soil surface (throughfall). In the used model version \( I \) was calculated according to (2.12).

4.3.5. Crack module

Recently a crack module was added to the SWAP model which can be used to describe changes in the vertical water movement due to swelling and shrinkage in clay soils. Swelling and shrinkage are supposed to follow a polygon pattern at the surface. Through the specified shrinkage characteristic SWAP calculates the crack depth and relative cross sectional area of the cracks at the soil surface. The matrix and crack infiltration is calculated separately according to [5, Bronswijk, 1991]:

\[
P_t < I_{\text{max}} \quad I_m = A_m P_t \\
P_t > I_{\text{max}} \quad I_m = A_m I_{\text{max}} \\
I_c = A_c (P_t - I_{\text{max}}) + A_c P_t
\]

in which \( P_t \) is rainfall intensity [m s\(^{-1}\)], \( I_{\text{max}} \) maximum infiltration rate of soil matrix [m s\(^{-1}\)], \( I_m \) and \( I_c \) infiltration into soil matrix and cracks respectively [m s\(^{-1}\)] and \( A_m \) and \( A_c \) relative area of soil matrix respectively cracks [-].

As shown in Figure 4.4, water stored in the cracks \( W_c \) will either be absorbed by the soil matrix represented by the flux \( q_{c,m} \) or flow rapidly to nearby drains or ditches represented by \( q_{c,d} \). The absorption flux \( q_{c,i} \) to soil compartment \( i \) can be described by:

\[
q_{c,i} = -k(h_i) \frac{\partial H}{\partial x} = -k(h_i) \frac{h_i}{4D}
\]

in which \( H \) is soil water potential [m] and \( x \) horizontal distance [m]. The total soil matrix flux \( q_{c,m} \) is the sum of all compartment fluxes \( q_{c,i} \) between the bottom of the crack and the water level in the crack. The bypass flow to drains or ditches \( q_{c,d} \) is calculated similar to linear reservoirs:

\[
q_{c,d} = k_d W_c
\]

in which \( k_d \) is the rate coefficient for bypass flow to drains or ditches [s\(^{-1}\)]. The change of water storage in the crack is finally calculated as:

\[
\frac{\partial W_c}{\partial t} = I_c - q_{c,m} - q_{c,d}
\]
Input data needed specifically for the crack module are rainfall intensity and the parameters $e_0$, $\nu_1$ and $\nu_2$ describing the shrinkage characteristic (3.44). Furthermore, the depth $S_c$ at which the crack area $A_c$ for surface infiltration is calculated, a geometry factor $R_s$ and values of $k_d$ and $D$ are needed.

![Diagram of water fluxes in a cracked soil](image)

Figure 4.4: Schematic picture of water fluxes in a cracked soil [Bronswijk, 1988]

4.3.6. Additional changes

To validate SWAP93 using the data obtained in the Ziharec field experiment, some changes were made to the original model described in the instructions manual [38, Work group SWAP, 1994]. First, the model originally calculates the leaf area index $LAI$ from soil cover whereas in the adjusted version $LAI$ is also direct input. This $LAI$ is used to calculate the potential evaporation according to (4.20).

Second, the original precipitation-interception function in SWAP was also based on soil cover. This function was replaced by equation (2.12) obtained for maize by Schmidt and Mueller [33, 1991].
5. **MODEL VALIDATION**

5.1. **Results DAIR**

The data collected during the field experiment were used to validate the model DAIR. Since model calculations must start at January 1, data collected at the meteorological station in Ziharec were used for the period prior to the start of the experiment. Only results for the period during which the field experiment was carried out are presented here.

For the start of the model simulations with DAIR at Jan 1 the initial conditions were optimized in order to obtain agreement with measured ground water level at the start of the field experiment (June 3). Additional input data were measured daily mean values of air temperature, air humidity and daily precipitation.

At the upper boundary the potential evapotranspiration was calculated according to Budyko's method multiplied by a crop factor according to (4.5). The crop factor $k_c$ was taken as 1.05 during crop stage 3 and 0.6 during crop stage 4 (Table 5.1) according to Doorenbos and Pruitt [9, 1977]. Resulting $ET_{pot}$ values of Budyko's method are compared to $ET_{pot}$ calculated by the Priestley-Taylor method. For the latter, only data obtained directly from the field experiment are used. Figure 5.1 shows that Budyko's method yields a more uniform pattern with less extreme values than the Priestley-Taylor method. Obviously, this difference is caused by the limited values of $ET_{pot}$ during a specific month as given in appendix C for Budyko's method, whereas the Priestley-Taylor method is based on daily measured meteorological data and hence has no specified upper or lower limits. The cumulative potential evapotranspiration over the field experimental period, however, is rather similar for both methods: 392 and 374 [mm] for Budyko's and Priestley-Taylor method respectively. To obtain the cumulative values, $ET_{pot}$ was estimated from standard meteorological data when field data were missing.

The actual evapotranspiration is calculated from potential evapotranspiration and available soil moisture according to (4.6) and (4.7). The value of critical soil moisture $SM_{crit}$ in (4.7) was chosen equal to $SM_{fc}$ in the first computation run hence the dashed diagonal in Figure 4.2 represents the applied reduction. In case actual evapotranspiration calculated by a different method is available, the value of $SM_{crit}$ could be used to tune and adjust model results. Within the
Table 5.1: Crop factors used in DAIR according to FAO standards [Doorenbos and Pruitt, 1977]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>crop</th>
<th>stage</th>
<th>humidity</th>
<th>$RH_{\text{min}} &gt; 70%$</th>
<th>$RH_{\text{min}} &lt; 20%$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>wind speed [m s$^{-1}$]</td>
<td>0-5</td>
<td>5-8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>corn</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 5.1: Potential evapotranspiration calculated by Budyko’s method (**) and Priestley-Taylor method (—)

framework of this study, however, no results of additional methods were used. The value of $SM_{av}$ is obtained after calculating the ground water level $h_{gw}$ and runoff $Q_0$ for which three methods are available given by (4.10), (4.11) and (4.13). Since it appeared that simulated $ET_{act}$ in this study was hardly influenced by the chosen $Q_o$ method (maximum daily difference 0.6 [mm], cumulative 7.6 [mm]), only results obtained when using (4.13) are presented here.

The resulting simulated values of $ET_{act}$ and field results obtained by the standard flux profile method are shown in Figure 5.2. During periods for which field data are missing, $ET_{act}$ was estimated from standard meteorological data. Figure 5.2a clearly shows that the deviation between simulated and measured values is rather large during the starting period and middle part of the field experiment, with simulated values being structurally lower respectively higher than field data. Possible causes of these deviations may be found in determination of $ET_{pot}$ or
reduction of $ET_{pot}$ to $ET_{act}$ based on available soil moisture. Since the differences in $ET_{pot}$ from measured data (Priestley-Taylor method) and long-term climatic characteristics (Budyko's method) during these periods don't show similar large structural deviations (Fig. 5.1), the cause probably lies in the runoff or soil moisture routine.

Figure 5.2: Simulated values of daily actual evapotranspiration (a) and cumulative values (b) (**) by DAIR compared to field data (−).

The ground water level $h_{gw}$ is computed from calculated seepage $Q_{seep}$ and capillary rise $Q_{cap}$ as described in 4.2. The empirical coefficients $qflco1$ and $qflco2$ needed to calculate $Q_{cap}$ by (4.1) were obtained from the soil water retention curve $\theta(h)$. The penetration coefficient $C_{pen}$ describing the change of $h_{gw}$ due to seepage or capillary rise was chosen as the reciprocal value of saturated moisture content $\theta_s$. The resulting simulated and measured ground water level are shown in Figure 5.3. The general trend of decreasing $h_{gw}$ during the field experiment is followed rather well during a drying period like in the middle part of the experiment. However, the sharp increase of $h_{gw}$ to about 30 cm below soil surface in June as well as the changes after sequential wetting and drying in the last weeks of the experiment are not found in simulated values. The sharp increase to 30 cm was caused by continuing rainfall which could not be stored anymore in the nearly saturated soil profile. The incapability of DAIR to simulate such short term changes, indicates that the soil moisture routine is not functioning properly as
found also for \( ET_{act} \) calculations (Fig. 5.2a).

Figure 5.3: Ground water level simulated by DAIR (**) and field measured data (—)

5.2. Results SWAP93

The verification of the model SWAP93 was performed with the Priestley-Taylor method to calculate potential evapotranspiration at the upper boundary. At the bottom boundary, measured daily ground water level was given as input. The soil profile was taken as a one-layer system of 2 m depth with the hydraulic characteristics as presented in Table 3.1. As initial condition the measured soil moisture content at each nodal point was used (40 nodes) with intermediate values obtained by linear interpolation. Additional input data like leaf area index and rooting depth were all according to measured data. The resulting standard input file is given in Appendix D. In order to test the impact of the crack module described in 4.3.5, the results of two model simulation runs are described here being one run without and one including simulation of crack formation. When using the crack module, additional required input data are precipitation at 30 min intervals and parameters characterizing the shrinking characteristic (Table 3.3).

The potential evapotranspiration calculated by SWAP is 402 mm which is slightly higher than results presented in 3.5 (374 mm) since the soil heat flux \( G \) in
(3.36) is ignored. As mentioned in 3.3.4, the $ET_{pot}$ resulting from the Priestley-Taylor method can be considered as a reference value which formally should be multiplied by a crop factor, this is however not standard practice and also not included in SWAP.

The model splits $ET_{pot}$ into potential evaporation $E_{pot}$ and transpiration $T_{pot}$ according to (4.19). The result is shown in Fig. 5.4. For the reduction of $E_{pot}$ the Boesten model (3.46) was used with coefficient $\beta = 0.63 \text{ cm}^{0.5}$ and the potential transpiration $T_{pot}$ is reduced according to (4.15). The resulting $ET_{act} = E_{act} + T_{act}$ is shown in Figure 5.5 for model runs with and without simulating soil crack formation. Obviously, the model run without implementing the crack module yields a reasonable simulation of measured actual evapotranspiration $ET_{act}$ throughout the growing season with an average deviation between measured and simulated values of 0.6 mm. Relatively large differences are found on day 165 (2.8 mm) and in the period from day 234 to 240 during which however no field data are available and $ET_{act}$ was estimated from standard meteorological data of the Ziharec station. The cumulative evapotranspiration over the growing season is simulated very well, yielding a total $ET_{act}$ of 280 mm which is equal to the measured value.

Implementation of the crack module causes a sharp decrease of $ET_{act}$ during the first part of the field experiment (Fig. 5.5a). This result is mainly caused by a strong decrease of evaporation compared to the former model run as shown in Figure 5.6. Since the calculation and reduction of $E_{pot}$ is not influenced directly by crack formation, the effect of the crack module is obviously a smaller maximum Darcian flux at the surface which causes lower simulated values of $E_{act}$. During the dry-down period in July, the value of $E_{act}$ becomes negligible and hence the difference between simulation runs with and without crack formation gets smaller.

![Figure 5.4: Potential evaporation $E_{pot}$ and transpiration $T_{pot}$ calculated by the model SWAP](image-url)
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Figure 5.5: Daily values of actual evapotranspiration (a) and cumulative values (b) from field data (solid) and SWAP calculations (** no cracks, oo cracks simulated)

The model SWAP yields as output daily values of the volumetric soil moisture content $\theta$ and pressure head $h$ at each nodal point. In order to compare simulated data with field measurements, three representative days were selected for which the measured and simulated data are shown in Figure 5.7. Only simulation without crack formation is shown since implementation of the crack module yielded similar results for the presented days. The selected days are: day 179 (June 28) immediately after a wet period with shallow ground water levels during the first period of the field experiment, day 219 (August 7) at the end of a long dry period in July with continuously decreasing ground water level and day 251 (September 8) towards the end of the field experiment. As can be seen in Fig. 5.7, there is a discrepancy between the saturated moisture content $\theta_s$ obtained from laboratory data (Table 3.1) and the 'field' $\theta_s$ resulting from the TDR calibration (Fig. 2.5) causing a structural difference between measured and simulated values. The general pattern of the vertical soil moisture profile, however, is followed rather well at day 179 and 219. At day 251 the measured profile is uniform with depth, while
the simulated values show a clear water front at about 50 cm depth.

Based solely on these results, the implementation of the crack module offers no significant improvement in the water budget simulation. The sensitivity of the model to errors in the parameters characterizing the shrinking process, which were taken from literature values, was not tested however. Furthermore solute transport, being a factor significantly influenced by crack formation, was not considered in this study. A detailed sensitivity analysis of SWAP93, including the effect of using different $ET_{pot}$ calculation methods and a multi-layer soil profile, was performed by Meijninger and Van Schaik [20, 1995]. Their analysis, however, did not include an extensive study of the crack module implementation.

5.3. Model comparison

The results of the models DAIR and SWAP93 can mainly be compared on the way the calculation and reduction of $ET_{pot}$ is treated. Ground water level and soil moisture can not be compared since the ground water level is calculated by DAIR from seepage and capillary rise but given as input to the SWAP model. Similarly, soil moisture and hydraulic head profiles are given as output by SWAP whereas DAIR only uses a single total soil moisture value.

As described in 4, the main difference between the models lies in the conceptual base of DAIR with a simplified parameterization of the water movement in the soil profile and the physical base of SWAP solving the one-dimensional flow equation for small internal time-steps. Furthermore, the way potential evapotranspiration is determined is rather different.
The cumulative potential evapotranspiration over the growing season is simulated rather adequately by both models. The reduction to $ET_{act}$ is best performed by the model SWAP without including the crack module. Reduced evapotranspiration as resulting from DAIR is not very accurate which probable cause lies in the parameterization implied in the soil moisture and/or runoff routine as mentioned in 5.1. For the same reason, sudden changes in ground water level are not simulated well by DAIR. The general trend over the growing season, however, is again simulated rather adequate.

In general, the main points of further study for the SWAP model can be considered the effect of the clay module on evaporation calculations. A significant improvement to DAIR might be the implementation of a different routine for determining $ET_{pot}$, offering the possibility to simulate a wider range of meteorological conditions. An adjusted routine for determining the ground water level was already implemented in the model DINUND (see 4.1), implementing this routine standard in DAIR might improve the calculation of vertical soil water movement.
6. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

• Field experiment

The field data were used to calculate actual evapotranspiration by the standard flux profile method and Bowen ratio method. The results obtained by the Bowen ratio method appeared rather suspicious during several periods. However, no proper explanation for this problem was found. For future use, a similar installation of equipment and measurement set-up hence needs special attention with respect to the application of this method.

The comparison of actual evapotranspiration and soil moisture depletion on a short term base appears rather inaccurate. Over the entire field experiment, however, the different vertical water budget terms yield a nearly closed water balance.

Overall, a comprehensive set of meteorological data, hydrological data and crop parameters results from the field experiment. This data set can well be used for future model studies concerning the soil-water-plant-atmosphere system.

• Potential evapotranspiration

Several methods were applied to calculate potential evapotranspiration. Differences between the methods of Penman, Priestley-Taylor and Makkink are relatively small. When applying the methods of Monteith-Rijtema and Thom-Oliver the proper determination of resistance parameters, especially minimum bulk surface resistance, from available field data is questionable. Therefore, the Priestley-Taylor method is considered the most adequate for this study.

Budyko’s method used in the model DAIR is based on long term meteorological data in typical climatic zones and hence not very suitable to determine daily potential evapotranspiration in a specific field situation.

• Model results

The potential evapotranspiration on a daily base is not simulated very accurately by the conceptual model DAIR, the cumulative value over the experimental period however is calculated quite well. The reduction to actual evapotranspiration shows large deviations compared to measured data. The average trend of
changes in ground water level throughout the growing season is simulated properly but sudden changes in ground water level after rainfall are not calculated by DAIR. Major improvements might be achieved by incorporating a more physically based method to calculate potential evapotranspiration and an adjustment of the parameterization of the hydrological processes.

In the model SWAP the potential evapotranspiration was calculated by the Priestley-Taylor method which was also used to calculate $ET_{pot}$ based upon field data. The validation run without using the recently added crack module yielded best results in simulations of actual evapotranspiration. Implementation of the crack module causes a too low evaporation during the first, relatively wet part of the field experiment. No serious effect was found on simulated soil moisture during model runs with or without crack formation. Additional research to study the impact of the crack module and model sensitivity to changes in shrinking characteristic parameters is recommended.

Generally spoken, results obtained by SWAP seem in better agreement with field data than simulated values by DAIR. However, the relatively small set of meteorological data and soil properties needed to run DAIR or any conceptual model in general may be an advantage when not much data are available for a specific situation. For use on a long term base, however, the effect of discrepancies between measured and simulated data should be tested thoroughly.
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A. DAILY VALUES OF RADIATION, SOIL HEAT FLUX AND ACTUAL EVAPOTRANSPIRATION

Daily values (24 h) of the fluxes measured during the field experiment after necessary corrections. Presented fluxes are soil heat flux at the surface $G$, net radiation, incoming short-wave radiation $R_s$, reflected short-wave radiation $R_a$, sensible heat flux $H$ and latent heat flux $L_v$. All fluxes are given in $[\text{W m}^{-2}]$. Values of $H$ and $L_v$ are calculated by either the standard flux profile method or Bowen ratio method (at sunset/sunrise Bowen ratio fluxes replaced by flux profile results).

Missing data are indicated by (a): missing data due to a instrument or datalogger failure or (b): no wet bulb temperature profile measured.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>day nr</th>
<th>date</th>
<th>$G$</th>
<th>$R_s$</th>
<th>$R_a$</th>
<th>$R_s$</th>
<th>$H$</th>
<th>$L_v$</th>
<th>$H$</th>
<th>$L_v$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>154</td>
<td>30695</td>
<td>-4</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>155</td>
<td>40695</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>265</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>156</td>
<td>50695</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>157</td>
<td>60695</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>158</td>
<td>70695</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>159</td>
<td>80695</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>284</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>160</td>
<td>90695</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>161</td>
<td>100695</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>162</td>
<td>110695</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>163</td>
<td>120695</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>164</td>
<td>130695</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>288</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>165</td>
<td>140695</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>281</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>166</td>
<td>150695</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>167</td>
<td>160695</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>168</td>
<td>170695</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>309</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>169</td>
<td>180695</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>-8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>170</td>
<td>190695</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>275</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>day nr</td>
<td>date</td>
<td>$G$</td>
<td>$R_n$</td>
<td>$R_{s8}$</td>
<td>$R_{s1}$</td>
<td>$H$</td>
<td>$L_vE$</td>
<td>$H$</td>
<td>$L_vE$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>171</td>
<td>200695</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>315</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>172</td>
<td>210695</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>284</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>173</td>
<td>220695</td>
<td>-22</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>174</td>
<td>230695</td>
<td>-5</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>175</td>
<td>240695</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>176</td>
<td>250695</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>177</td>
<td>260695</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>178</td>
<td>270695</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>179</td>
<td>280695</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>325</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>180</td>
<td>290695</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>338</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>181</td>
<td>300695</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>323</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>182</td>
<td>10795</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>310</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>183</td>
<td>20795</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>184</td>
<td>30795</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>295</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>185</td>
<td>40795</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>263</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>186</td>
<td>50795</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>187</td>
<td>60795</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>249</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>188</td>
<td>70795</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>311</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>189</td>
<td>80795</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>316</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>190</td>
<td>90795</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>314</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>191</td>
<td>100795</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>308</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>192</td>
<td>110795</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>309</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>193</td>
<td>120795</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>283</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>194</td>
<td>130795</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>262</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>195</td>
<td>140795</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>196</td>
<td>150795</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>197</td>
<td>160795</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>291</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>198</td>
<td>170795</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>222</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>199</td>
<td>180795</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>285</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200</td>
<td>190795</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>262</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>201</td>
<td>200795</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>305</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>202</td>
<td>210795</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>298</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>203</td>
<td>220795</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>292</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>-9</td>
<td>202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>204</td>
<td>230795</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>251</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>205</td>
<td>240795</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>296</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Bowen ratio

flux profile
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>day nr</th>
<th>date</th>
<th>G</th>
<th>$R_s$</th>
<th>$R_{s1}$</th>
<th>$R_{s2}$</th>
<th>$H$</th>
<th>$L_vE$</th>
<th>$H$</th>
<th>$L_vE$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>206</td>
<td>250795</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>293</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>207</td>
<td>260795</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>295</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>208</td>
<td>270795</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>247</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>209</td>
<td>280795</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>210</td>
<td>290795</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>211</td>
<td>300795</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>292</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>212</td>
<td>310795</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>287</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>213</td>
<td>10895</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>262</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>214</td>
<td>20895</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>215</td>
<td>30895</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>216</td>
<td>40895</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>217</td>
<td>50895</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>249</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>218</td>
<td>60895</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>219</td>
<td>70895</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>261</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>220</td>
<td>80895</td>
<td>-4</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>221</td>
<td>90895</td>
<td>-9</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>222</td>
<td>100895</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>276</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>223</td>
<td>110895</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>273</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>224</td>
<td>120895</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>282</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>225</td>
<td>130895</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>268</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>226</td>
<td>140895</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>268</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>227</td>
<td>150895</td>
<td>-6</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>228</td>
<td>160895</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>229</td>
<td>170895</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>230</td>
<td>180895</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>231</td>
<td>190895</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>232</td>
<td>200895</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>233</td>
<td>210895</td>
<td>-9</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>234</td>
<td>220895</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>235</td>
<td>230895</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>236</td>
<td>240895</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>237</td>
<td>250895</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>238</td>
<td>260895</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>239</td>
<td>270895</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>240</td>
<td>280895</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>day nr</th>
<th>date</th>
<th>G</th>
<th>$R_a$</th>
<th>$R_{a\downarrow}$</th>
<th>$R_{a\uparrow}$</th>
<th>$H$</th>
<th>$L_vE$</th>
<th>$H$</th>
<th>$L_vE$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>241</td>
<td>290895</td>
<td>-7</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>242</td>
<td>300895</td>
<td>-7</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>243</td>
<td>310895</td>
<td>-4</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>244</td>
<td>10995</td>
<td>-7</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>245</td>
<td>20995</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>246</td>
<td>30995</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>247</td>
<td>40995</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>248</td>
<td>50995</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>231</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>249</td>
<td>60995</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>250</td>
<td>70995</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>251</td>
<td>80995</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>-12</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>252</td>
<td>90995</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>253</td>
<td>100995</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>254</td>
<td>110995</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
B. DAILY POTENTIAL EVAPOTRANSPIRATION
BY DIFFERENT METHODS

Daily values of potential evapotranspiration [mm] calculated by the methods described in 3.3. Missing data due to an instrument or datalogger failure are indicated by (a). Additionally daily results of Budyko's method used in the model DAIR (see 5.2) are given.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>day nr</th>
<th>date</th>
<th>Priestley-Taylor</th>
<th>Penman</th>
<th>Makkink</th>
<th>Budyko</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>154</td>
<td>30695</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>155</td>
<td>40695</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>156</td>
<td>50695</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>157</td>
<td>60695</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>158</td>
<td>70695</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>159</td>
<td>80695</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>160</td>
<td>90695</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>161</td>
<td>100695</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>162</td>
<td>110695</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>163</td>
<td>120695</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>164</td>
<td>130695</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>165</td>
<td>140695</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>166</td>
<td>150695</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>167</td>
<td>160695</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>168</td>
<td>170695</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>169</td>
<td>180695</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>170</td>
<td>190695</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>171</td>
<td>200695</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>172</td>
<td>210695</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>173</td>
<td>220695</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>174</td>
<td>230695</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>175</td>
<td>240695</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>day nr</td>
<td>date</td>
<td>Priestley-Taylor</td>
<td>Penman</td>
<td>Makkink</td>
<td>Budyko</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>176</td>
<td>250695</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>177</td>
<td>260695</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>178</td>
<td>270695</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>179</td>
<td>280695</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>180</td>
<td>290695</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>181</td>
<td>300695</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>182</td>
<td>10795</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>183</td>
<td>20795</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>184</td>
<td>30795</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>185</td>
<td>40795</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>186</td>
<td>50795</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>187</td>
<td>60795</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>188</td>
<td>70795</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>189</td>
<td>80795</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>190</td>
<td>90795</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>191</td>
<td>100795</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>192</td>
<td>110795</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>193</td>
<td>120795</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>194</td>
<td>130795</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>195</td>
<td>140795</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>196</td>
<td>150795</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>197</td>
<td>160795</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>198</td>
<td>170795</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>199</td>
<td>180795</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200</td>
<td>190795</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>201</td>
<td>200795</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>202</td>
<td>210795</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>203</td>
<td>220795</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>204</td>
<td>230795</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>205</td>
<td>240795</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>206</td>
<td>250795</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>207</td>
<td>260795</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>208</td>
<td>270795</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>209</td>
<td>280795</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>210</td>
<td>290795</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>day nr</td>
<td>date</td>
<td>Priestley-Taylor</td>
<td>Penman</td>
<td>Makkink</td>
<td>Budyko</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>211</td>
<td>300795</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>212</td>
<td>310795</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>213</td>
<td>10895</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>214</td>
<td>20895</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>215</td>
<td>30895</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>216</td>
<td>40895</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>217</td>
<td>50895</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>218</td>
<td>60895</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>219</td>
<td>70895</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>220</td>
<td>80895</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>221</td>
<td>90895</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>222</td>
<td>100895</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>223</td>
<td>110895</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>224</td>
<td>120895</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>225</td>
<td>130895</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>226</td>
<td>140895</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>227</td>
<td>150895</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>228</td>
<td>160895</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>229</td>
<td>170895</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>230</td>
<td>180895</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>231</td>
<td>190895</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>232</td>
<td>200895</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>233</td>
<td>210895</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>234</td>
<td>220895</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>235</td>
<td>230895</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>236</td>
<td>240895</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>237</td>
<td>250895</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>238</td>
<td>260895</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>239</td>
<td>270895</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>240</td>
<td>280895</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>241</td>
<td>290895</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>242</td>
<td>300895</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>243</td>
<td>310895</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>244</td>
<td>10995</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>245</td>
<td>20995</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>day nr</td>
<td>date</td>
<td>Priestley-Taylor</td>
<td>Penman</td>
<td>Makkink</td>
<td>Budyko</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>246</td>
<td>30995</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>247</td>
<td>40995</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>248</td>
<td>50995</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>249</td>
<td>60995</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>250</td>
<td>70995</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>251</td>
<td>80995</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>252</td>
<td>90995</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>253</td>
<td>100995</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>254</td>
<td>110995</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
C. DAIR POTENTIAL EVAPOTRANSPIRATION

Daily potential evapotranspiration [mm d\(^{-1}\)] as a function of vapour pressure deficit \(VPD\) [mbar] in tabular form as used by the DAIR model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VPD</th>
<th>I/XII</th>
<th>II</th>
<th>III</th>
<th>IV</th>
<th>V</th>
<th>VI</th>
<th>VII</th>
<th>VIII</th>
<th>IX</th>
<th>X</th>
<th>XI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>1.71</td>
<td>2.43</td>
<td>2.13</td>
<td>1.39</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>0.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td>1.82</td>
<td>2.36</td>
<td>2.90</td>
<td>2.63</td>
<td>2.07</td>
<td>1.55</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td>0.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td>1.73</td>
<td>2.27</td>
<td>2.77</td>
<td>3.27</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>2.02</td>
<td>1.52</td>
<td>1.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>1.58</td>
<td>2.09</td>
<td>2.65</td>
<td>3.07</td>
<td>3.59</td>
<td>3.23</td>
<td>2.84</td>
<td>2.40</td>
<td>1.84</td>
<td>1.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.44</td>
<td>1.86</td>
<td>2.40</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3.37</td>
<td>3.88</td>
<td>3.61</td>
<td>3.14</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>2.16</td>
<td>1.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.08</td>
<td>2.68</td>
<td>3.27</td>
<td>3.61</td>
<td>4.13</td>
<td>3.86</td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td>3.06</td>
<td>2.40</td>
<td>2.15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.29</td>
<td>2.96</td>
<td>3.57</td>
<td>3.86</td>
<td>4.37</td>
<td>4.10</td>
<td>3.64</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>2.68</td>
<td>2.37</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td>4.08</td>
<td>4.60</td>
<td>4.31</td>
<td>3.87</td>
<td>3.58</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>4.03</td>
<td>4.29</td>
<td>4.82</td>
<td>4.52</td>
<td>4.10</td>
<td>3.82</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>4.23</td>
<td>4.47</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>4.71</td>
<td>4.29</td>
<td>4.02</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>4.66</td>
<td>5.18</td>
<td>4.89</td>
<td>4.45</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>4.82</td>
<td>5.35</td>
<td>5.05</td>
<td>4.63</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>4.98</td>
<td>5.52</td>
<td>5.23</td>
<td>4.81</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>5.15</td>
<td>5.68</td>
<td>5.37</td>
<td>4.95</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>5.29</td>
<td>5.83</td>
<td>5.50</td>
<td>5.10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>5.44</td>
<td>5.95</td>
<td>5.63</td>
<td>5.24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>5.58</td>
<td>6.08</td>
<td>5.76</td>
<td>5.39</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>5.71</td>
<td>6.20</td>
<td>5.89</td>
<td>5.52</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
D. STANDARD INPUT FILE OF THE MODEL SWAP

GENERAL

>genhdr: 'Mais on heavy clay; analysis of growing season'
>output: 0 1 'outputseason.bal'
>exfile: 1 'soilprofile.prf' 1 1 0 0 0 0
>timeva: 1995 1995 154 254 1.0e-6 0.2 2 1.0e-3
>crack: 0
>redeva: 2 0.63
>irriva: 0
>methdr: 'meteorological conditions in growing season'
>topbnd: 2 1
>metfil: 1995 'meteo.dat'
>crphdr: 'maize Slovakia 1995'
>sinkva: 0 0 0
>rootac: 0 365. 366.
>excons: 1.26
>crpfil: 1995 'swap93.inp'
>crppro: 0
>profil: 2 40 20 40 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5
>soilfil: 'swap93.inp' 'swap93.inp'
>pondmx: 0.0
>incond: 0 0.424 0.429 0.413 0.397 0.380 0.364 0.369 0.374 0.379 0.376 0.372 0.369
0.366 0.363 0.489 0.489 0.489 0.489 0.489 0.489 0.489 0.489 0.489 0.489 0.489
0.489 0.489 0.489 0.489 0.489 0.489 0.489 0.489 0.489 0.489 0.489 0.489 0.489
>bbdfil: 'swap93.inp'
>drains: 0
>solute: 0
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> mobile: 0
> anafil: 0
> balance: 0

CROP PARAMETERS

> lasc95: 0.0280 2.9100 0.9570
> prin95: 0
> soco95: 1 154 0.034 156 0.036 164 0.270 175 1.060 188 2.720 199 5.290 222 3.990
> 242 2.84 255 2.757

SOIL PHYSICAL CHARACTERISTICS

> solhd1: 'Topsoil of heavy clay'
> metho1: 1
> solld1: 0 0.489 15.46 0.0532 -8.823 1.081 0
> solhd2: 'Subsoil of sandy clay'
> metho2: 1
> solld2: 0 0.489 15.46 0.0532 -8.823 1.081 0

BOTTOM BOUNDARY

> bothdr: 'Groundwater boundary'
> swbottb: 0
> daygwl: 11 154 -72 155 -75 156 -77 157 -74 158 -71 159 -68 160 -71 161 -67 162
> -65 173 -65 174 -68 175 -71 176 -72 177 -73 178 -74 179 -75 180 -76 181 -77 182
> -75 183 -74 184 -72 185 -73 186 -74 187 -75 188 -76 189 -77 190 -77 191 -78 192
> -78 193 -80 194 -81 195 -83 196 -85 197 -86 198 -86 199 -87 200 -89 201 -90 202
> -91 203 -93 204 -94 205 -96 206 -97 207 -99 208 -100 209 -102 210 -103 211 -105
> 221 -115 222 -113 223 -112 224 -111 225 -112 226 -112 227 -114 228 -117 229 -116
> 239 -125 240 -123 241 -121 242 -121 243 -117 244 -116 245 -116 246 -113 247 -113