

## Lectures 3 Characterizing the Vegetation Canopy, Part II: Leaf Area Index

Instructor: Dennis Baldocchi  
Professor of Biometeorology  
Ecosystem Science Division  
Department of Environmental Science, Policy and Management  
345 Hilgard Hall  
University of California, Berkeley  
Berkeley, CA 94720

August 27, 2012


### This set of lectures will discuss:

1. Leaf area index
  - i. Observations
  - ii. Theoretical Limits
  - iii. Variation with time: season, decade, century
  - iv. Variation with space: height, horizontal, globe
  - v. Measurement methods
  - vi. Predicting leaf area index, nutrition, functionality and water balance
  - vii. Predicting leaf area from allometry

### L3.1 Leaf Area Index

Leaf area is one of the most important biometeorological variables to be characterized. It is an inventory of the population of leaves that are absorbing light and momentum and are exchanging heat, moisture, CO<sub>2</sub> and trace gases with the atmosphere. From a micrometeorological perspective an increase in leaf area index increases light interception and the source/sink strength for heat, water and CO<sub>2</sub> exchange. It can also start a negative feedback loop by increasing drag on wind, decreasing wind velocity that acts to reduce mass and energy exchange (Albertson *et al.*, 2001). Lower wind velocity in the canopy will also act to accentuate profiles of temperature, humidity and CO<sub>2</sub> in the vegetation, which in turn will have feedbacks with physiological resistances linked to the stomata.

In general, **Leaf Area Index** is the amount of one-sided leaf area per unit area of ground. But for conifers, that have cylindrical needles, one may consider either the projected area of the needles or the **hemi-surface area** of the needles (Chen, Black, 1992).



**Figure 1 Projected area of a hemisircle onto a flat surface. Notice the surface area of the hemi-circle is greater than its projected area.**

Different plant functional types will possess a different amount and range of leaf area, leaf biomass and leaf area density. To give the reader, appreciation for the range and ranking of values we draw information from a network of long term ecological and biometeorology studies.

**Table 1 Global survey of leaf area index of landscape classes. (Asner *et al.*, 2003)**

Functional type	Mean LAI	Std Dev
Polar desert/alpine tundra	3.85	2.37
Moist tundra	.82	.47
Boreal forest woodland	3.11	2.28
Temperate savanna	1.37	.83
Temperate evergreen broadleaved forest	5.4	2.32
Temperate mixed forest	5.26	2.88
Temperate conifer forest	6.91	5.85
Temperate deciduous forest	5.3	1.96
Temperate wetland	6.66	2.41
Cropland Temperate	4.36	3.71
Plantation Temperate	9.19	4.51
Tall medium grassland	2.03	5.79
Short grassland	2.53	.32
Arid shrubland	1.88	.74
Mediterranean shrubland	1.71	.76
Tropical wetland	4.95	.28
Tropical savanna	1.81	1.81

Tropical evergreen rain forest	5.23	2.61
Tropical deciduous forest	4.67	3.08
Tropical pasture	2.85	2.62
Crop tropical	3.65	2.14
Plantation tropical	9.91	4.31

Based on a brief literature survey we see that a range of values exist for forests, crops, grasslands and other plant types. We also notice a confined range of values. We see no canopies with leaf area indices exceeding 20. Nor do we see plant stands with very low fractional values, except after a major disturbance like fire, harvesting or plowing. This leads us to ask:

*How much leaf area can a plant canopy sustain?*

From a light harvesting perspective, there tends to be an upper limit of leaf area that a canopy can sustain. Jarvis and Leverenz (1983) used Beer's Law to derive a simple equation for estimating leaf area index. Beer's Law predicts light transmission through a turbid medium, in terms of the relative light transmission ( $I/I_0$ ), as an exponential function of leaf area index (L) and a proportionality constant ( $k$ );  $k$  reflects the geometric influence associated with the angle between leaves and the sun:

$$I / I_0 = \exp(-kL)$$

On the basis of this relation one can calculate the amount of canopy that will develop enough leaf area to intercept over 95% of incident sunlight, a value large enough to sustain enough photosynthesis to offset respiratory costs. If a canopy intercepts 95% of incident sunlight, then only 5% is transmitted through the vegetation, a value that relates to  $I/I_0$ . Algebraic re-arrangement of Beer's law produce

$$L = -\ln(0.05) / k$$

Results from applying this equation are listed in Table 1. For planar leaves, we may assume the light extinction coefficient,  $k$ , equals 0.5. In this case, the theoretical limit for leaf area index is about 6. In practice this value will vary with the leaf angle distribution and clumping (topics covered in later lectures). Conifers possess clumped shoots, thereby they are able to maintain higher leaf area indices than broadleaved plant stands.

**Table 2 List of leaf area index, measured and computed (adapted from Jarvis and Leverenz, 1983).**


Species	L	K	L <sub>95%</sub>
<i>Pinus resinosa</i>	2.6	0.40	7.5
<i>Pinus radiate</i>	8.3	0.51	5.9
<i>Pinus sylvestris</i>	2.8	0.62	4.8
<i>Picea sitchensis</i>	9.8	0.53	5.7
<i>Picea abies</i>	8.4	0.28	10.7

<i>Psuedotsuga menziesii</i>	11	0.48	6.2
<i>Eucalpytus maculata</i>	2.8	0.57	5.3
<i>Liriondendron tulipifera</i>	6.0	0.29	10.3
<i>Fagus crenata</i>	7.0	0.65	4.6
<i>Quercus robur</i>	5.0	0.39	7.7
<i>Populus tremula</i>	3.8	0.39	7.7

So far we have noted a wide range of leaf area indices for different ecosystems. If we are to predict fluxes of mass and energy between the biosphere and atmosphere, predict weather and climate, radiation attenuation, or interpret the radiation reflected from the land, as detected by satellites, we'd like to know a ball-park value of leaf area index *a priori*. The key question to ask is:

*What factors cause leaf area index to differ among ecosystems?*


Correlative and biogeographical analyses suggests that leaf area index is strongly tied to site water balance and nutrient status (Scheffer *et al.*, 2005; Woodward, 1987).



**Figure 2** Relation between fraction of vegetative cover,  $V$ , and annual precipitation,  $P$  (Scheffer *et al.*, 2005)

The data presented Figure 3 support this notion. They indicate that a strong relation exists between leaf area index, precipitation and potential evaporation (a measure of the net water balance) and leaf nitrogen content (a measure of nutrition and photosynthetic capacity). The independent axis is based on a dimensionless quantity, and is an example of applying engineering scaling theory to ecology and biometeorology applications. Note that this relationship says nothing about how leaf area may vary within a habitat. But its mechanism is attributed to a series of connected facts: 1) light interception and canopy

coverage scale with primary productivity (Monteith, 1977); 2) primary productivity scales with evaporation (Sinclair *et al.*, 1984); and 3) the amount of water evaporated by a landscape is limited by available rainfall and net radiation (Budyko, 1974; Priestley, Taylor, 1972).



**Figure 3** Correlation among leaf area index and climate and biogeochemical factors (precipitation, leaf nitrogen content and evaporation) (Baldocchi, Meyers, 1998; Eamus, Prior, 2001).


Additional sources of variation include age, disturbance history, soil texture and genetic material. Nor does this relation deal with effects of complex terrain, accessibility to ground water and the runoff of precipitation. Nevertheless, independent data, obtain across a transect of Australian savanna (Eamus, Prior, 2001), supports the ideas presented in this simple figure and for conditions at the drier end of the plant-climate continuum. Leaf nitrogen improves the coefficient of determination ( $r^2$ ) because it is a subtle marker of drought effects. As water is needed to provide nutrients, too much rain leaches N. Consequently, plants in dry climates produce thick leaves with high N.

### L3.2 Temporal Variations in Leaf Area Index

Within a given plant functional type, leaf area will vary with time and space. The major scales of temporal variation are associated with the seasons and decades. The major spatial source in leaf area is in the vertical and horizontal dimensions.


*a. Seasonal Variations*

Herbaceous and woody vegetation all experience significant seasonal changes in leaf area. Annual grasses, herbs and crops must grow from a seed. Their seasonal development of leaf area is initially slow, experiences an exponential growth phase, a plateau and a reduction, as leaves senesce and drop. Consequently, a crop growing in the temperate zone of North America may not reach maximum leaf area index (and full canopy closure, LAI > ~3) until midsummer (e.g. day 210) (Figure 4). In other words, this soybean crop only forms a closed canopy for about 40 days of the year. This is an important fact to recognize because it demonstrates that crops, because they are grown from seed, are inefficient solar collectors for much of the growing season. Ultimately this limits their potential to convert sunlight into biomass that can be converted to energy.




**Figure 4** Seasonal variation of leaf area index of soybeans, growing near Mead, NE in 1979. data of D. Baldocchi.

Perennial vegetation, such as deciduous forests, experiences a different time course than crops. During the winter dormant period only stems and twigs are exposed. Leaf expansion can be rapid in spring, as leaves growth draws on reserves laid down the previous fall. In Oak Ridge, TN full canopy and maximum leaf area will occur by about day 140. As one progresses northward to New England, maximal leaf area will occur about a month later. But this date is still much sooner than the date of peak LAI experienced by crops. In the autumn (> day 300), many leaves are present, but they are senescent and are physiologically inactive. By comparing data in Figures 4 and 5 we observe that canopy coverage over cropland is quite sparse for a long portion of the growing season, as compared to forests growing in a similar temperate zone. The forest attains full leaf coverage for over 150 days of the growing season, compared to 40 or so days by the crop.



**Figure 5** Seasonal change in leaf area index of a temperate broadleaf forest (Wilson, Baldocchi, 2000). Inferred from light transmission measurements.

With most canopies it is difficult to measure leaf area as frequently as desired. Indirect assessments of leaf area index can be acquired by relating leaf area index to albedo or reflective vegetation indices. A few years ago NASA launched the TERRA satellite and it is now being used as a tool to assess seasonal trends in leaf area index using the MODIS sensor (Figure 6).



**Figure 6** Seasonal variation in fraction of Leaf Area Index. These calculations were derived from MODIS sensor on the TERRA satellite. Data are available from the FLUXNET web site.

When assessing leaf area index of native vegetation with remote sensing, it is important to distinguish live from dead leaf matter, which is a major problem with perennial grasslands.

### L3.3 Spatial Variations in Leaf Area Index

If we divide the canopy into multiple layers we will observe different amounts of leaf area in different layers. The amount of leaf area per unit volume is the **leaf area density**. The total **leaf area index** of a plant stand, then, is simply the integral, or summation, of the leaf area density ( $a(z)$ ) of successive layers:


$$L = \int_0^h a(z) dz \approx \sum a(z) \Delta z$$

#### a. Vertical

Forests experience pronounced vertical zonation in leaf area. Ecologists define six levels within a forest ((Parker *et al.*, 1989) (Figure 7). The **emergent layer**, the **outer canopy**, the **overstory**, the **middle story**, the under story and the **ground layer**. These layers are defined as follows:



1. Emergent layer: an irregular zone of extremely tall trees, rising above the mean canopy.
2. Outer canopy: surface of canopy in direct contact with the atmosphere. It is an undulating surface, with walls and canyons of plant material that form gaps.
3. Overstory: the layer consisting of dominant and co-dominant trees.
4. Middle story: a transitional area, where tree crowns are partly illuminated and suppressed.
5. Understory (subcanopy). woody plants reside in shaded areas. They tend to be fully suppressed. Growth is resumed when a nearby tree falls and produces a gap in the forest.
6. Ground layer: this layer is at the bottom of the forest and contains seedlings, herbs, and litter.



**Figure 7 Schematic view of forest layers (adapted from Parker, 1995).**

More recently, Parker and Brown (2000), working on an old growth Douglas fir forest defined three zones, on the basis of light transmission and variance. They defined the upper bright zone, a mild transition zone and a lower dim zone.

An example of the vertical variation of leaf area density of a 50 year old temperate deciduous forest is shown in Figure 8 (Hutchison *et al.*, 1986). In this case, about 75% of the leaf area occurs in the upper 25% of the canopy. We will see in later lectures how the

distribution of leaf area affects wind, light, temperature and other microclimatic variables in a canopy.





Figure 8 Leaf area profile, temperate broadleaved forest, Hutchison et al. (1986)

The previous figure gives us a static view of the leaf area profile in a forest; wide application of such a figure forces one to suffer from scientific error on the basis of too little data. As more and more data have become published in the literature we learned that the vertical structure of a forest is not static in time or space (Aber, 1979; Parker, Brown, 2000). The vertical variation of a forest will vary by species, functional type and as a forest matures, on decadal to century time scales. For example, in a mixed species forest, different species will have different vertical profiles, too. (Figure 9). These results are very important as we are now able to invoke ecological rules to help us prescribe leaf area profiles in forests.



**Figure 9** Profile of leaf area in an eastern deciduous forest. Parker GG, Brown MJ (2000)

Perennial vegetation, such as forests, experience four stages of development (Sprugel, 1985). So one can expect the forest to maintain a different leaf area indices and LAI profiles as it progresses through its life cycle (Aber, 1979). The sequence of development of a hardwood forest is noted in the following (Figure 10):

**1. Stand reinitiation.** 1-10 years. Herbs and shrubs dominate site (species A dominates)

After disturbance seeds, spores and rhizomes are available to germinate and grow quickly. Light conditions have improved and there is less competition for water and nutrients. With disturbances such as floods, volcanoes and landslides there is new substrate.

Animals and insects and birds are important for re-introducing new genetic material.

A young forest is a short stand with a vertical distribution of leaf area that can be approximated with a Gaussian distribution.

**2. Stem exclusion stage** (aggradation phase).

Woody species start to monopolize a plot. Invasion of other trees and shrub seedlings stops. Presences of herbs and grasses is reduced or absent. physiognomic and species diversity is low (species B dominates).

Self thinning is quite severe with time and may reach 90%. Stem thinning follows a  $-3/2$  law with time.

Leaf area of the stand reaches its maximum during the stem exclusion period.

Upper limit of leaf area tends to correspond with about 90% interception of sunlight., which for hardwoods is on the order of 5 to 6.

**3. Under-story re-initiation stage** (aggradation phase continues). Dominant woody species start to lose dominance of the site. Understory becomes reestablished. Includes shade tolerant herbs and may have shade tolerant seedlings.

Trees approach maximum height, growth slows. Gaps are created by mortality and allow shade tolerant understory to be established.

A forest of intermediate age is a much taller stand. It possesses a disproportionate amount of leaf area near the top of the stand and possesses little leaf area in the understory.

**4. Old growth stage.** If no disturbance, first generation trees die. More tolerant trees replace them and grow in gaps are areas of degenerated canopy. (species b, c and d dominate). Little if any height growth occurs. Diameter growth continues, on the other hand. Tree species and structural diversity is maximal. The leaf area index profile is 'bottom heavy'.





Figure 10 Variation of leaf area index profile with stand age, after (Harding *et al.*, 2001)

*b. Horizontal Variation*

The horizontal distribution of plants and leaf area canopy can be homogeneous or heterogeneous. Within the homogeneous class are closed stands, which may possess foliage that is distributed in a random or uniform manner. A 'big-leaf' or plane parallel turbid medium is a common abstraction of horizontally homogeneous canopies.

Heterogeneous stands can have vegetation that is spatially arrayed in clumped (oak/grass savanna) or regular (as row crops, vineyards) patterns. Once we define the location of a plant, its canopy can take a variety of shapes. Foliage envelopes are often defined as discrete arrays of plants (cones, ellipses, cubes, cylinders) or rectangular or triangular hedges. Heterogeneous stands may form closed canopies, as does a tropical forest or an open stand, such as an oak/grass savanna.



**Figure 11** Spatial distribution of a ponderosa pine stand. (Law *et al.*, 2001).

Within a foliage envelope leaves may possess random or clumped groupings. In the case of conifers needles are perched on shoots. Hence, a detailed analysis of leaf area index produces a wide distribution of estimates based on whether one is in the crown or gaps.

There is freeware software on the internet for visualizing forest stands. One example is Stand Visualization System

<http://forsys.cfr.washington.edu/svs.html>




Figure 12 <http://forsys.cfr.washington.edu/bitmaps/cover.gif>

### L3.4 Leaf Area Index and Growth Measurement Methods

**Direct** and **indirect** methods are used to assess leaf area index (Chen, 1996; Jonckheere *et al.*, 2004). Direct methods are labor intensive, and in the case of tall trees, may be impractical. They involve manually sampling of leaves. The method is destructive and time consuming. One must also consider a proper sampling strategy to ensure a statistically representative number of leaves and plants. Four sampling methods, used most often, are the stratified clip method, the dispersed individual plant method, point quadrat method and litter fall collection method.

#### *a Direct methods*

Several direct and indirect methods exist for determining leaf area index.

The **Stratified Clip Method** is a simple a direct method for evaluating leaf area. The first step is to delimit a rectangular (or circular) area of known dimension. Horizontal layers are successively clipped. For small crops, samples 0.5 by 0.5 m to 1 by 1 m are typical. The area of leaves are measured directly with an automatic planimeter, a very labor intensive task. Often investigators will develop relations between leaf weight and leaf area from a subsample. Then, estimate the leaf area on the basis of the total weight of the sample. This short cut can be subject to error, as specific leaf weight varies with

height and species. One also needs to determine how many samples are required to provide a robust estimate of the population mean. The number of samples will increase with the heterogeneity of the stand.

A second method is the **Dispersed** individual plant method. This method involves detailed measurements on individual plants. It is most often used in forestry, where it is simpler to fell tall trees, than to measure vertical profiles of vegetation. Foresters also apply regression statistics to samples to develop allometric relations, from which leaf area, or some other structural parameter, can be assessed by a simply measured surrogate such as diameter at breast height.

The **point quadrat** method involves the passing of metal probes through the canopy, much like the transmission of a ray of light. The leaf area of the canopy can be related to the number of contacts that a probe makes with the foliage.

The **litter fall method** places bushel baskets of know area under a forest. Leaves are collected and their leaf area is measured. Caution should be exercised using a weight/area ratio to determine leaf area from bulk weight measurements. The ratio of leaf weight to area varies with depth in the canopy.

### Allometric Scaling Laws

Many ecologist develop and use allometric relations to evaluate leaf area index (Gower *et al.*, 1999; Whittaker, Woodwell, 1967) since it is very laborious and time consuming to harvest a large number of trees. To obtain a statistically representative sample they often measure such indices as diameter at breast height and relate that to leaf area index. One common function is the logarithmic relation between diameter of breast height or basal area (the independent variable) and leaf area index.

$$\log(y) = A + B\log(x)$$

This equation can produce a power law relation between mass per dry weight,  $M$ , or plant area,  $A$ , and stem diameter,  $D$ .

$$M = aD^b$$

$$A = cD^e$$

Whittaker and Woodwell (1967) developed a regression of leaf area index on basal area (as well as for bark area) for forests growing in New York and the Smoky Mountains. They reported that values of a  $A$  ranged from 2.93 to 3.8 and  $B$  ranged from 1.52. An example of the relation between leaf area index and sapwood area is shown in figure 13.




Figure 13 Leaf area index versus sapwood area for a spectrum of trees. Data from Gower et al., 1999

Gower et al. (1999) report strong correlations between leaf area index and sapwood area for several tree species, as well as diameter at breast height. But they conclude that site specific allometric relations need to be developed for accurate estimates of leaf area index.




Figure 14 Test of estimates of leaf area index based on ‘direct’ allometric methods and ‘indirect’ light transmission methods. Gower et al, 1999



More recently, a group of scientist led by West (Enquist *et al.*, 2003; West *et al.*, 1999) have re-evaluated scaling theory and reassert that the allometric relations follow certain power laws. By comparing their theory with data they show that that these power laws are valid for over 20 orders of magnitude. For example, cross sections of tree trunks and aeorta scale with mass to the  $\frac{3}{4}$  power, as does metabolic rates (B) of organisms. The mechanisms for such scaling derive from 3 points:

1. Living things are sustained by transport of materials (water, nutrients) through networks of paths.
2. For the network to function, it must be space filling throughout the volume
3. the final branch is scale invariant
4. the energy required to transport material must be minimized.

From first principles we can draw insight into the exponents of power law between area (A) and volume (V), and with assumptions on density convert these to mass.

$$A \sim l^2 \therefore l \sim A^{1/2}$$

$$V \sim l^3 \therefore l \sim V^{1/3}$$


$$A \sim V^{2/3}$$

$$\rho \sim M / V \sim g / l^3$$

Annual rate of growth, G, scales as a  $\frac{3}{4}$  power of body mass, M, for over 20 orders of magnitude ( $G \sim M^{3/4}$ ). Plant body length scales as  $\frac{1}{4}$  power of mass. And photosynthetic body mass,  $M_p$  scales with  $\frac{3}{4}$  power of non-photosynthetic body mass,  $M_n$  ( $M_p \sim M_n^{3/4}$ ). Together they find that growth rate is directly proportional to photosynthetic body mass,  $M_p$ . ( $G \sim M_p$ ).

#### *b. Indirect Methods*

**Indirect methods** of estimating leaf area index are based on light transmission or reflectance theories (Chason *et al.*, 1991; Chen, 1996; Chen *et al.*, 1997; Jonckheere *et al.*, 2004; Lang, 1987). This can be done by interpreting light and dark spots on hemispherical photographs or by employing quantum sensors that either traverse through a canopy or measure the sky brightness. The theory on radiative transfer will be discussed in more detail, but here we introduce the methods of indirectly assessing leaf area in brief, for completeness.



**Figure 15 Hemispherical photograph of a deciduous, temperate broadleaved forest near Oak Ridge, TN.**

Hemispherical measurements from hemispheric photos (Jonckheere *et al.*, 2004; van Gardingen *et al.*, 1999) or sensors (eg, LAI-2000) assume that leaf area index,  $L$ , is a function of the natural log of beam transmission,  $T$ , integrated over the hemisphere.

$$L = -2 \int_0^{\pi/2} \ln(T(\theta)) \cos(\theta) \sin(\theta) d\theta$$

The concept of using beam penetration to estimate leaf area index was pioneered by Lang (1987), who realized that the contact number ( $K$ ) can be represented by the product of the leaf area index and the direction cosine function  $G$ . In turn this product is a function of the cosine of the zenith angle and the natural log of the light transmission fraction.

$$K(\theta) = LG(\theta) = -\cos \theta \ln(T(\theta))$$

Lang showed that the contact number is a linear function of zenith angle,  $\theta$

$$K(\theta) = a + b\theta$$

And he had the insight that the value for  $G$  converges to about 0.5 when the sun zenith angle is at **one radian**, no matter what the leaf inclination angle distribution was. Consequently, one can evaluate leaf area index with the measurements shown in Figure 16 and the following equation that is derived from the intercept (a) and slope (b)

$$LAI = 2(a + b)$$





Figure 16 Relation between contact number and zenith angle, data of Baldocchi, Chason and Huston.

This approach is valid unless there is clumping of foliage (Chason *et al.*, 1991; Chen, 1996). A comprehensive survey of comparing direct vs indirect measures of LAI is presented in Gower *et al.*, 1999. Overall methods compare within 30%. The notable difference is that indirect methods saturate and plateau at leaf area indices of 5 to 6, which can correspond with direct measures as large as 9. In other words, indirect methods are unreliable if the canopy LAI exceeds 6.

*Spatial Distribution of Leaves and Shoots, Clumping Factors*

We have spoken of very high leaf area indices being sustained by conifers. Leverenz and Hinckley (1990) contend that conifer shoots are able to utilize shade better than flat leaves. They report a positive and linear correlation between the maximum leaf area and R, the ratio between the shoot silhouette area and the area of all the needles after they have been plucked from the shoot and are aligned on a flat plane. Values of R approaching one are indicative of a flat leaf or zero mutual shading by the needles. Their results support a hypothesis that shade adaptation by shoots affects their productivity more than the morphology of shoots.



**Figure 17** Comparison of maximum leaf area index the ratio between the projected shoot and needle area.

Estimates of projected effective and actual leaf area are interrelated to one another with the application of shoot and crown clumping factors.

From light transmission theory the effective leaf area index that intercepts photons is related to the hemisurface leaf area index through corrections for element and crown clumping:

$$L_e \sim L_{hc} \times \Omega_E / \gamma_E$$

The half-total surface area per m<sup>2</sup> ground corrected for clumping at the needle and shoot scales and wood interception is:

$$L_{hc} \sim L_e \times \gamma_E / \Omega_E$$

Where:  $\gamma_E$  is the needle-to-shoot area ratio for foliage clumping within shoot;  $\Omega_E$  is the element clumping index that quantifies the effect of foliage clumping at scales larger than the shoot. This approach assumes that woody materials have a spatial distribution similar to foliage, and may result in a small error in the LAI estimates (Chen *et al.*, 1997).

Measurements of woody biomass are rare. Yet, such information is needed to assess bole respiration, energy interception during the leafless dormant stage of deciduous forests. The plant surface area of bark ranges between 0.3 to 0.6 m<sup>2</sup> per meter of land (Hutchison *et al.*, 1986; Whittaker, Woodwell, 1967).

There is also some controversy about the role of woody biomass. There is often a low probability that photons will intercept wood before leaves (Kucharic and Norman).

**Table 3 A contemporary survey of canopy attributes was recently published by Gower *et al.*, (1999), Law *et al.* (2001), Chen *et al.* 2005.**

species	$\Omega$	$\gamma$	L
Sugar maple	.95	1	7.1
Oak	.88	1	4.2
Hemlock	.94		5.4
Aspen	.64	1	3.3
Jack pine	.45	1.2-1.4	2.2
Black spruce	.38	1.3-1.4	5.6
Douglas fir		1.77	
Scots pine		1.75	
Red pine		2.08	6.1
Ponderosa pine	0.83	1.29	1.6
Broadleaf evergreen	0.63		
Broadleaf deciduous closed	0.69		
Needleleaf evergreen	0.62		
Needleleaf deciduous	0.68		

Chen *et al* (2005) just published a global survey and map of clumping factors, as shown in the figure below




Fig. 6. Global vegetation clumping index map derived from POLDER 1 data using the normalized difference between interpolated hotspot and darkspot NIR reflectance and applied to vegetated land cover. Vegetation clumping increases with decreasing values of the index.

### Detecting LAI From Space

Radiation sensed by satellites can provide global scale models need information on leaf area. Such information is very important due to the dynamic nature of ecosystems and their spatial extent; it is virtually impossible to send out teams into the field to assess leaf area directly. Modern scientists are estimating leaf area for sensors perched on satellites, such as LANDSAT, AVHRR, SPOT and the recently launched TERRA (MODIS/Land) <http://modis-land.gsfc.nasa.gov/>.

$$NDVI = \frac{I_{NIR} - I_{VIS}}{I_{NIR} + I_{VIS}}$$

The Normalized Difference Vegetation Index are a function of upwelling radiances (I) in the near infrared (nir) and visible wave bands, where the nir is associated with 800 nm wavelength radiation and the visible is linked to radiation near the 600 nm waveband.

NDVI can also be expressed in terms of reflectances

$$NDVI = \frac{\rho_{NIR} - \rho_{VIS}}{\rho_{NIR} + \rho_{VIS}}$$

NDVI ranges between zero and one. Sensor has restricted field of view (2-15 degrees) and is nadir viewing, from directly overhead.

Simple Ratio is another remote sensing index. The simple ratio is a function of near infrared radiation under field condition.

$$SR = \frac{I_{NIR}}{I_{VIS}}$$

$$SR = \frac{\rho_{NIR}}{\rho_{VIS}}$$


$I_{vis}$ : (0.4 to 0.7  $\mu\text{m}$ );  $I_{nir}$ : (0.7 to 1.1  $\mu\text{m}$ )

Sellers (1987) developed theory showing how the Simple Ratio can be used to evaluate leaf area.

$$\frac{\partial(SR)}{\partial L} = \frac{1}{\rho_{vis}} \left( \rho_{vis} \frac{\partial \rho_{nir}}{\partial L} - \rho_{nir} \frac{\partial \rho_{vis}}{\partial L} \right)$$

$$\frac{\partial(SR)}{\partial L} \sim \frac{\partial \rho_{nir}}{\partial L} \sim \exp(aL)$$

Since the sensitivity of SR is an exponential function of leaf area index, the index saturates as leaf area index increases, hence the method does not evaluate canopies with high leaf area well.



**Figure 18** spectral reflectance index and leaf area index across a spectrum of leaf area indices. Data are from the OTTER project and reports by Peterson et al and Spanner et al.

Indices such as NDVI and SR were developed for the past generation of satellites, e.g. LANDSAT. Due to the coarse spectral resolution of these sensors, the indices are sensitive to contamination by the reflection of non-vegetated background material. On the other hand it is worth to continue computing these indices due to the historical length of their record, as such information gives us an unprecedented ability to monitor land use change.

With the launching of the TERRA satellite, with high spectral resolution, new and better indices have been developed, such as EVI, the enhanced vegetation index and its predecessor, SAVI (<http://tbrs.arizona.edu/projects/evi.htm>). The advantage of applying EVI is its ability to decouple confounding influences the canopy background and the atmosphere. Mathematically it is defined as:

$$EVI = G \frac{\rho_{nir} - \rho_{red}}{\rho_{nir} + C_1 \rho_{red} - C_2 \rho_{blue} + B}$$

G is a gain factor,  $C_1$  and  $C_2$  are atmospheric correction factors for the transmission of red and blue sunlight and B is the background brightness factor. Values adopted by NASA in their application of the EVI algorithm are:  $B=1$ ,  $C_1 = 6$ ,  $C_2 = 7.5$ , and  $G = 2.5$ .



Figure 19 shows a global map of EVI that is being generated routinely by the MODIS project.




Figure 19 Global map of EVI. [http://tbrs.arizona.edu:8080/modis/gm\\_index.htm](http://tbrs.arizona.edu:8080/modis/gm_index.htm)

Remote sensing products are now being used to evaluate leaf area index at global and regional scales. Below we show a global map.





Figure 20 Global map of estimated leaf area index, May 2002. Lab of Ranga Myneni, Boston University.

Higher resolution AVHRR data can also be used to generate regional scale models of leaf area index.



**Figure 21 Summer maximum LAI in California. Computations by Ned Nikolov, 1 km resolution and corrected for clumping. Data are based on AVHRR data on the NOAA satellite (Nikolov, Zeller, 2006).**

### 3.5 Other Measures of Stand Character

Information on growth is important for it informs us on how leaf area index, height and other plant features are changing with time. Several terms are used to describe the current status of plants and growth:

1. leaf fresh weight;
2. leaf water content (fresh-dry)/fresh;
3. specific leaf dry weight: mass dry/surface area;
4. Specific leaf area (SLA) is the ratio of leaf area to leaf mass. This is an index of leaf structure. The inverse of SLA is specific leaf weight. The term has been criticized as being a misnomer as specific refers to 'per unit mass.;
5. Relative growth rate, RGR,  $R_w$ . Instantaneous rate of growth relative to the living plant biomass.

$$RGR = \frac{dW}{dt} \frac{1}{W} = \frac{d(\ln W)}{dt}$$

W is the total plant weight (g), time is time in days. Theoretically, W is living plant weight, so errors occur, in interpretation, when dead matter is used.

When growth is exponential, RGR is constant through the interval.

$$m(t) = m(t_0) \exp(rgr(t - t_0))$$

The function concept of relative growth rate idea links back to Blackmun who used economic theory to examine plant growth. He assumed their growth rate was constant. In reality, RGR changes with ontogeny, it increases with time in the initial stages of life and decreases in the senescing stages (see Poorter and Garnier, 1999).

The da Vinci rule, cross sectional area of a trunk is equal to the sum of the cross section area of the branches at the next level (Enquist, 2002). Nice project to test with student data.

## Summary

- Leaf area index is one of the most important biometeorological variables to assess, as it is a measure of the population of the plants and leaves that are interacting with the environment; this can occur by intercepting photons, being a source of water, heat or CO<sub>2</sub> or being a sink for CO<sub>2</sub> and pollutants.
- There are theoretical limits to how much leaf area a landscape can sustain. Assuming no limiting factors, then the amount of leaf area to intercept 95% of incoming sunlight sets the limit, which can vary between 3 and 10 depending on leaf angle orientation and clumping.
- Climatic factors that cause variations in leaf area index among ecosystems include precipitation, evaporation and leaf nutrient content.
- Leaf area index is not static with time. It changes markedly in deciduous plants as they transcend from dormancy to full leaf and leaf fall. Subtle changes in leaf area occur in evergreens as they drop and add leaves.
- Vertical profiles of leaf area need to be assessed to employ multi-layer models. Distribution of leaf area varies with stand age of forests.
- Methods to assess leaf area index are direct and indirect. Indirect methods depend on light transmission or reflection theory and can be assessed with hand held instruments or satellites peering down from space.

## Data/Resources

New data on LAI are available on-line from the Oak Ridge National Laboratory Distributed Active Archive Center, Oak Ridge, Tennessee, U.S.A.  
[http://www.daac.ornl.gov/VEGETATION/lai\\_des.html](http://www.daac.ornl.gov/VEGETATION/lai_des.html)

## References:

- Aber JD (1979) Foliage height profiles and succession in northern hardwood forests. *Ecology* **60**, 18-23.
- Albertson JD, Katul GG, Wiberg P (2001) Relative importance of local and regional controls on coupled water, carbon, and energy fluxes. *Advances in Water Resources* **24**, 1103-1118.
- Asner GP, Scurlock JMO, Hicke JA (2003) Global synthesis of leaf area index observations: implications for ecological and remote sensing studies. *Global Ecol Biogeography* **12**, 191-205.
- Baldocchi DD, Meyers T (1998) On using eco-physiological, micrometeorological and biogeochemical theory to evaluate carbon dioxide, water vapor and trace gas fluxes over vegetation: a perspective. *Agricultural and Forest Meteorology* **90**, 1-25.
- Budyko MI (1974) *Climate and Life* Academic Press, New York, NY.
- Chason J, Huston M, Baldocchi DD (1991) A comparison of direct and indirect methods for estimating forest canopy leaf area. *Agricultural and Forest Meteorology* **57**, 107-128.
- Chen JM (1996) Optically-based methods for measuring seasonal variation of leaf area index in boreal conifer stands. *Agricultural and Forest Meteorology* **80**, 135-163.
- Chen JM, Black TA (1992) Defining Leaf-Area Index for Non-Flat Leaves. *Plant Cell and Environment* **15**, 421-429.
- Chen JM, Blanken PD, Black TA, Guilbeault M, Chen S (1997) Radiation regime and canopy architecture in a boreal aspen forest. *Agricultural and Forest Meteorology* **86**, 107-125.
- Chen JM, Menges CH, Leblanc SG (2005) Global mapping of foliage clumping index using multi-angular satellite data. *Remote Sensing of Environment* **97**, 447-457.
- Eamus D, Prior L (2001) Ecophysiology of trees of seasonally dry tropics: Comparisons among phenologies. *Advances in Ecological Research, Vol 32* **32**, 113-197.
- Enquist BJ, Economo EP, Huxman TE, *et al.* (2003) Scaling metabolism from organisms to ecosystems. *Nature* **423**, 639-642.
- Gower ST, Kucharik CJ, Norman JM (1999) Direct and Indirect Estimation of Leaf Area Index, fAPAR, and Net Primary Production of Terrestrial Ecosystems. *Remote Sensing of Environment* **70**, 29-51.
- Harding DJ, Lefsky MA, Parker GG, Blair JB (2001) Laser altimeter canopy height profiles: methods and validation for closed-canopy, broadleaf forests. *Remote Sensing of Environment* **76**, 283-297.

- Hutchison BA, Matt DR, Mcmillen RT, *et al.* (1986) The Architecture of a Deciduous Forest Canopy in Eastern Tennessee, USA. *Journal of Ecology* **74**, 635-646.
- Jarvis PG, Leverenz J (1983) Productivity of temperate, deciduous and evergreen forests. In: *Encyclopedia of Plant Physiology* (ed. al OLe). Springer-Verlag, Berlin.
- Jonckheere I, Fleck S, Nackaerts K, *et al.* (2004) Review of methods for in situ leaf area index determination: Part I. Theories, sensors and hemispherical photography. *Agricultural and Forest Meteorology* **121**, 19-35.
- Lang ARG (1987) Simplified estimate of leaf area index from transmittance of the sun's beam. *Agricultural and Forest Meteorology* **41**, 179-186.
- Law BE, Van Tuyl S, Cescatti A, Baldocchi DD (2001) Estimation of leaf area index in open-canopy ponderosa pine forests at different successional stages and management regimes in Oregon. *Agricultural and Forest Meteorology* **108**, 1-14.
- Monteith JL (1977) Climate and Efficiency of Crop Production in Britain. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society of London Series B-Biological Sciences* **281**, 277-294.
- Nikolov N, Zeller K (2006) Efficient retrieval of vegetation leaf area index and canopy clumping factor from satellite data to support pollutant deposition assessments. *Environmental Pollution* **141**, 539-549.
- Parker GG, Brown MJ (2000) Forest canopy stratification - Is it useful? *American Naturalist* **155**, 473-484.
- Parker GG, Oneill JP, Higman D (1989) Vertical Profile and Canopy Organization in a Mixed Deciduous Forest. *Vegetatio* **85**, 1-11.
- Priestley CHB, Taylor RJ (1972) On the assessment of surface heat flux and evaporation using large-scale parameters. *Monthly Weather Review* **100**, 81-92.
- Scheffer M, Holmgren M, Brovkin V, Claussen M (2005) Synergy between small- and large-scale feedbacks of vegetation on the water cycle. *Global Change Biology* **11**, 1003-1012.
- Sellers PJ (1987) Canopy reflectance, photosynthesis, and transpiration, II. The role of biophysics in the linearity of their interdependence. *Remote Sensing of Environment* **21**, 143-183.
- Sinclair TR, Tanner CB, Bennett J (1984) Water use efficiency in crop production. *BioScience* **34**, 36-40.
- van Gardingen PR, Jackson GE, Hernandez-Daumas S, Russell G, Sharp L (1999) Leaf area index estimates obtained for clumped canopies using hemispherical photography. *Agricultural and Forest Meteorology* **94**, 243-257.
- West GB, Brown JH, Enquist BJ (1999) A general model for the structure and allometry of plant vascular systems. *Nature* **400**, 664-667.
- Whittaker RH, Woodwell GM (1967) Surface area relations of woody plants and forest communities. *American Journal of Botany* **54**, 931-939.
- Wilson KB, Baldocchi DD (2000) Seasonal and interannual variability of energy fluxes over a broadleaved temperate deciduous forest in North America. *Agricultural and Forest Meteorology* **100**, 1-18.
- Woodward FI (1987) *Climate and Plant Distribution* Cambridge University Press.