

## 1. About the data set

Site name (three letter code)	Teshio CC-LaG experiment site (TSE)	
Period of registered data	From January 1 2005 to December 31 2005	
This document file name	FxFmt_TSE_2005_30m_01-2.pdf	
Corresponding data file name	FxFmt_TSE_2005_30m_01-2.csv	
Revision information		
Date	Details of revision	Renewed file name
17 June 2008	First registration	FxFmt_TSE_2005_30m_01.pdf FxFmt_TSE_2005_30m_01.csv Siln_TSE_2008_04.pdf
6 October 2022	DOI (Digital Object Identifier) was assigned. The contact person#2 was updated. The citation format was described in the other information.	FxFmt_TSE_2005_30m_01-2.pdf FxFmt_TSE_2005_30m_01-2.csv Siln_TSE_2008_05.pdf
Contact person#1	Kentaro Takagi (kentt@fsc.hokudai.ac.jp)	
Contact person#2	Yoshiyuki Takahashi (yoshiyu@nies.go.jp)	
Contact person#3		
Other Information	When this data set is referred to in publications, it should be cited in the following format. Takagi and Takahashi (2022), Micrometeorological CO <sub>2</sub> Flux Data at Teshio CC-LaG Experiment site (TSE), Ver.x.x *1, National Institute for Environmental Studies, DOI:10.17595/20221006.001. (Reference date *2: YYYY/MM/DD) *1 The version number is indicated in the name of each data file. *2 As the reference date, please indicate the date you downloaded the files.	

## 2. Site description

☺ to Data provider ..... Please explain the site condition during the period of this dataset.

☹ to DB user ..... See also the general information file.

Hour line (Time difference from UTC)	Japan standard time (JST) (9 hours ahead of UTC)
Vegetation Type	Young larch plantation
Dominant Species (Overstory)	hybrid ( <i>Larix gmelinii</i> × <i>L. kaempferi</i> ) larch
Dominant Species (Understory)	<i>Sasa senanensis</i> and <i>Sasa kurilensis</i>

Canopy height	ca. 1.1 m
LAI	Larch LAI in the stripe-cut row is ca. max 1.3 and <i>Sasa</i> in the remained row is ca. max 5.7
Other information	

### 3. Observation and calculation

☺ to Data provider ..... A list of references is shown in the last page. **Please fill-in the blanks as much as possible, or select the suitable option.**

#### 3-1. Flux observation system and data acquisition

Type of sonic anemometer	Sonic anemometer-thermometer (KAIJO, DA600-3TV, TR-61A), Sensor span: 10 cm
Type of IRGA	LI-COR, LI-7000, Distance between gas inlet and NDIR: 15 m, Height of gas inlet: 4.6 m, ca. 3 m above canopy surface, Distance between gas inlet and anemometer: 5 cm.
Sampling rate	10Hz
Averaging time	30min
Flux measurement height #1	4.6m
Flux measurement height #2	
Flux measurement height #3	
Zero-plane displacement	Constant (0.6m)
Roughness length	Not evaluated
Calibration information	CO <sub>2</sub> fluctuations were calibrated every day by using two standard CO <sub>2</sub> gases (320 and 420 μmol mol <sup>-1</sup> ). Sensors for air temperature, relative humidity, net radiation, solar radiation, wind speed are checked once a year, with the certificated instruments.
Other information	Tower: 32 m (Climbable) Flux tower:4.5m Electrical power: Two power generators (until 10 Feb.) : Commercial power supply (From 10 Feb.) Data: All data are recorded using a data logger (CSI, CR-5000), and saved on to HD card

#### 3-2. Flux calculation

		Note/References
Flow attenuation	✓ Not applied	
Coordinate rotation	✓ Planar fit *1	The sonic rotation angle for planar fit rotation was determined every day using 30-min averages of wind speed in a 15-day moving window
Lag removal	✓ Constant value for each month	Sonic-tube lag time for CO <sub>2</sub> & H <sub>2</sub> O was determined monthly by averaging the lag times determined every 30 min under turbulent conditions

#### 3-3. Flux corrections

		Note/References

For sensible heat flux	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✓ Cross wind correction <sup>*2</sup></li> <li>✗ Water vapor correction <sup>*3</sup></li> </ul>	
High frequency loss	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Which fluxes? [ u*, H]</b></li> <li>✓ Moor (1986) <sup>*4</sup> (Correction for path length and sensor separation)</li> <li>• <b>Which fluxes? [ LE]</b></li> <li>✓ Moor (1986) <sup>*4</sup> (Correction for path length for SAT)</li> <li>✓ Experimental approach <sup>*5-7</sup> (see Note)</li> <li>• <b>Which fluxes? [ Fc]</b></li> <li>✓ Moor (1986) <sup>*4</sup> (Correction for path length for SAT)</li> <li>✓ Experimental approach <sup>*5-7</sup> (see Note)</li> </ul>	Co-spectra between vertical winds and scalars (temperature and CO <sub>2</sub> & H <sub>2</sub> O concentrations) were normalized according to the covariance integrated over the band-pass range and averaged over periods with similar wind speed under turbulent conditions. The correction factor ( $\epsilon$ ) was determined from the ratio of integrated, normalized co-spectra, using temperature as a reference. $\epsilon$ depends on the mean wind speed ( $u$ ): $\epsilon = a + b u$ , where $a$ and $b$ are coefficients that were determined every year or upon a change in the system; $a$ and $b$ for CO <sub>2</sub> were 1.09 and 0.153, respectively and for H <sub>2</sub> O were 1.15 and 0.253, respectively
Low frequency loss (Detrending)	✗ Block average	
WPL Correction <sup>*8</sup>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✓ For latent heat (LE) flux</li> <li>✗ For CO<sub>2</sub> flux</li> </ul>	
Others	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✓ Temperature dependency for latent heat: L</li> <li>✓ Humidity dependency for specific heat: Cp</li> <li>✓ Temperature dependency for air density</li> <li>✓ Pressure dependency for air density</li> </ul>	

### 3-4. Quality control

		Note/References
Raw data test <sup>*9</sup>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✓ Spike test (see Note)</li> <li>✓ Absolute limits</li> <li>✓ Absolute variance</li> <li>✓ Higher-moment statistics</li> <li>✓ Resolution test</li> <li>✓ Discontinuities</li> </ul>	Threshold for the spike was more than 5× s.d. in a series of 3000 overlapping datapoints
Non steady state test	✓ YES	The measured flux signals of 30 min duration was divided into 6 sub records (5 min), and if the difference between the mean covariance of the 6 sub records and the covariance for the full period is more than 60% under turbulent condition, the flux data were removed (Instationarity ratio test) <sup>*10</sup>

Integral turbulence characteristics <sup>10</sup>	✓ YES	The observed integral characteristic of the vertical wind ( $\sigma_w/u_*$ ) was compared to the ideal values estimated from the Monin-Obukhov similarity, where $\sigma_w$ and $u_*$ are the standard deviation of the vertical wind velocity and friction velocity, respectively. The flux values were removed when the difference between the observed and ideal values was more than 70%
Correlation coefficient	✓ Not applied	
Wind direction	✓ Not applied	
Footprint test	✓ YES	Fetch for the flux observation decreased after the clearcutting. The distances between the flux observation point and boundaries of the cut area ranged from 140 to 340 m in the eight cardinal and intercardinal directions. To remove the effect of flux from outside the clearcut, we evaluated the footprint of the observed CO <sub>2</sub> flux using the model developed by Kormann & Meixner (2001) <sup>11</sup> , which accounts for thermal stability. We evaluated the cumulative footprint every 30 min up to 2 km and up to the boundaries of the cut area (distance according to wind direction) from the observation point in 1-m steps. The flux data were removed if the ratio of the two cumulative values was <0.7 (i.e., contribution from the cutover was less than about 70%).
Ablosute thresholds	✓ YES	600 > IE > -300 W m <sup>-2</sup> 50 > FCO <sub>2</sub> > - 50 micoromol m <sup>2</sup> s <sup>-1</sup>
Others	✓	

### 3-4. Storage term

		Note/References
Storage term	• <b>Not evaluated</b>	

### 3-5. Other information

☺ to Data provider ..... If your flux data were evaluated by gradient method, please explain the observation method here.

		Note/References


#### 4. Registered Data

Observation items	Symbol	Unit	Height(s) Depth(s)	Instruments	Level of data processing
Year	Year	-	****	****	#### (YYYY)
Date	DOY	-	****	****	1~365(6)
Time	TIME	-	****	****	#### (HHMM)
Wind direction	WD	degrees	32m	Photo-electric wind vane, 020C, MetOne	Vector average
Wind speed	WS_32	$\text{m}\cdot\text{s}^{-1}$	32m	Photo-electric cup anemometer, 010C, MetOne	
Wind speed	WS_25	$\text{m}\cdot\text{s}^{-1}$	25m	Photo-electric cup anemometer, 010C, MetOne	
Wind speed	WS_21	$\text{m}\cdot\text{s}^{-1}$	21m	Photo-electric cup anemometer, 010C, MetOne	
Wind speed	WS_15	$\text{m}\cdot\text{s}^{-1}$	15m	Photo-electric cup anemometer, 010C, MetOne	
Wind speed	WS_10	$\text{m}\cdot\text{s}^{-1}$	10m	Photo-electric cup anemometer, 010C, MetOne	
Wind speed	WS_6	$\text{m}\cdot\text{s}^{-1}$	6m	Photo-electric cup anemometer, 010C, MetOne	
Wind speed	WS_4	$\text{m}\cdot\text{s}^{-1}$	4m	Photo-electric cup anemometer, 010C, MetOne	
Net Radiation	Rn_32	$\text{W}\cdot\text{m}^{-2}$	32m	Net radiometer, CNR-1, Kipp&Zonen	
Net Radiation	Rn_3	$\text{W}\cdot\text{m}^{-2}$	3m	Net radiometer, CNR-1, Kipp&Zonen	Onder the canopy
Photosynthetic active photon flux density	PPFD_32	$\text{micromol}\cdot\text{m}^{-2}\cdot\text{s}^{-1}$	32m	Quantum sensor, LI-190SZ, LI-COR	
Photosynthetic active photon flux density	PPFD1_3	$\text{micromol}\cdot\text{m}^{-2}\cdot\text{s}^{-1}$	3m	Quantum sensor, LI-190SZ, LI-COR	Over the canopy
Photosynthetic active photon flux density	PPFD2_3	$\text{micromol}\cdot\text{m}^{-2}\cdot\text{s}^{-1}$	3m	Quantum sensor, LI-190SZ, LI-COR	Over the canopy
Global solar radiation (incoming)	Rg1_32	$\text{W}\cdot\text{m}^{-2}$	32m	Thermopile type pyranometer, M-21F, Kipp&Zonen	
Global solar radiation (incoming)	Rg2_32	$\text{W}\cdot\text{m}^{-2}$	32m	Net radiometer, CNR-1, Kipp&Zonen	
Global solar radiation	Rg_3	$\text{W}\cdot\text{m}^{-2}$	3m	Net radiometer, CNR-1,	Over the

(incoming)				Kipp&Zonen	canopy
Long-wave radiation (incoming)	Rgl1_32	$W \cdot m^{-2}$	32m	Thermopile type infrared radiometer, PIR, EPPLEY	
Long-wave radiation (incoming)	Rgl2_32	$W \cdot m^{-2}$	32m	Net radiometer, CNR-1, Kipp&Zonen	
Long-wave radiation (incoming)	Rgl_3	$W \cdot m^{-2}$	3m	Net radiometer, CNR-1, Kipp&Zonen	Over the canopy
Global solar radiation (outgoing)	Rg_out_32	$W \cdot m^{-2}$	32m	Net radiometer, CNR-1, Kipp&Zonen	
Global solar radiation (outgoing)	Rg_out_3	$W \cdot m^{-2}$	3m	Net radiometer, CNR-1, Kipp&Zonen	Over the canopy
Long-wave radiation (outgoing)	Rgl_out_32	$W \cdot m^{-2}$	32m	Net radiometer, CNR-1, Kipp&Zonen	
Long-wave radiation (outgoing)	Rgl_out_3	$W \cdot m^{-2}$	3m	Net radiometer, CNR-1, Kipp&Zonen	Over the canopy
Air temperature	Ta_32	degrees C	32m	Ventilated platinum resistance thermometer, HMP45A, VAISALA	
Air temperature	Ta_25	degrees C	25m	Ventilated platinum resistance thermometer, HMP45D, VAISALA	
Air temperature	Ta_21	degrees C	21m	Ventilated platinum resistance thermometer, HMP45D, VAISALA	
Air temperature	Ta_15	degrees C	15m	Ventilated platinum resistance thermometer, HMP45D, VAISALA	
Air temperature	Ta_10	degrees C	10m	Ventilated platinum resistance thermometer, HMP45D, VAISALA	
Air temperature	Ta_6	degrees C	6m	Ventilated platinum resistance thermometer, HMP45D, VAISALA	
Air temperature	Ta_4	degrees C	4m	Ventilated platinum resistance thermometer, HMP45D, VAISALA	
Air temperature	Ta_2	degrees C	2m	Ventilated platinum resistance thermometer, HMP45A, VAISALA	
H <sub>2</sub> O concentration	Ho_32	$g \cdot m^{-3}$	32m	Ventilated HUMICAP hygrometer, HMP45D, VAISALA	
H <sub>2</sub> O concentration	Ho_25	$g \cdot m^{-3}$	25m	Ventilated HUMICAP hygrometer, HMP45D, VAISALA	



H <sub>2</sub> O concentration	Ho_21	$\text{g} \cdot \text{m}^{-3}$	21m	Ventilated HUMICAP hygrometer, HMP45D, VAISALA	
H <sub>2</sub> O concentration	Ho_15	$\text{g} \cdot \text{m}^{-3}$	15m	Ventilated HUMICAP hygrometer, HMP45D, VAISALA	
H <sub>2</sub> O concentration	Ho_10	$\text{g} \cdot \text{m}^{-3}$	10m	Ventilated HUMICAP hygrometer, HMP45D, VAISALA	
H <sub>2</sub> O concentration	Ho_6	$\text{g} \cdot \text{m}^{-3}$	6m	Ventilated HUMICAP hygrometer, HMP45D, VAISALA	
H <sub>2</sub> O concentration	Ho_4	$\text{g} \cdot \text{m}^{-3}$	4m	Ventilated HUMICAP hygrometer, HMP45D, VAISALA	
H <sub>2</sub> O concentration	Ho_2	$\text{g} \cdot \text{m}^{-3}$	2m	Ventilated HUMICAP hygrometer, HMP45D, VAISALA	
Precipitation	PPT	mm	3m	0.1 mm-pulse tipping-bucket rain gauge with heater, CYG-52202, RM Young	30 min sum
Barometric pressure	Pa	hPa	2m	BAROCAP barometer, PTB210-C6C5A, VAISALA	
Ground heat flux	G1_2	$\text{W} \cdot \text{m}^{-2}$	-2cm	Heat flux plate, HFT-1.1, REBS	
Ground heat flux	G2_2	$\text{W} \cdot \text{m}^{-2}$	-2cm	Heat flux plate, HFT-1.1, REBS	
Ground heat flux	G3_2	$\text{W} \cdot \text{m}^{-2}$	-2cm	Heat flux plate, HFT-1.1, REBS	
Ground heat flux	G4_2	$\text{W} \cdot \text{m}^{-2}$	-2cm	Heat flux plate, HFT-1.1, REBS	
Ground heat flux	G5_2	$\text{W} \cdot \text{m}^{-2}$	-2cm	Heat flux plate, HFT-1.1, REBS	
Soil water content	SWC1_5	$\text{m}^3 \text{m}^{-3}$	-5cm	TDR sensor, CS615, CSI	
Soil water content	SWC1_10	$\text{m}^3 \text{m}^{-3}$	-10 cm	TDR sensor, CS615, CSI	
Soil water content	SWC1_30	$\text{m}^3 \text{m}^{-3}$	-30 cm	TDR sensor, CS615, CSI	
Soil water content	SWC1_60	$\text{m}^3 \text{m}^{-3}$	-60 cm	TDR sensor, CS615, CSI	
Soil water content	SWC2_5	$\text{m}^3 \text{m}^{-3}$	-5 cm	TDR sensor, CS615, CSI	
Soil water content	SWC2_10	$\text{m}^3 \text{m}^{-3}$	-10 cm	TDR sensor, CS615, CSI	
Soil water content	SWC3_5	$\text{m}^3 \text{m}^{-3}$	-5 cm	TDR sensor, CS615, CSI	
Soil water content	SWC3_10	$\text{m}^3 \text{m}^{-3}$	-10 cm	TDR sensor, CS615, CSI	
Soil water content	SWC4_5	$\text{m}^3 \text{m}^{-3}$	-5 cm	TDR sensor, CS615, CSI	

Soil water content	SWC4_10	m <sup>3</sup> m <sup>-3</sup>	-10 cm	TDR sensor, CS615, CSI	
Soil water content	SWC5_5	m <sup>3</sup> m <sup>-3</sup>	-5 cm	TDR sensor, CS615, CSI	
Soil water content	SWC5_10	m <sup>3</sup> m <sup>-3</sup>	-10 cm	TDR sensor, CS615, CSI	
Soil temperature	Ts1_1	degrees C	-1 cm	Platinum resistance thermometer, C-PTWP, CLIMATEC	
Soil temperature	Ts1_5	degrees C	-5 cm	Platinum resistance thermometer, C-PTWP, CLIMATEC	
Soil temperature	Ts1_10	degrees C	-10 cm	Platinum resistance thermometer, C-PTWP, CLIMATEC	
Soil temperature	Ts1_20	degrees C	-20 cm	Platinum resistance thermometer, C-PTWP, CLIMATEC	
Soil temperature	Ts1_40	degrees C	-40 cm	Platinum resistance thermometer, C-PTWP, CLIMATEC	
Soil temperature	Ts1_80	degrees C	-80 cm	Platinum resistance thermometer, C-PTWP, CLIMATEC	
Soil temperature	Ts1_120	degrees C	-120 cm	Platinum resistance thermometer, C-PTWP, CLIMATEC	
Soil temperature	Ts2_1	degrees C	-1 cm	Platinum resistance thermometer, C-PTWP, CLIMATEC	
Soil temperature	Ts2_5	degrees C	-5 cm	Platinum resistance thermometer, C-PTWP, CLIMATEC	
Soil temperature	Ts2_10	degrees C	-10 cm	Platinum resistance thermometer, C-PTWP, CLIMATEC	
Soil temperature	Ts3_1	degrees C	-1 cm	Platinum resistance thermometer, C-PTWP, CLIMATEC	
Soil temperature	Ts3_5	degrees C	-5 cm	Platinum resistance thermometer, C-PTWP, CLIMATEC	
Soil temperature	Ts3_10	degrees C	-10 cm	Platinum resistance thermometer, C-PTWP, CLIMATEC	
Soil temperature	Ts4_1	degrees C	-1 cm	Platinum resistance thermometer, C-PTWP, CLIMATEC	
Soil temperature	Ts4_5	degrees C	-5 cm	Platinum resistance	

				thermometer, C-PTWP, CLIMATEC	
Soil temperature	Ts4_10	degrees C	-10 cm	Platinum resistance thermometer, C-PTWP, CLIMATEC	
Soil temperature	Ts5_1	degrees C	-1 cm	Platinum resistance thermometer, C-PTWP, CLIMATEC	
Soil temperature	Ts5_5	degrees C	-5 cm	Platinum resistance thermometer, C-PTWP, CLIMATEC	
Soil temperature	Ts5_10	degrees C	-10 cm	Platinum resistance thermometer, C-PTWP, CLIMATEC	
Snow depth	SNOWD	m	Ca. 4m	Sonic ranging sensor , SR50, CSI	
Sensible heat flux	H	$W \cdot m^{-2}$	4.6m	DA-600-3TV, TR61A, Kaijo	
Latent heat flux	LE	$W \cdot m^{-2}$	4.6m	DA-600-3TV, TR61A, Kaijo & LI-7000, LICOR	
Net ecosystem CO <sub>2</sub> exchange	NEE1	$micromol \cdot m^{-2} \cdot s^{-1}$	4.6m	DA-600-3TV, TR61A, Kaijo & LI-7000, LICOR	
Net ecosystem CO <sub>2</sub> exchange	NEE2	$micromol \cdot m^{-2} \cdot s^{-1}$	4.6m	DA-600-3TV, TR61A, Kaijo & LI-7000, LICOR	With friction velocity correction ( $u^* > 0.1$ m/s)
Friction velocity	USt	$m \cdot s^{-1}$	4.6m	DA-600-3TV, TR61A, Kaijo	

### 5. Note for data users

☺ to Data provider ..... If you use some tags (flags/identifiers) to identify the levels of data processing, please explain the meanings of the tags.

The figure of “-99999” denote missing or rejected data.

### 6. Important events

☺ to Data provider..... Please list noteworthy events during the observation period. For example, relocation of the instruments, reasons for missing observation, dates of sowing and harvesting at agricultural site should be listed in the table by date.

Date	Events
17-29 June	Weeding of newly developed <i>Sasa</i> shoot in the strip-cut row

## References

### Flux calculation

\*1 Wilczak, J.M., Oncley, S.P. and Stage, S.A., 2001. *Boundary-Layer Meteorology*, 99: 127-150.

### Flux correction

\*2 Kaimal J.C. and Gaynor, J.E., 1991. *Boundary-Layer Meteorology*, 56: 401-410.

\*3 Hignett, P., 1992. *Boundary-Layer Meteorology*, 61: 175-187.

\*4 Moore, C.J., 1986. *Boundary-Layer Meteorology*, 37: 17-35.

\*5 Aubinet, M. et al., 2000. *Advances in Ecological Research*, 30: 113-175.

\*6 Aubinet, M. et al. 2001. *Agricultural and Forest Meteorology*, 108: 293-315.

\*7 Kowalski, AS. et al. 2003. *Global Change Biology*, 9: 1051-1065.

\*8 Webb, E. K., Pearman, G.I. and Leuning, R., 1980. *Quarterly Journal of the Royal Meteorological Society*, 106: 85-100.

### Quality control

\*9 Vickers, D. and Mahrt, L., 1997. *Journal of Atmospheric and Oceanic Technology*, 14: 512-526.

\*10 Foken, T. and Wichura, B., 1996. *Agricultural and Forest Meteorology*, 78: 83-105.

\*11 Kormann R. and Meixner F.X., 2001 *Boundary-Layer Meteorology*, 99, 207-224.