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ABSTRACT

Previous measurements of the urban energy balance primarily have been conducted in summertime. This paper reports the first extended set of winter–spring-time energy balance measurements for a city. The study was conducted in a suburb of Vancouver, British Columbia, from January to June 1987. It included hourly measurements of net all-wave radiation, sensible heat flux and the Bowen ratio. The anthropogenic and storage heat fluxes were modeled. A dynamic source area model was employed to ensure the modeled parameters were consistent spatially with the measured turbulent fluxes. The winter–spring urban energy balances observed in this study are different to those reported for summertime conditions at the same site. The fluxes for the entire period are not symmetrical about solar noon. Hence earlier interpretations possibly should be modified. Apart from this feature the spring season balances are similar to those reported for the summertime in terms of relative importance of individual fluxes. The wintertime energy balance appears to be different to that of spring and summer. The most noticeable feature is the increased importance of the latent heat flux, which on average is the largest output flux in the balance. A secondary, more expected feature, is the increased importance of anthropogenic heat flux as an input in winter.
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INTRODUCTION

Knowledge of the surface energy balance is considered fundamental to an understanding of the boundary layer meteorology and climatology of any site. The surface energy balance of an extensive urbanized surface is defined for a volume that contains the elements of the surface ‘canopy’, the air between the canopy elements, and the soil down to a depth sufficient to ensure that vertical heat exchange is negligible over the period of interest. Fluxes are determined per unit area of the top of the volume. A fuller explanation of this concept is given by Oke (1988). The surface energy balance may be written:

\[ Q^* + Q_F = Q_H + Q_E + \Delta Q_S + \Delta Q_A \] (W m\(^{-2}\))

where all terms are flux densities; \( Q^* \) is the net all-wave radiation; \( Q_F \) the anthropogenic heat; \( Q_H \) the sensible heat; \( Q_E \) the latent heat; \( \Delta Q_S \) the net heat storage; and \( \Delta Q_A \) the net heat advection. Positive values on the left side of equation (1) are inputs to the system, positive values on the right side are outputs.

Construction of valid energy balances for spatially non-uniform surfaces, such as cities, requires that all component fluxes represent identical source areas. This is particularly important when measured and modeled fluxes are to be combined within an energy balance. If each term in equation (1) is obtained separately, the balance can close only if each term refers to the same system. The surface area influencing the measurement of one term must be the same as that influencing any other term, whether it is measured or modeled, otherwise the energy balance equation is internally inconsistent. The surface area contributing to a flux measurement is termed the ‘source area’ by Schmid and Oke (1990). The shape and size of the source area...
is dependent firstly on the process involved, secondly on the instrument used for the measurement, and thirdly on the conditions under which the measurement is performed. The equivalent of the source area in the case of a modelled flux is the model domain, i.e. the surface portion that contains all the characteristics considered in the model. It follows that the source areas of each measured term and the domains of each modelled term must be equivalent for a spatially consistent surface-energy balance.

The objective of this paper is to utilize the source area concept in combining measurement and modelling to investigate urban energy balance fluxes under winter and spring conditions. The scale of the flux determinations relate to an area of suburban land use; i.e. at the local scale (Oke, 1984), rather than from individual surfaces, such as lawn or road. The state of urban energy balance research has been reviewed by Oke (1988). Except for Kerschgens and Drauschke’s (1986) two-day winter field study in Bonn, Germany, most urban energy balance measurements have been conducted in summer. This study probably is the first to report measured fluxes for an extended period of winter and spring conditions.

DETERMINATION OF HOURLY ENERGY BALANCES

In this study hourly energy balance fluxes are determined for a site (called Sunset) in a suburban area of Vancouver, British Columbia, using measurements of $Q^*$, $Q_H$ and $Q_E$, and modelled values of $Q_F$ and $\Delta Q_A$. $\Delta Q_A$ is omitted on the basis of Steyn’s (1985) analysis of data from the same tower. He showed energy residuals from overdetermined balances are zero in the mean, and are unrelated to wind speed or direction. This strongly suggests that the Sunset site is not characterized by systematic local-scale advection. This conclusion is further supported by the small spatial variability found by Schmid et al. (1991) when comparing observations on the fixed tower at Sunset with those from a mobile tower operated at several sites within a 2-km radius.

Physical setting and climatology of Vancouver during the study period

Observations were conducted in the Sunset suburb, Vancouver (49°15'N, 123°18'W; Figure 1). Vancouver is located on the west coast of North America, but is climatically isolated from the continental interior by a series of mountain chains paralleling the coastline. It is sheltered from the Pacific Ocean by Vancouver Island. The city is situated at the west end of the Lower Fraser Valley and has low to moderate relief. The Sunset neighbourhood is predominantly composed of one- and two-storey single family dwellings. The area has a slight south-westerly slope towards the Fraser River.

The general climatology of Vancouver is described in Hay and Oke (1976), the following is a brief description. The large-scale upper level flow generally is from the westerly quarter, off the Pacific. Embedded in this flow are disturbances (cyclones), which are best developed and most frequent in winter. High-pressure (anticyclonic) regimes have a relatively low frequency in the winter months, because normally they are unable to withstand the invasion of vigorous cyclonic disturbances. Summer brings an extension of the Pacific anticyclone regime into the mid-latitudes, resulting in the predominance of generally cloudless, warm weather with light flow.

Several physical features of the landscape combine to produce local climate variations. Chief among these are the influences of topography, proximity to the ocean, and urbanization. The setting of Vancouver leads to the occurrence of land–sea and mountain–valley circulations. The land/sea breeze causes predominantly westerly winds during daytime and weaker easterly flow during the night. It has a higher frequency during the summertime (Steyn and Faulkner, 1986). Owing to the sea breeze and the associated advection of marine air, the height of the daytime planetary boundary layer typically is reduced to only 500 m or less (Steyn and Oke, 1982; Steyn and McKendry, 1988; Cleugh, 1990).

Measurements were conducted from Year Day (Y/D) 87/21 (21 January) to 87/179 (28 June 1987). The monthly average climate statistics collected by the Canadian Atmospheric Environment Service at the Vancouver International Airport Climate Station (Fig. 1) indicate that, in general, the measurement period was warmer than normal, had a greater number of sunshine hours, but had almost normal precipitation (more as rain and less as snow than normal).
Measured fluxes

To obtain fluxes representative of the local scale, measurements must be made well above the height of the roughness elements to ensure that observations are conducted in the surface layer, so that they represent the integrated effects of the surface types that characterize the land use (Oke et al., 1989).

Roth et al. (1989) report a study of the turbulence spectra of temperature, the vertical and longitudinal wind components as well as the cospectra of the fluxes of sensible heat and momentum at the Sunset site, including an assessment of whether the measurement height used is above the roughness sublayer. In accord with their findings a sensor height of > 20 m above zero plane displacement, and an averaging time of 60 minutes were selected for the present study. The zero plane displacement and roughness lengths of the Sunset site were determined by Steyn (1980) to be 3.5 m and 0.52 m, respectively.

The variables measured, details of the instrumentation used and their positions on the tower are presented in Table I. The signals were logged on Campbell Scientific Inc CR21X data loggers. All times referred to are local apparent time (LAT).

From the data collected from the RTDMS (see Table I) β was calculated:

\[ \beta = \frac{[\gamma(\Delta T_a + \Gamma \Delta z)]}{[(s + \gamma)\Delta T_w - \gamma \Delta T_a]} \]  

(2)

where \( \Delta T_a \) is the dry-bulb temperature difference (°C); \( \Delta T_w \) the wet-bulb temperature difference (°C); \( \Gamma \) the dry adiabatic lapse rate (°C m \(^{-1}\)); \( s \) the slope of the saturation vapour pressure curve at \( T_w \) (Pa °C \(^{-1}\)), calculated using Lowe (1977); \( \gamma \) the psychrometric constant (Pa °C \(^{-1}\)), calculated using Fritschen and Gay (1979) with
Table I. Instrumentation specifications for the measurements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Flux</th>
<th>Instrument manufacturer, model</th>
<th>Height* (m)</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Net all-wave radiation $Q^*$</td>
<td>Net pyrradiometer&lt;br&gt;Swissteco S1</td>
<td>20.5</td>
<td>Polythene domes: inflated and kept free of internal condensation by air pumped through granulated silica desiccant&lt;br&gt;Instantaneous error: 3-4% (Latimer, 1972)&lt;br&gt;Hourly error: 5% (Cleugh and Oke, 1986)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Sensible heat flux $Q_H$  | Sonic anemometer and fine wire thermocouple system (SAT)
Campbell Scientific CA27 | 20.5        | Vertical wind velocity: phase shift in the sound wave<br>Air temperature: fine-wire thermocouple (diameter 12.7 µm)<br>Sample rate: 10 Hz Covariances: 15-minute periods<br>Hourly flux: mean of four 15-minute values<br>Measurement errors: Tanner (CSI, pers. comm., 1987); measurement error < 10%; Roth et al. (1989); system measures $w'T'$ adequately; Schmid et al. (1991): intercomparison of two instruments for hourly flux RMSE = 12 W m$^{-2}$ |
| Wind speed $u$            | Cup anemometer<br>Met-One 012A                                       | 19          |                                                                                                   |
| Wind direction $\phi$     | Wind vane<br>Met-One 024A                                            | 19          |                                                                                                   |
| Relative humidity Temperature $T$ | Relative humidity probe Rotronics Instrument Corp. MP-100     | 19          |                                                                                                   |
| Dry bulb and wet bulb temperature $T_d$ and $T_w$ | Reversing temperature difference measurement system (RTDMS)
Similar to McCaughey et al. (1987) | 17.2        | Used to determine Bowen ratio ($\beta = Q_H/Q_E$)<br>Temperature: 10 junction copper/constantan thermopiles, mounted within aspirated shields on two carts that move up and down on a trackway; Cart separation: 7.1 m<br>Reversal: twice per hour—ten minutes to travel (< 4 minutes) and equilibrate at the new level. 20 minutes at each level—providing two 10-minute means |
| Precipitation $P$         | Rain gauge<br>Meteorolog. Res. Inc 382B                              | 10.1        |                                                                                                   |

* Effective height of instruments. The instruments were mounted on a 29-m triangular-section steel lattice, free-standing tower. The base of the tower is 5 m below the level of a surrounding embankment. Therefore the maximum effective height of the tower is 20.5 m (height of instruments minus zero plane displacement and embankment).
latent heat of vaporization calculated using Henderson-Sellers (1984); and \( \Delta z \) the sensor separation (m). Using this system \( Q_H \) can be determined from \( \beta \) using the energy balance:

\[
Q_{H\beta} = \frac{\beta(Q^* + Q_F - \Delta Q_S)}{(1 + \beta)}
\]  

(3)

and similarly the latent heat flux \( (Q_E) \) can be determined:

\[
Q_{E\beta} = \frac{(Q^* + Q_F - \Delta Q_S)}{(1 + \beta)}
\]  

(4)

Alternatively, \( Q_E \) can be calculated using \( \beta \) and \( Q_H \) measured with the SAT (see Table I): \( Q_E = Q_H/\beta \).

The error analysis used to determine the precision of the RTDMS follows the procedure of Kalanda (1979). Using this method maximum errors were determined for the temperature differences, absolute temperatures, \( \beta \), \( Q_{H\beta} \) and \( Q_{E\beta} \). The errors calculated for each hour were used to stratify the data to decide whether the Bowen-ratio–energy-balance or the SAT–energy-balance method should be used to determine the ‘measured’ \( Q_E \).

For some hours there is more than one method of obtaining the \( Q_H \) and \( Q_E \) fluxes. In the case of \( Q_H \), eddy correlation measurements were used preferentially \( (Q_{H\beta}) \); otherwise, it was obtained using equation (3) \( (Q_{H\beta}) \). If the resulting \( Q_{H\beta} \) and latent heat fluxes \( (Q_{E\beta}) \) were realistic and the error in \( Q_{H\beta} \) and \( Q_{E\beta} \) were less than 30 per cent, or if the absolute size of both fluxes was less than 20 W m\(^{-2}\), then the calculated fluxes were accepted.

The method used for \( Q_E \) is dependent on that used for \( Q_H \). If \( Q_H \) from the SAT was available then it was determined as a residual \( (Q_{ER}) \) from equation (1). Otherwise it was calculated from equation (4) \( (Q_{E\beta}) \). The hours when this was used are the same as those for \( Q_{H\beta} \). The reason for choosing to accept \( Q_H \) and \( Q_{ER} \) first rather than following a procedure of determining an optimum energy balance, such as that suggested by Steyn (1985), is based on the expectation that this procedure will produce the smallest error in the turbulent fluxes.

Results of a statistical and graphical comparison of the turbulent sensible heat flux densities determined by eddy correlation \( (Q_{H\beta}) \) and Bowen-ratio–energy-balance \( (Q_{H\beta}) \) are similar to those reported by Cleugh and Oke (1986) for a rural site. Here the comparison is broken down by error in \( \beta \) (Table II). Only 8 h of the simultaneous measurements had a maximum error of less than 10 per cent. These values, except for one point, are virtually identical. As the error increases (beyond 20 per cent) the number of extreme outliers does not increase. At \( \leq 100 \) per cent error there is a noticeable increase in values close to zero; in particular, values of \( Q_{H\beta} \) are calculated as almost equal to zero, whereas for the same hours \( Q_H \) have a greater range.

Modelled fluxes

Given that the radiative field is relatively uniform in space (Schmid et al., 1991) it is appropriate to match all modelled fluxes (in this study \( Q_F \) and \( \Delta Q_S \)) to the source areas for the turbulent fluxes since these are variable. To ensure that the energy balance is consistent for an hour when fluxes are both modelled and measured the turbulent source areas are imposed on a geographic information system containing the surface characteristics necessary to calculate the spatially corresponding anthropogenic and storage fluxes. This allows the surface description for modelling purposes to vary dynamically with meteorological conditions (wind directions, stability, etc.), hence with the measurements.

The dimensions of the elliptically shaped source area are determined using the Schmid and Oke (1990) Source Area Model (SAM). The SAM output consists of weighted elliptically shaped source areas for each hour with dimensions that are a fairly sensitive function of sensor height, and are further affected by stability and roughness, in that order of importance. All source area dimensions increase as the stability changes from unstable to neutral to stable conditions (Pasquill, 1972). The area between each ellipse has equal weight (see Grimmond and Oke 1991, figure 2). Utilizing the meteorologically controlled SAM ellipses with a data base (Appendix I) it is possible to assign objectively the values to parameters necessary for consistent flux calculations. The relation between the components are:
Table II. Comparison of $Q_H$ and $Q^H_H$ (W m$^{-2}$) with varying errors in $\beta^a$

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Per cent age error in $\beta$</th>
<th>$Q_H$</th>
<th>$Q^H_H$</th>
<th>RMSE (W m$^{-2}$)</th>
<th>MAE (W m$^{-2}$)</th>
<th>$m_r$</th>
<th>$r^2$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$&lt;10$</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>32.2</td>
<td>35.9</td>
<td>35.4</td>
<td>52.6</td>
<td>23.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$&lt;20$</td>
<td>499</td>
<td>170.2</td>
<td>93.7</td>
<td>139.9</td>
<td>88.9</td>
<td>68.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$&lt;30$</td>
<td>683</td>
<td>149.3</td>
<td>94.8</td>
<td>122.9</td>
<td>72.1</td>
<td>67.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$&lt;40$</td>
<td>777</td>
<td>136.8</td>
<td>96.5</td>
<td>114.2</td>
<td>74.0</td>
<td>64.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$&lt;50$</td>
<td>846</td>
<td>128.8</td>
<td>97.4</td>
<td>107.6</td>
<td>75.2</td>
<td>63.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$&lt;60$</td>
<td>890</td>
<td>123.5</td>
<td>98.2</td>
<td>103.7</td>
<td>76.0</td>
<td>62.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$&lt;70$</td>
<td>948</td>
<td>117.2</td>
<td>99.3</td>
<td>98.5</td>
<td>76.8</td>
<td>61.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$&lt;80$</td>
<td>991</td>
<td>112.8</td>
<td>99.5</td>
<td>95.2</td>
<td>77.1</td>
<td>60.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$&lt;90$</td>
<td>1033</td>
<td>108.6</td>
<td>99.7</td>
<td>92.3</td>
<td>77.5</td>
<td>59.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$&lt;100$</td>
<td>1079</td>
<td>104.1</td>
<td>99.9</td>
<td>88.9</td>
<td>77.9</td>
<td>59.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$^a n =$ number of hours; SD = standard deviation; RMSE = root-mean-square error; MAE = mean absolute error; $r^2$ = coefficient of determination; $m_r$ = slope of linear functional relationship (Mark and Church, 1977).

Storage heat flux. $\Delta Q_S$, the net uptake or release of energy from the urban system, cannot be measured directly. An objective hysteresis model that has been tested over a range of meteorological conditions is used to calculate $\Delta Q_S$ (Grimmond et al., 1991). The general form of the equation is:

$$\Delta Q_S = \sum_{i=1}^{n} \left[ a_{i1}(Q^* + Q_F) + a_{i2}(Q^* + Q_F)^2 + a_{i3} \right]$$

where, when $\Delta t = 1$, $\frac{\partial(Q^* + Q_F)}{\partial t} = 0.5 \cdot [(Q^* + Q_F)_{i+1} - (Q^* + Q_F)_{i-1}]$, $\frac{\partial(Q^* + Q_F)}{\partial t}$ has units of W m$^{-2}$ h$^{-1}$; and the coefficients $a_{i1}$, $a_{i2}$, and $a_{i3}$ are dimensionless, h, and W m$^{-2}$ respectively. The model parameters ($a_{i1}$, $a_{i2}$, $a_{i3}$) relate to the surface characteristics, which are weighted by their proportional presence ($i$). These are calculated using the SAM weighted ellipses and the geographic data base (Appendix I).

Anthropogenic heat flux. $Q_F$, the energy released owing to human activities, is often regarded as negligible or is ignored in urban energy balance studies. This is due to two factors, both of which are related to the fact that most previous studies have been conducted under summer conditions. Firstly, in many urban areas in the mid- and high latitudes the absolute size of $Q_F$ is smaller in summer than in winter. Secondly, even if this is not the case in the summertime the magnitude of the other fluxes are larger and therefore the relative importance of $Q_F$ is smaller. Its magnitude may be of the order of the error of measurements only. In this study of the seasonal nature of the energy balance of a temperate city, its magnitude and relative importance in the balance can become important and must be considered.

$Q_F$ may be subdivided into three components (Bach, 1970):

$$Q_F = Q_{FV} + Q_{FH} + Q_{FM}$$

where $Q_{FV}$ is the heat produced by combustion of vehicle fuels; $Q_{FH}$ is released from 'stationary sources' (primarily within buildings); and $Q_{FM}$ is the heat released by metabolism (often negligible when compared with the other two components, but incorporated in this study for completeness). $Q_F$ cannot be measured directly. Appendix II outlines the methods used to approximate $Q_F$ on an hourly basis.

Figure 2 shows the daily trend of the three $Q_F$ components and their combined total for YD 87/22 using a 2-km radius circle centred on the Sunset site to determine the required mean surface parameters. The influence of the morning and afternoon rush hours are apparent in the $Q_{FV}$ and $Q_F$ profiles, and the slightly out of phase peaks in $Q_{FH}$, $Q_{FM}$ is small and shows a step transition between the 'sleep' and 'active' periods of the day. In the summer in Vancouver $Q_{FH}$ is reduced but $Q_F$ remains approximately the same.

Consideration needs to be given to the inclusion of the $Q_F$ term in the energy balance. Some of the measured terms of the energy balance include portions of the anthropogenic heat release so there is some danger of
'double counting'. On the output side of the energy balance, the measured fluxes already will incorporate the effect of $Q_F$. A portion of $Q_F$ is incorporated in measurements of $Q_H$ (using the SAT) and RTDMS temperatures. Measurements of $Q^*$, also, partially include $Q_F$ because it affects the longwave exchange portion of $Q^*$ via the surface temperature ($T_S$):

\[ L_\uparrow = e\sigma T_S^4 \]  
\[ Q^* = K^* + (L_\downarrow - L_\uparrow) \quad (W\ m^{-2}) \]

where $L_\uparrow$ is the longwave radiation emitted from the surface; $\epsilon$ the emissivity of the surface materials; and $\sigma$ the Stefan-Boltzmann constant ($W\ m^{-2}\ K^{-4}$); $K^*$ the net shortwave radiation; and $L_\downarrow$ the longwave radiation received at the surface ($W\ m^{-2}$). $Q_F$ causes an increase in $T_S$ which leads to an increase in $L_\uparrow$. The increase in $T_S$, and therefore the effect on $Q^*$, is a function of the heat capacity of the building fabric, the three-dimensional surface area of the building, and the amount of energy released within the building. The effect on temperature can be calculated approximately through the steps outlined in Appendix II. Such calculations indicate that the increase in $T_S$, as a consequence of $Q_F$, will be less than 1°C. Within the range 0–40°C, a 1°C rise in $T_S$ results in 5–6 $W\ m^{-2}$ increase in $L_\uparrow$. Therefore the measured $Q^*$ flux includes a reduction due to the $Q_F$ flux. In this study $Q_F$ was added directly to the energy balance. Its significance as an energy input to the system is discussed below.

ENERGY BALANCE RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Measurements have been conducted at the same site as this study by Oke and McCaughey (1983) and Cleugh and Oke (1986) in the summers of 1980 and 1983, respectively. It should be noted that Oke and McCaughey state that the summer of 1983 was an extreme case with respect to evaporation, so the comparisons should be considered in that context. In both studies $Q^*$ was measured in the same manner as here, but $Q_F$ was not included in the energy balance. Oke and McCaughey (1983) measured $\beta$ using a reversing differential psychrometer system different to that used in this study (see Kalanda et al. (1980) for full details). Oke and McCaughey used the objective linear storage heat flux parameterization (Oke et al., 1981) to obtain $\Delta Q_S$, together with $\beta$ to calculate $Q_H$ and $Q_E$. Cleugh and Oke (1986) also used the objective linear storage scheme, but $Q_H$ was measured using a SAT, leaving $Q_E$ as a residual in the energy balance. The difference in methods, especially considering their dependence on $\Delta Q_S$, suggests that the results of the different studies should be compared with caution. The only fluxes directly comparable with the present results are $Q^*$, and $Q_H$ for 1983.

![Figure 2. Anthropogenic heat flux for 87/22 with the three components and total hourly flux](image-url)
It is important to recognize that the instrumentation utilized in this study, in particular the SAT, means that the data is biased to ‘non-rain’ periods (but does not explicitly exclude periods of rain). The data collected can be stratified by the method used to give six data sets for computations:

M1—complete 24-h days with $Q_H$ via SAT only (56 days);
M2—complete 24-h days with $Q_H$ via SAT and RTDMS (73 days);
M3—complete 24-h days (M2) and days that have 21–23 h for which energy balances can be calculated (99 days);
M4—M3 plus days with 19–20 h of data (109 days);
M5—M4 plus days with < 19 h of data (145 days);
M6—all 159 days, however some hours only have $Q^*$ data.

With a transition from method M1 through to M6 the conditions under which the measurements were taken become more diverse and less restricted to ‘good’ weather, but less complete in terms of full data availability. In order to consider the effect of the measurement method on the individual fluxes the average monthly flux for both daytime ($Q^* > 0$) and daily (24 h) data for each method were determined. The values for each flux and method are plotted in Figure 3, with the points representing M4 connected. As would be expected $Q^*$ shows the greatest variability with method as this flux was measured under the widest range of conditions (M6). The daily (24 h) results presented subsequently are calculated using M4. This method represents a trade-off between data quality and completeness, and the greatest range of meteorological conditions. The average energy balance fluxes and ratios of the partitioning of the energy for each month using M4 are presented in Table III.

The diurnal trend of the mean monthly fluxes (using M4) are shown in Figure 4. A time series of the daytime ($Q^* > 0$) mean fluxes (in MJ m$^{-2}$ d$^{-1}$) and the Bowen ratios for the entire period are shown in Figure 5.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period</th>
<th>$Q^* + Q_F$</th>
<th>$Q^*$</th>
<th>$Q_F$</th>
<th>$\Delta Q_s$</th>
<th>$Q_H$</th>
<th>$Q_E$</th>
<th>$\frac{Q^<em>}{Q^</em> + Q_F}$</th>
<th>$\frac{Q_F}{Q^* + Q_F}$</th>
<th>$\frac{\Delta Q_s}{Q^* + Q_F}$</th>
<th>$\frac{Q_H}{Q^* + Q_F}$</th>
<th>$\frac{Q_E}{Q^* + Q_F}$</th>
<th>$\beta$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(a) Daytime: $Q^* &gt; 0$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21–59</td>
<td>4·62</td>
<td>4·27</td>
<td>0·35</td>
<td>0·87</td>
<td>1·67</td>
<td>2·08</td>
<td>0·92</td>
<td>0·07</td>
<td>0·19</td>
<td>0·36</td>
<td>0·45</td>
<td>0·80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60–90</td>
<td>9·95</td>
<td>9·52</td>
<td>0·43</td>
<td>2·63</td>
<td>4·13</td>
<td>3·20</td>
<td>0·96</td>
<td>0·04</td>
<td>0·26</td>
<td>0·42</td>
<td>0·32</td>
<td>1·29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91–120</td>
<td>10·31</td>
<td>9·83</td>
<td>0·48</td>
<td>2·61</td>
<td>3·59</td>
<td>4·11</td>
<td>0·95</td>
<td>0·05</td>
<td>0·25</td>
<td>0·35</td>
<td>0·40</td>
<td>0·87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>121–151</td>
<td>14·71</td>
<td>14·24</td>
<td>0·47</td>
<td>4·22</td>
<td>5·85</td>
<td>4·64</td>
<td>0·97</td>
<td>0·03</td>
<td>0·29</td>
<td>0·40</td>
<td>0·33</td>
<td>1·26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>152–179</td>
<td>14·84</td>
<td>14·36</td>
<td>0·48</td>
<td>4·28</td>
<td>6·15</td>
<td>4·41</td>
<td>0·97</td>
<td>0·03</td>
<td>0·29</td>
<td>0·42</td>
<td>0·30</td>
<td>1·40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) Daytime: $(Q^* + Q_F) &gt; 0$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21–59</td>
<td>4·62</td>
<td>4·22</td>
<td>0·40</td>
<td>0·83</td>
<td>1·66</td>
<td>2·13</td>
<td>0·91</td>
<td>0·09</td>
<td>0·18</td>
<td>0·36</td>
<td>0·46</td>
<td>0·78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60–90</td>
<td>9·95</td>
<td>9·52</td>
<td>0·43</td>
<td>2·63</td>
<td>4·13</td>
<td>3·20</td>
<td>0·96</td>
<td>0·04</td>
<td>0·26</td>
<td>0·42</td>
<td>0·32</td>
<td>1·29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91–120</td>
<td>10·31</td>
<td>9·83</td>
<td>0·48</td>
<td>2·61</td>
<td>3·59</td>
<td>4·11</td>
<td>0·95</td>
<td>0·05</td>
<td>0·25</td>
<td>0·35</td>
<td>0·40</td>
<td>0·87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>121–151</td>
<td>14·71</td>
<td>14·24</td>
<td>0·47</td>
<td>4·22</td>
<td>5·85</td>
<td>4·64</td>
<td>0·97</td>
<td>0·03</td>
<td>0·29</td>
<td>0·40</td>
<td>0·32</td>
<td>1·26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>152–179</td>
<td>14·86</td>
<td>14·36</td>
<td>0·51</td>
<td>4·15</td>
<td>6·32</td>
<td>4·40</td>
<td>0·97</td>
<td>0·03</td>
<td>0·28</td>
<td>0·43</td>
<td>0·30</td>
<td>1·44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c) Daily: (24 h)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21–59</td>
<td>2·56</td>
<td>1·75</td>
<td>0·80</td>
<td>−1·13</td>
<td>1·50</td>
<td>2·18</td>
<td>0·69</td>
<td>0·31</td>
<td>−0·44</td>
<td>0·59</td>
<td>0·85</td>
<td>0·69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60–90</td>
<td>7·31</td>
<td>6·53</td>
<td>0·78</td>
<td>0·14</td>
<td>3·89</td>
<td>3·28</td>
<td>0·89</td>
<td>0·11</td>
<td>0·02</td>
<td>0·53</td>
<td>0·45</td>
<td>1·19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91–120</td>
<td>8·34</td>
<td>7·62</td>
<td>0·72</td>
<td>0·78</td>
<td>3·48</td>
<td>4·08</td>
<td>0·91</td>
<td>0·09</td>
<td>0·09</td>
<td>0·42</td>
<td>0·49</td>
<td>0·85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>121–151</td>
<td>12·39</td>
<td>11·73</td>
<td>0·66</td>
<td>2·03</td>
<td>5·97</td>
<td>4·40</td>
<td>0·95</td>
<td>0·05</td>
<td>0·16</td>
<td>0·48</td>
<td>0·36</td>
<td>1·36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>152–179</td>
<td>12·74</td>
<td>12·08</td>
<td>0·66</td>
<td>2·16</td>
<td>6·31</td>
<td>4·27</td>
<td>0·95</td>
<td>0·05</td>
<td>0·17</td>
<td>0·50</td>
<td>0·34</td>
<td>1·47</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figures 3–5 and Table III permit a consideration of the relative and absolute trends in each flux and their variability over the extended winter–spring period.

As expected in Vancouver, $Q_F$ decreases in significance and size as $Q^*$ increases from winter to summer. The relative importance is greater for the whole day (24 h) than for the daytime hours [$Q^* > 0$ or $(Q^* + Q_F) > 0$] (Table III). For the daytime hours it is less than 10 per cent of the energy input $(Q^* + Q_F)$ for all months. When the whole day is considered $Q_F$ contributes more than 10 per cent to the energy balance up until April (Y/D 87/91–120). Therefore it should be considered negligible or can be ignored only if research is being conducted for daytime hours, or if the whole day is under consideration in a non-wintertime study. However, it is probably necessary to pay close attention to the diurnal variability only if a wintertime study is being conducted. Note Vancouver is a city that does not require air conditioning in the summer. Thus the major seasonal change in absolute $Q_F$ is a consequence of reduced heating requirements in the warmer periods. The magnitude and diurnal pattern of the $Q_F$ fluxes are similar to those calculated for other suburban areas (see for
example Kalma (1974) or Oke (1988) for a review). The seasonal reduction between winter and summer is similar to other cities that do not have high summertime cooling demands.

The monthly averaged daytime $\Delta Q_s/(Q^* + Q_F)$ ratio increases from 0.18 to 0.28 as $Q^*$ increases. The daytime ratios are higher than those for the previous two summertime studies (Cleugh and Oke = 0.22, Oke and McCaughey = 0.23), except for January–February, but of course different methods were used in 1987. There is a net gain in $\Delta Q_s$ for each month except January–February (Figure 3), although there are individual days that do not have a net gain until YD 87/132 (Figure 5). However, the frequency of these days, and the net loss days, drops through time, with none after early March (YD 87/72). The daytime total $\Delta Q_s$ mimics the $Q^*$ daytime total pattern (Figure 5) throughout the study period.

The daily and daytime $Q_H$ flux increases with increasing $Q^*$. The monthly mean daily ratio varies between 0.42 and 0.59 but does not show a distinct seasonal trend (Table III(c)). The daytime ratios vary between 0.36 and 0.43 (Table III(b)). The June value of 0.43 is very similar to the 1983 summertime ratio of 0.44. The 1987 data seem to be more like the 1983 data set than that for 1980.
\(Q_E\) in absolute terms, generally, increases with increasing \(Q^*\). However, the daytime and daily \(Q_E\) in June 1987 was less than for May, which resulted in a slightly lower proportion of \(Q^* + Q_F\) going into \(Q_E\). The trend of the mean monthly daily \(Q_E/(Q^* + Q_F)\) ratio shows a decrease from 0.85 in January–February to 0.34 in June (Figure 3). The high ratios in the wintertime are the result of the combination of frequent rain events and small radiation input. Under such conditions the available energy goes first into drying the surface. The daytime \(Q_E/(Q^* + Q_F)\) ratios do not show as pronounced a trend as the daily data. The May (0.32) and June (0.30) ratio for 1987 are similar to that for the 1983 data. From Figures 3 and 4 it can be seen that \(Q_E\) is an important term in the energy balance in all months. In particular, it is the dominant output flux in the January–February period.

The mean monthly 24-h \(\beta\) (calculated from average \(Q_H\) and \(Q_E\) fluxes) varies between 0.69 and 1.48 with a mean for the measurement period of 1.17. The daytime \((Q^* > 0)\) mean for the measurement period is 1.16 with a range of 0.80–1.40. There is a fairly systematic increase in \(\beta\) with time (Table III, Figure 5) with the exception of the early part of April, reflecting a period of rain. In the early part of the year there are many days when \(\beta\) is < 1 and very few days when it is > 2. By May and June the frequency of days with \(\beta < 1\) is very small and there are now blocks of days when it is > 2. On a monthly basis the January–February and April \(\beta\) values are < 1, the remaining months are > 1. The 1983 summertime \(\beta\) lies between the May and June 1987 data. The 1987 mean is close to the typical value of 1 given by Oke (1982) for suburban areas.

The diurnal trend of hourly average fluxes of \(Q_H\), \(Q_E\), and \(\Delta Q_S\) for the whole measurement period (YD 87/21–179) follow a very similar path until about 1200 LAT (Figure 4: 21–179). In the afternoon \(Q_H\) is greater than \(Q_E\) which in turn is greater than \(\Delta Q_S\). \(Q_H\) goes through zero after \(Q^*\), \(Q_E\) at approximately the same time as \(Q^*\), and \(\Delta Q_S\) about 1 h earlier (Figure 4: 21–179). When considered month by month the data for the January–February period (Figure 4: 21–59) stand out as distinct. For this wintertime period \(Q_E\) is the most significant output flux in the morning and is the same size as the sensible heat flux in the afternoon. The diurnal trend of the average energy balances for March–June (Figure 4: 60–90, 91–120, 121–151, 152–179) are remarkably similar in form although the size of the fluxes increase. After noon \(Q_H\) is the most important output flux. The second most important output flux is consistently \(Q_E\), except for April when it equals \(Q_H\) (Figure 4: 91–120).

The fact that the three output fluxes are very similar before solar noon (1200 LAT) (Figure 4) is different from the summertime energy balances reported by Cleugh and Oke (1986), and is due to their calculation of \(\Delta Q_S\) with a linear function (see above) so that \(Q_E\) could be determined as a residual. Measurements from this study, however, indicate that there is an asymmetrical hysteresis relation between 'measured' \(\Delta Q_S\) (i.e. determined as a residual from measured fluxes) and \(Q^*\) (see Grimmond et al., 1991, Figure 8). The difference between these studies, in terms of their diurnal pattern, demonstrates the importance of the storage parameterization, not only in the context of the storage heat flux \textit{per se}, but also because it influences the apparent size of \(Q_H\) and \(Q_E\), unless they are determined independently. Except for January–February, the afternoon fluxes generally are similar to those of the Cleugh and Oke study, with \(Q_H\) the largest flux, then \(Q_E\), and then \(\Delta Q_S\). This suggests that the relative importance of the fluxes remains similar through the spring and summer. However, winter appears to show the greatest difference as noted above. Further winter measurements are needed to document this.

\textbf{CONCLUSIONS}

The results reported here are for a suburban area of a mid-latitude west coast city. The data used to determine the energy balances consist of measured \((Q^*, Q_H, Q_E)\) and modelled \((\Delta Q_S, Q_F)\) fluxes. With the available data sources there has been an attempt to maintain consistency between the measurement source area and model domain by use of Source Area Model. It should be noted that the data reported here are amongst the first winter and spring-time measurements.

The winter–spring urban energy balances observed in this study are different from those reported for summertime conditions at the same site. The fluxes for the entire period are not symmetrical about solar noon. Hence earlier interpretations possibly should be modified. Apart from this feature the spring season balances are similar to those reported for the summertime in terms of relative importance of individual fluxes.
The wintertime energy balance appears to be different to that of spring and summer. The most noticeable feature is the increased importance of the latent heat flux, which is in large part due to the temperate maritime climate of Vancouver. On average it is the largest output flux in the balance. A secondary, more expected feature, is the increased importance of anthropogenic heat flux as an input in winter.
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APPENDIX I: SURFACE DATA BASE

Surface parameter values were calculated using a computerized data base and accessing system that was developed for this study. A parameter can be assessed in response to different source area shapes as meteorological conditions change.

Data base

The requirements of the data base were that the individual grid squares of information would allow the influence of small differences in location of the area boundaries to be identified, but not so small that the effort required to gather the necessary information was unrealistic. These requirements were deemed met by using 100 x 100 m squares, and data were collected for a 5-km-radius circle centred on the tower (i.e. approximately 8000 squares). The choice of a 5-km circle was based on the areal limits of SAM. Each square was assigned an X and Y coordinate between −50 and +50 (no zero).

The Greater Vancouver Regional District 1:2500 land use maps, which have the land use for individual properties, for the Municipalities of Burnaby (1980), Richmond (1980) and the City of Vancouver (1983) were used as the initial data source. Additional information was gathered from Canada Statistics (1987) for the 1986 census, aerial photographs (Vancouver City Planning Department, 1985, scale 1:2500), and visual inspection. The areal extent of surface types within a property were determined from City of Vancouver By-Laws (Vancouver City 1987); facilities within each park from Vancouver Board of Parks and Recreation (1986) and Hickok (1977); data for schools from Vancouver School Board (1982); and aerial photographs (Vancouver City Planning Department, 1985). Further information was calculated and added for the modelling of individual fluxes; i.e. sub-databases were generated for the calculation of specific fluxes.

The data base was compared with a previous detailed surface description conducted by Grimmond (1983) for the Hudson Catchment; a 21-ha area approximately 4.5 km west of the Sunset Tower. The surface characteristics were found to agree very closely. The population calculated from the data base also corresponded very closely to that for individual census tracts.

A second more detailed surface survey was conducted of 10 blocks near the tower. For each 1 x 1 m square the surface type and height were determined. The information included: vegetation type; vegetation type beneath; shape of vegetation; building type; roof type; and paved surface materials. The information was gathered from visual surveys and aerial photographs (Vancouver City Planning Department, 1985, scale 1:2500).

Accessing system

A modified version of SAM, which incorporated an extension to stable conditions using Gryning et al. (1987), was used to calculate hourly dimensions of the nine source-area ellipses: a (distance to the upwind edge
of the source area), $b + c$ (length of the source area), and $d$ (half the width of the source area) dimensions (see Schmid and Oke, 1990, Figure 5). These are used with the mean wind direction ($\varphi$) by the surface data base accessing system to identify which grid squares to use for calculating surface parameters.

To calculate the data base coordinates of an elliptical source area it is necessary to first identify the boundaries when it is aligned with the $x$ axis because, by definition, an ellipse has to have its longest axis parallel to either the $x$ or $y$ axis (Draper and Klingman, 1972). The $b + c$ axis is initially assumed to be aligned along the $x$ axis ($90^\circ$). The unrotated $Y$ values ($Y_{90}$) are calculated for $X$ values ($X_{90}$) from minimum ($a$) to maximum ($a + b + c$) in steps. The step size can be varied. The smaller the step the better the fit but the greater the computational time. If $b + c$ is the longest axis then the calculation is conducted as follows:

$$Y_{90} = (d^2 - (d^2 \frac{(X_{90} - (a + b))^2}{b^2}))^{0.5} \quad (A1)$$

If the $d$ axis is the longest then $d$ is replaced by $b$ and vice versa in equation (A1).

The located points on the boundaries are then rotated so that the $b + c$ axis is aligned with $\varphi$. As the ellipse is symmetrical about the $x$ axis the rotation can be calculated using the same equations, first with $a + Y_{90}$ and second with $a - Y_{90}$ value.

$$X = (\cos(\varphi - 90)X_{90} + \sin(\varphi - 90)Y_{90})/\text{SQS}_x$$

$$Y = (\cos(\varphi - 90)Y_{90} - \sin(\varphi - 90)X_{90})/\text{SQS}_y$$

where $\text{SQS}_x$ and $\text{SQS}_y$ are the grid dimensions (m). Only the maximum and minimum $Y$ coordinates are stored for each $X$ coordinate. Note that the surface parameter value is determined from the mean of the nine mean values, i.e. a mean value is determined between each ellipse and then for the composite ellipse. Thus areas closer to the tower have proportionally a greater influence than those further away.

For each geometric shape the number of $X$ coordinates (or lines of coordinate data), and the maximum and minimum value of $Y$ for each $X$ is stored for each hour. Once the grid coordinates are identified the required information from the data base can be accessed and the value of the surface parameter calculated. The coordinate finding subroutines also can be linked to the process calculation programs. Since the same coordinates were used several times they were stored for future use.

**APPENDIX II: ANTHROPGENIC HEAT FLUX CALCULATION METHODS**

**Anthropogenic heat flux components**

$Q_F$ is approximated utilizing parameters determined for each hourly weighted source area (section on Modelled fluxes and Appendix I). $Q_F$ is composed of three components (equation (6), Table AII.1).

(i) $Q_{FF}$ is a function of the type and amount of gasoline used, the number of vehicles ($n_v$) travelling within the source area, the distance they travel, and the fuel efficiency of the vehicles (distance travelled per unit of gasoline). In British Columbia three types of fuel are commonly used (Table AII.2). For fuel economy a value representative for all vehicle types found in a city of 11253 m$^2$ (Whitford, 1984) was used. Figure AII.1 illustrates $n_v$ profiles for the study area for the major and minor roads.

(ii) In the study area, the two fuels that contribute to $Q_{FH}$ are electricity and gas; other fuels were considered to be negligible and were ignored. Two scales of data were available to enable the calculation of $Q_{FH}$. Firstly, data at the individual property (consumer) scale were available for 600 consumers within close proximity to the measurement tower. The data were stratified by premise class: single family dwelling, apartments, institutional (further subdivided into schools, churches, hospitals, etc.), industrial, etc., and were available in 2-monthly billing period intervals with no indication of hourly use. Secondly, the only available information showing hourly variation in consumption of electricity and gas was aggregated at much larger scales for the two grid systems. Hourly variation of the consumer-scale heat release was apportioned using the grid fluctuations. BC Hydro provided the gas and electricity data at the two scales (grid and consumer).

(iii) To calculate $Q_{FM}$ the day was subdivided into two time periods: ‘active’ (0700–2300 h) and ‘sleep’ (2300–0700 h). For people the metabolic rates from Oke (1978) were used. The number of animals was
Table AII.1. Equations used to calculate the three components of QF

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Equation</th>
<th>Symbols</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$Q_{FV}$</td>
<td>$Q_{FV} = \left( \frac{nv_i(t)D_{Vi}EV}{A \cdot 3600} \right)$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$Q_{FH}$</td>
<td>$Q_{FH} = \left[ \frac{GR(t)E(n_{Ci}C_{Ei})}{(n_{Gi}C_{Gi}GEF)/3600)\text{}/A} \right]$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$Q_{FM}$</td>
<td>$Q_{FM} = \left( \frac{nM(t)/A} \right)$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- $A$—source area (m²)  
- $i$—road type (major or minor)  
- $n_v$—number of vehicles  
- $D_{V_i}$—length of road  
- $EV$—energy used per vehicle (J m⁻¹)  
- $t$—time (h)  
- $j$—fuel type  
- $NHC_j$—net heat combustion (J kg⁻¹)  
- $\rho_j$—density of fuel (kg m⁻³)  
- $WFS_j$—weighting of fuel sales  
- $FE$—mean fuel economy (m⁻¹)  
- $n$—number of consumers  
- $C$—total mean consumption per individual consumer  
- $GR(t)$—grid consumption  
- $GR(t)$—total grid consumption for study period  
- $GEF$—gas efficiency (0.675)  
- $E$, $G$—electricity (W), gas (J)  
- $M$—metabolic rate (W)  
- $n$—number of people and animals

Table AII.2. Fuel consumption, density and net heat combustion (sources: Oilweek, 21 September 1987; Shell Canada Ltd. personal communication, 1988)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fuel type</th>
<th>Consumption in BC January–June 1987 (ML)</th>
<th>Consumption (per cent)</th>
<th>Density range* (kg m⁻³)</th>
<th>Net heat combustion (MJ kg⁻¹)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Premium unleaded</td>
<td>185.8</td>
<td>11.03</td>
<td>740–770 (755)</td>
<td>44.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regular unleaded</td>
<td>621.1</td>
<td>36.86</td>
<td>720–740 (730)</td>
<td>44.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regular leaded</td>
<td>878.1</td>
<td>52.11</td>
<td>710–730 (720)</td>
<td>45.07</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Gasoline density varies with fuel mix and season—the midpoint value (in parenthesis) was used

Figure AII.1. Mean profiles of traffic counts for major and minor roads in the study area. (Data source: City of Vancouver Traffic Department, traffic counts)
assumed to be 10 per cent of the people and their metabolic rate was set to approximately 25 per cent of people (Bach, 1970).

Method for calculation of the effect of $Q_v$ on surface temperature

The mean maximum hourly $Q_{FM}$ and $Q_{FM}$ are calculated for a time period (units of joules) for an individual ‘mean’ premise. The summed $Q_{FM}$ and $Q_{FM}$ are reduced by 30 per cent because of air leakage heat losses from buildings (Canadian General Standards Board, 1980). The surface area of the buildings is calculated and used to determine a mean flux density (W m$^{-2}$) loss from within the buildings. Using values assigned for the heat capacity of the building fabrics and building thicknesses the change in external surface temperature can be calculated. The effect on $L$ is calculated and the net effect on $Q^*\text{ determined.}$
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