1 Crop evapotranspiration calculation using infrared thermometers aboard center pivots

2
3 Paul D. Colaizzi ^{1,*}, Susan A. O'Shaughnessy ¹, Steve R. Evett ¹, and Ryan B. Mounce ²

4
5 * Corresponding author. Tel.: +1 806 356 5763; fax: +1 806 356 5750.

6 E-mail address: Paul.Colaizzi@ars.usda.gov (P.D. Colaizzi).

7 ¹ USDA Agricultural Research Service, Conservation and Production Research Laboratory, P.O. Drawer
8 10, 2300 Experiment Station Road, Bushland, TX 79012, USA

9 ² USDA Agricultural Research Service, Cropping Systems Research Laboratory, 3810 4th Street, Lubbock,
10 TX 79415, USA

Abstract

Irrigation scheduling using remotely sensed surface temperature can result in equal or greater crop yield and crop water use efficiency compared with irrigation scheduling using in-situ soil water profile measurements. Crop evapotranspiration (ET_c) is useful for irrigation scheduling, and can be calculated using surface temperature. Recent advances in wireless infrared thermometers (IRTs) have made surface temperature measurement a viable alternative to in-situ soil water profile measurements, and wireless IRTs are practical for deployment aboard moving irrigation systems, such as center pivots. However, ET_c calculation has not been tested using IRTs aboard center pivots in conjunction with recent advances in a two-source energy balance (TSEB) model. We compared daily ET_c calculated by a TSEB model to daily ET_c estimated by a simple soil water balance (SSWB), where the SSWB used volumetric soil water measured by a field calibrated neutron probe to the 2.4-m depth. Crops included two seasons each of corn (*Zea mays* L.), cotton (*Gossypium hirsutum* L.), and grain sorghum (*Sorghum bicolor* L.) at Bushland, Texas, USA. Discrepancies of TSEB vs. SSWB daily ET_c were similar for each crop and season, and had root mean squared error from 1.5 to 1.8 mm per day, mean absolute error from 1.1 to 1.5 mm per day, and mean bias error from -0.51 to 0.63 mm per day. A sensitivity analysis was conducted for daily evaporation (E), daily transpiration (T), and ET_c calculated by the TSEB model. These were most sensitive to radiometric surface temperature, air temperature, the reference temperature used in time scaling (i.e., to convert instantaneous to daily E , T , and ET_c), and incoming solar irradiance. Because over half of the irrigated area in the USA is now by center pivot, ET_c calculated using IRTs aboard center pivots will be useful to maintain or increase crop water productivity.

Keywords: Two source energy balance model, soil water balance, remote sensing, Texas

1. Introduction

In-field quantification of crop evapotranspiration (ET_c) and water stress will play an increasing role in managing and enhancing crop water productivity (Ahmad et al., 2009; Evans and Sadler, 2008; Senay et al., 2009; Zwart and Bastiaanssen, 2007). Specific applications include irrigation scheduling and irrigation automation (Jones, 2004; O'Shaughnessy et al. 2015; Osroosh et al., 2015); additional applications include detection and mitigation of abiotic and biotic stresses, which may be caused by malfunctioning irrigation equipment, salinity or other soil and water constituents inhibiting crop economic yield, pests, and disease (Falkenberg et al., 2007; Li et al., 2008). Numerous methods exist for estimating ET_c , including the crop coefficient-reference evapotranspiration approach (Allen et al., 1998; Anderson et al., 2017; Howell et al., 2004; Hunsaker et al., 2005), lysimetry (Howell et al., 1995; 1997), boundary layer measurements (Bowen ratio, eddy covariance, scintillometry, surface renewal; Alfieri et al., 2012; French et al., 2012; Liu et al., 2011; Todd et al., 2000), in-situ soil water profile measurement (Evelt et al., 2012), and radiometric canopy temperature measurement (Maes and Steppe, 2012). The latter is derived from, or assumed equal to, remotely sensed directional brightness temperature of vegetated surfaces (Norman and Becker, 1995). Routine estimates of ET_c using canopy temperature measurements have several practical advantages compared with alternative methods. Also, many forms of water stress indices used in irrigation scheduling or to detect abiotic or biotic stress are based on actual ET_c relative to a non-water stressed ET_c value, where actual ET_c is estimated by in-field canopy temperature measurements (Jackson, 1982; Moran et al., 1994; Jones, 2004).

The advantages of using canopy temperature to estimate ET_c are at once the result of, and contingent on, meeting certain requirements of real-time farm management (Jackson, 1984). These include spatial resolution (several meters), repeat frequency (no more than a few days), and turnaround time (interval from field measurement to useful data product; no more than a few minutes). These are in addition to the obvious requirements of reasonable instrument cost, precision, accuracy, and extent

of field area coverage. The recent development of unmanned aerial vehicles (UAVs) have overcome many technical barriers to meeting these requirements (Bellvert et al., 2014; Berni et al., 2009; Gago et al., 2015; Zarco-Tejada et al., 2013), but regulatory barriers may restrict UAVs from flying in certain areas (Thomasson et al., 2016; Woldt et al., 2015). Moving irrigation systems have long been recognized as a possible platform for ground-based radiometers, particularly infrared thermometers (IRTs) used to measure canopy temperature (Phene et al., 1985; Sadler et al., 2002). Center pivots now occupy over 50% and 80% of the irrigated area in the USA and US Great Plains, respectively (USDA, 2014). Their widespread adoption, along with proper design, installation, and management, offer unprecedented opportunity to increase crop water productivity, but nonetheless represent a primary consumer of freshwater resources (Moore et al., 2015). Center pivot rotational speeds can be managed where angular positions of sprinklers are distributed to different times of the day. This is intended to improve irrigation distribution uniformity over the season by distributing daytime and nighttime differences in evaporative and wind drift losses more uniformly throughout the field (Han et al., 1994; Playán et al., 2005; Steiner et al., 1983). This can also distribute midday and afternoon coverage of IRTs (when ET_c typically reaches diurnal maxima) to all angular positions of the field, albeit there is a tradeoff between field coverage and repeat frequency (Haberland et al., 2010).

Irrigation scheduling can be automated using canopy temperature measured by stationary IRTs (Evelt et al., 2000; Upchurch et al., 1996; Wanjura et al., 1992). The concept was extended to moving IRTs aboard center pivots, and resulted in crop yield and water use efficiency comparable or greater than manual irrigation scheduling using soil water profile measurements by a neutron probe (O'Shaughnessy and Evelt, 2010a; O'Shaughnessy et al., 2012a; 2013; Peters and Evelt, 2008). The canopy temperature-based algorithms used in these studies included the time-temperature threshold (Wanjura et al., 1992), crop water stress index (Jackson et al., 1981), and an integrated crop water stress index (O'Shaughnessy et al., 2012a). These algorithms do not distinguish between soil and canopy

temperature, which can differ by more than 30 °C, and can influence the apparent surface temperature during partial canopy cover. This has sometimes resulted in unneeded irrigation events occurring early in the season prior to full canopy cover (O'Shaughnessy et al., 2011a; 2011b).

A two-source energy balance (TSEB) model may provide a way to reduce errors in ET_c and crop water stress calculations by partitioning surface temperature into soil and canopy components. The TSEB model of Norman et al. (1995) and Kustas and Norman (1999) uses directional brightness surface temperature, does not require much greater input data compared with the theoretical crop water stress index, and solves the energy balance of the soil and canopy regimes separately. In addition to calculating the soil and canopy temperature components, the TSEB calculates soil evaporation (E) and canopy transpiration (T), which can be combined as ET_c . Previous studies tested the TSEB for corn and soybean in Central Iowa (USA) with partial to full canopy cover (Anderson et al., 2005; Li et al., 2005). In Bushland, Texas (USA), which is a semiarid climate noted for large advected sensible heat flux, the TSEB model was shown to calculate ET_c and latent heat flux for fully irrigated cotton with relatively small discrepancies (<20%) compared with ET_c measured by lysimeters and eddy covariance, respectively (Anderson et al., 2012; Cammalleri et al., 2014; Kustas et al., 2012). Recent studies also improved E and T partitioning, along with ET_c calculations, for the fully irrigated cotton at that study location (Colaizzi et al., 2016a; Song et al., 2016). These studies used stationary wired IRTs and stationary inverted pyrgeometers at 15-min intervals and small spatial scales, and one-time-of-day satellite measurements at larger spatial scales. However, no TSEB model version has been tested for moving IRTs aboard center pivots, and relatively few TSEB studies have considered different crops grown over multiple seasons, which entail relatively wide ranges of climatic and growing conditions typical of the Southern High Plains region of the USA (Baumhardt et al., 2016). Further, the recent TSEB model version has not been tested using recently developed wireless IRTs and wireless sensor networks (O'Shaughnessy and Evett, 2010b; O'Shaughnessy et al., 2011b).

The objective of this study was to test the TSEB model in calculating ET_c using moving IRTs aboard center pivots. A secondary objective was to conduct a sensitivity analysis of E , T , and ET_c to selected input variables (likely as having the most uncertainty in practice) for a small, medium, and large canopy. Although separate E or T measurements were presently not available in the center pivot fields, their inclusion in the sensitivity analysis was deemed important in assessing the impact of different canopy sizes. A forthcoming paper will extend the TSEB model to include thermal-based indices for irrigation scheduling, and compare these to existing indices.

2. Materials and Methods

2.1. TSEB Model Overview

The TSEB model version used here was described in Colaizzi et al. (2016a). This was essentially the series resistance TSEB version described by Norman et al. (1995) and Kustas and Norman (1999) with several modifications designed for ground based IRTs and row crops. The series resistance formulation was chosen over the parallel resistance alternative because the former was shown to be less sensitive to input variables over a wider range of vegetation cover (Li et al., 2005). The modifications included submodels to calculate the vegetation view factor in an IRT footprint (Colaizzi et al. 2010), partitioning net shortwave and net longwave radiation to the soil and canopy components (Colaizzi et al., 2012a; 2012b), calculation of surface soil heat flux in crop interrows (Colaizzi et al., 2016b; 2016c), replacing the Priestley-Taylor with the Penman-Monteith equation to calculate initial crop transpiration (Colaizzi et al., 2012c; 2014; 2016a), and calculation of daily ET_c from one-time-of-day IRT measurements by the time scaling method (Peters and Evett, 2004). In addition, leaf area index (LAI) is a required input throughout the TSEB model. However, only canopy width (w_c), canopy height (h_c), and plant population measurements were available in the present study, and LAI measurements were available only in a few seasons and in a limited number of plots. Therefore, LAI was estimated by an

allometric method that used plant population, h_c , and cumulative growing degree days (Colaizzi et al., 2017).

The TSEB model with series resistance includes an aerodynamic resistance (r_A), canopy boundary layer resistance (r_X), and soil surface resistance (Figure 1). Sensible heat fluxes (H) are transferred through these resistances by temperature gradients, and are related to available energy and latent heat fluxes (LE) by

$$LE = R_N - G_0 - H \quad (1)$$

where R_N is net radiation, G_0 is surface soil heat flux, and all terms have $W m^{-2}$ units. In this sign convention, R_N is positive towards the canopy, and all other terms are positive away from the canopy.

The energy balance can be partitioned to the soil and canopy components as:

$$LE_C = R_{N,C} - H_C \quad (2a)$$

$$LE_S = R_{N,S} - G_0 - H_S \quad (2b)$$

where the subscripts C and S stand for canopy and soil, respectively. The sensible heat flux terms were calculated as:

$$H = \rho C_p \frac{T_{AC} - T_A}{r_A} \quad (3a)$$

$$H_C = \rho C_p \frac{T_C - T_{AC}}{r_X} \quad (3b)$$

$$H_S = \rho C_p \frac{T_S - T_{AC}}{r_S} \quad (3c)$$

where ρ is the density of moist air ($kg m^{-3}$), C_p is the specific heat of air ($1013 J kg^{-1} K^{-1}$), T_C , T_A , T_S , and T_{AC} are the temperatures of the canopy, air, soil, and air temperature within the canopy boundary layer, respectively (K), and all other terms were as defined previously. The resistance terms were calculated following Norman et al. (1995) and Kustas and Norman (1999), which generally apply to row crops planted in uniform soil and under conventional tillage (but may not apply to natural vegetation with non-cultivated or rocky soil; e.g., Morillas et al., 2013; Kustas et al., 2016).

Radiometric surface temperature (T_R) is related to T_C and T_S by:

$$\varepsilon T_R^4 = f_{VR} \varepsilon_C T_C^4 + (1 - f_{VR}) \varepsilon_S T_S^4 \quad (4)$$

where ε is the composite surface emissivity, and f_{VR} is the vegetation view factor in an IRT footprint (Colaizzi et al., 2010), and T_R was calculated from the directional brightness temperature (T_B) reported by an IRT (i.e., corrected for surface emissivity and reflected hemispherical longwave atmospheric irradiance; Norman and Becker, 1995):

$$T_R^4 = \frac{\varepsilon_R}{\varepsilon} T_B^4 + \left(1 - \frac{1}{\varepsilon}\right) \varepsilon_{atm} T_A^4 \quad (5)$$

where ε_R is the target emissivity that is set in the IRT firmware, ε_{atm} is the hemispherical longwave atmospheric emissivity (Idso, 1981), and all other terms are as defined previously. Idso et al. (1969) and Campbell and Norman (1998) showed that $\varepsilon_C \sim 0.98$ for most agricultural crops (although for a deep canopy, effective ε_C can increase to ~ 0.99 due to multiple reflections of longwave radiation inside the canopy). Field measurements of ε_S over bare soil at the study location were obtained by a Cimel CE 312 multiband thermal radiometer (Cimel Electronique, Paris, France), and $\varepsilon_S = 0.98 \pm 0.01$. This supported the assumption of $\varepsilon = \varepsilon_C = \varepsilon_S = 0.98$.

The system of equations was solved using a secant method (Norman et al., 1995), which was slightly modified for the Penman-Monteith TSEB version (Colaizzi et al., 2012c; 2016a). LE was converted to crop evapotranspiration (ET_C) by:

$$ET_C = LE \frac{1000 \tau_i}{10^6 \rho_w \lambda} \quad (6)$$

where 1000 converts m to mm, τ_i is the desired time interval (900 s), 10^6 converts MJ to J, ρ_w is the density of water (assumed 1000 kg m^{-3} at 20°C), and λ is the latent heat of vaporization, and $\lambda \sim 2.44 \text{ MJ kg}^{-1}$.

Since T_B was measured by IRT arrays on a moving center pivot, T_B was available at only one time or a few times of day for any point location. Therefore, following conversion from T_B to T_R , the time scaling method of Peters and Evett (2004) calculated T_R for each 15-min interval over 24 h:

$$T_{R,t2} = T_E + \frac{(T_{R,t1} - T_E)(T_{REF,t2} - T_E)}{(T_{REF,t1} - T_E)} \quad (7)$$

where T_{REF} is a reference temperature, T_E is the daily minimum T_{REF} , t_1 is the time of the one-time-of-day T_R measurement, and t_2 is all other times of day over 24 h. Here, T_{REF} was measured by stationary IRTs at the study location and averaged to 15-min intervals, or was calculated for a non-water stressed crop (Jackson et al., 1981) if T_{REF} measurements were missing (care should be exercised to avoid mixing T_{REF} sources within a 24 h interval; i.e., midnight to midnight). Only T_R data were used when the solar zenith angle $< 80^\circ$; the time scaling method was not accurate for T_R within 1 to 2 h of dawn or dusk (Peters and Evett, 2004). With diurnal T_R calculated, the TSEB model was run for each 15-min interval, and 15-min ET_C were summed to daily (24 h) ET_C .

2.2. Study Location

All data reported here were obtained at the USDA Agricultural Research Service Conservation and Production Research Laboratory, Bushland, Texas, USA (35° 11' N, 102° 6' W, 1170 m above MSL). The climate is semiarid with mean annual precipitation of 470 mm and mean Class A pan evaporation of 2600 mm, and regional and local advection is common. Soils are classed as Pullman clay loam (fine, mixed, superactive, thermic Torrertic Paleustoll) consisting of three primary layers, including an Ap horizon (0 to ~0.3 m), a Bt horizon with relatively high clay content (~0.3 to 1.3 m), and a Btk horizon with high calcic content (> 1.3 m) (USDA-NRCS, 2016). The Pullman clay loam has slow permeability and a plant available water content of approximately 140 mm m⁻¹ (Evett et al., 2012; Tolk and Evett, 2012).

2.3. Soil Water Balance

A simple soil water balance (SSWB) was used to estimate ET_C , which served as ground-truth to test the TSEB model in calculating ET_C . A general form of the soil water balance is:

$$ET_C = I + P + F + R + \Delta S \quad (8)$$

where I is irrigation, P is precipitation, F is net subsurface flux into the control volume, R is net runoff or runoff to the control volume surface, and ΔS is the net change in soil water stored in the control volume

(all have mm units). Here, F can include horizontal and vertical fluxes. Evett et al. (2012) compared three variants of the soil water balance to ET_c measured by weighing lysimeters, including the SSWB (where F was assumed equal to zero), the SSWB but with vertical F calculated at the bottom of the control volume having a fixed depth (2.4-m depth, which was the extent of volumetric soil water measurements by neutron probe), and with vertical F calculated at the bottom of the control volume defined by the zero flux plane. All three variants assumed horizontal F and R were zero, which was justified by uniform soil having slopes less than 0.0025 m m^{-1} , uniform irrigation, and use of furrow dikes and raised beds to minimize surface movement of I and P (Schneider and Howell, 2000). Inclusion of vertical F reduced ET_c by approximately 0.1 mm d^{-1} (except during heavy rain later in the season when vertical F was larger), and all three methods did not differ substantially when compared with ET_c measured by weighing lysimeters. Therefore, the SSWB method was used in the present study, making the assumption that $F = R = 0$.

Volumetric soil water was measured by a field calibrated neutron probe on successive days to determine ΔS . Field calibration procedures were described in Evett et al. (2008), and resulted in agreement better than $0.01 \text{ m}^3 \text{ m}^{-3}$ when compared with independent gravimetric soil samples obtained with a Madera probe (Precision Machine, Inc., Lincoln, Neb.). Separate calibrations were obtained for each soil horizon (Ap, Bt, and Btk) over the range of possible volumetric soil water contents. Volumetric soil water was measured in electrical metallic access tubes, where a single tube was installed in the center of each experimental plot used in the present study (described later). Measurements were obtained from 0.1- to 2.3-m depths in 0.2-m increments, which ensured that the complete profile was measured down to 2.4 m because the sphere diameter of emitted neutrons is typically $\geq 0.2 \text{ m}$ in the Pullman soil. The 2.4-m depth was well below the rooting depths of crops grown in the region, and would detect any vertical or horizontal F within this control volume. Measurement depths relative to the surface were controlled and standard readings were obtained using a depth control stand (Evett et al.,

2003). The depth control stand was critical to maintain accuracy of measurements near the surface (< 0.3 m), which are very sensitive to the probe depth.

The frequency of neutron probe measurements varied but was weekly or biweekly for plots having the largest irrigation rates, and less frequent for plots having more deficit irrigation rates. Therefore, ET_c estimated by the SSWB spanned varying numbers of days. However, numerous previous studies have reported ET_c at daily (24 h) intervals (e.g., Cammalleri et al., 2014; French et al., 2007; 2015; Song et al., 2016). Hence it was desired to interpolate ET_c to daily intervals between neutron probe measurement days to facilitate comparison. This was accomplished using a single crop coefficient and reference evapotranspiration approach. Cumulative reference evapotranspiration was calculated during the interval of successive neutron probe measurements. The single crop coefficient (K_c) was then calculated as

$$K_c = \frac{ET_c}{\sum_{d=1}^n ET_{o,d}} \quad (9)$$

where ET_c was calculated by the SSWB (mm), ET_o is the ASCE Standardized Penman-Monteith ET equation for a short reference crop at daily intervals (mm) (ASCE, 2005), and n is the number of days between successive neutron probe measurements. Note that ET_c and hence K_c were specific to each neutron tube or experimental plot. Then K_c was interpolated to daily intervals by fitting a Fourier series function (Slack et al., 1996):

$$K_c = a_0 + \sum_{f=1}^F (a_f \sin \theta_f + b_f \cos \theta_f) \quad (10)$$

and

$$\theta_f = 2\pi f \frac{CGDD}{CGDD_{max}} \quad (11)$$

where $a_0, a_1...a_F$, and $b_1...b_F$ are fit constants, f is the order of the Fourier series ($f=1$ because higher orders were not significant), $CGDD$ is cumulative growing degree days of the crop since planting ($^{\circ}\text{C}$), and

259 $CGDD_{max}$ is the maximum cumulative growing degree days (i.e., from planting to harvest or maturity)
 260 ($^{\circ}\text{C}$). The $CGDD$ were calculated following McMaster and Wilhelm (1997) as:

$$261 \quad CGDD = \sum_{d=1}^D (\overline{T}_A - T_{base})_d \quad (12)$$

262 where d is the number of days since planting, D is the number of days elapsed at $CGDD_{max}$, $\overline{T}_A$ is
 263 the mean daily air temperature, and T_{base} is the crop base temperature (i.e., below which no
 264 crop growth or development occurs), and $\overline{T}_A$ is constrained by:

$$265 \quad \overline{T}_A = (T_{A,max} + T_{A,min})/2 \quad \text{for } T_{A,max} \leq T_{peak} \text{ and } T_{A,min} \geq T_{base} \quad (13a)$$

$$266 \quad \overline{T}_A = (T_{peak} + T_{A,min})/2 \quad \text{for } T_{A,max} \geq T_{peak} \text{ and } T_{A,min} \geq T_{base} \quad (13b)$$

$$267 \quad \overline{T}_A = (T_{A,max} + T_{base})/2 \quad \text{for } T_{A,max} \leq T_{peak} \text{ and } T_{A,min} \leq T_{base} \quad (13c)$$

$$268 \quad \overline{T}_A = T_{base} \quad \text{for } T_{A,max} \leq T_{base} \text{ and } T_{A,min} \leq T_{base} \quad (13d)$$

$$269 \quad \overline{T}_A = (T_{peak} + T_{base})/2 \quad \text{for } T_{A,max} > T_{peak} \text{ and } T_{A,min} < T_{base} \quad (13e)$$

270 where $T_{A,max}$ is the maximum daily air temperature, $T_{A,min}$ is the minimum daily air temperature,
 271 and T_{peak} is the crop peak development temperatures (i.e., above which no increase in rate of
 272 crop growth or development occurs), and all temperature variables have ($^{\circ}\text{C}$) units. Crops used
 273 the present study included corn, cotton, and grain sorghum and are further described in the
 274 next section. Here, values of T_{base} and T_{peak} used were 10°C and 30°C , respectively, for corn
 275 (Gilmore and Rogers, 1958); 15°C and 50°C , respectively, for cotton (Peng et al., 1989), and 10°C and
 276 38°C , respectively, for grain sorghum (Gerik et al., 2003).

277 The SSWB approach was tested by comparing daily ET_c by the SSWB and fit Kc functions to daily
 278 ET_c measured by weighing lysimeters using a separate dataset previously published by Evett et al.
 279 (2012). Briefly, these data included two 4.7-ha fields planted in cotton in 2008. Large monolithic
 280 weighing lysimeters were located in the centers of each field (designated NE and SE for Northeast and

Southeast, respectively). Both fields were planted in raised beds and furrow diked following crop establishment, and fully irrigated by sprinkler. Row orientations were north-south for the NE field and east-west for the SE field. Each field contained eight neutron access tubes, with six outside and two inside each lysimeter. The same procedure was used as described above for neutron probe calibration and measurements for the six tubes outside the lysimeters. Data from that study were used because ET_C from SSWB vs. lysimeters were already compared at intervals between neutron measurement days, but not daily intervals that required interpolation by fitting K_c functions as shown here.

2.4. Additional Field Measurements

Measurements used to calculate daily ET_C using the TSEB model and SSWB method were obtained in two center pivot fields (e.g., Figure 2) and at a micrometeorological station. The two center pivot fields were located approximately 1.6 km north and south relative to each other, and were designated as North Pivot (N PVT) and South Pivot (S PVT). The N PVT included three spans and the S PVT included six spans with approximately 45-m lengths, resulting in ~5.7- and 23-ha irrigated areas, respectively (field corners were not irrigated). Each half of the fields were cropped and fallowed in alternating seasons to reduce spatial variability in antecedent soil water contents, and this also may have reduced crop vulnerability to pests and diseases. Crop data used in the present study included two seasons each of conventional corn, DT corn, cotton, and grain sorghum (simply termed sorghum herein) (Table 1).

Details of each crop season are in Table 1 references, but are briefly summarized here. Crops were planted in circular raised beds spaced 0.76 m apart, and furrow dikes were installed in crop interrows following crop establishment to control runoff and runoff. Irrigation water was applied in alternate interrows (i.e., drops spaced 1.52 m apart) and usually by low-energy precision application (LEPA) equipped with double-ended drag socks, although low-elevation spray application (LESA) was used in some seasons. Irrigation water applied was measured by calibrated totalizing flow meters.

Experimental designs were typically randomized complete blocks, and experimental treatments included different irrigation rates (% of meeting full ET_c requirements) and irrigation scheduling methods (manual by soil water profile measurement by neutron probe or automatic by T_B measurement by IRTs). Experimental plots were typically 12 to 18 rows wide (9 to 14 m, respectively) and 12 to 132 m long (depending on distance from pivot point) (Figure 2).

Plant growth stages were recorded approximately weekly or biweekly in experimental plots in 1.5 to 2.0 m areas. These included w_c and h_c measurements, and plant population counts up to or shortly following crop establishment. A limited set of LAI measurements were obtained for one cotton season and two grain sorghum seasons. Destructive plant samples were obtained several experimental plots. Plants were placed in coolers and transported indoors, leaves were stripped from plants, and leaf area was measured by a leaf area meter (model LI-3100, LI-COR, Lincoln, Neb.) and LAI was determined. Calibration of the meter was checked with a 0.005 m² reference disk. Measured LAI was compared to calculated LAI using an allometric method based on h_c , plant population, and $CGDD$ (Colaizzi et al., 2017). Because LAI measurements were not available for most of the crop seasons used in the present study, the allometric method was required to calculate LAI for plots used to test the TSEB model.

Wired and wireless IRTs were deployed on moving center pivots to measure T_B and at stationary field locations to measure T_{REF} (Figure 2). Most data obtained prior to 2011 used wired IRTs (model IRT/c.5.1-T-80F/27C, Exergen, Inc. Watertown, Mass.) (O'Shaughnessy et al., 2012a). The wired IRT detector was a Type T (copper-constantan) thermocouple with a bandpass of 8 to 14 μ m and reported precision and accuracy of 0.01 °C and ± 0.5 °C, respectively (i.e., for a target temperature range of ± 24 °C). Wireless IRTs and wireless mesh networks were developed in-house and also deployed on moving center pivots and at stationary field locations (O'Shaughnessy et al., 2013; the system was recently commercialized by Dynamax, Inc., Houston, Tex.). The wireless IRT included an infrared thermometer sensor (model MLX90614-BCF, Melexis, Ypres, Belgium) with a bandpass of 5.5 to 14 μ m,

reported precision and accuracy of 0.02 °C and ± 0.5 °C, respectively, and proprietary detector temperature compensating circuitry. Both wired and wireless IRTs had approximately a 5:1 field of view (FOV). For each experimental plot, two moving IRTs aboard the center pivot viewed the canopy in opposite directions to average temperature differences of sunlit and shaded surfaces (Wanjura and Upchurch, 2001). Moving IRTs were placed on masts approximately 1.5 m forward of drop hoses (i.e., ahead of the center pivot direction of travel), 2.0 m above the ground (V_R), 45° zenith angle (ϑ_R), and 0° to 45° azimuth angle (φ_R), where 0° is perpendicular to the crop row. Three to ten stationary IRTs viewed crop rows usually at nadir, and height above ground varied with h_C . Most stationary IRTs were deployed in plots having the largest irrigation rates.

Wired and wireless IRTs were tested in a controlled temperature room (Environmental Growth Chambers, Inc., Chagrin Falls, Oh.) using a black body reference surface (model CES100, Electro Optical Industries, Inc., Santa Barbara, Calif.). O'Shaughnessy et al. (2011b) reported test results of 24 wireless IRT prototypes and compared wireless and wired IRTs in outdoor conditions. In the controlled temperature room, the black body surface temperature was varied from 15 °C to 55 °C in 5 °C increments at four ambient temperatures of 15 °C, 25 °C, 35 °C, and 45 °C, where the target and ambient temperatures were the expected ranges during a typical growing season at the study location. Without calibration, the wireless IRTs vs. black body temperature root mean squared error (RMSE) ranged from 0.13 °C to 0.37 °C (0.26 °C average), and mean bias error (MBE) ranged from -0.2 °C to 0.76 °C. After applying a linear calibration, the RMSE range was reduced only to 0.10 °C to 0.31 °C (0.18 °C average), with nearly the same MBE. Thus the RMSE range was comparable to the manufacturer-reported accuracy of ± 0.5 °C with or without calibration, and the proprietary detector temperature compensation was effective for the expected ranges of target and ambient temperatures. The wireless IRTs were compared to the wired IRTs outdoors over ~ 48 h, which included a wide range of downwelling atmospheric longwave irradiance. The IRTs viewed a black aluminum block (81 cm x 38 cm

x 7.6 cm thick) having a measured emissivity of 0.99 at near-nadir; the aluminum block was placed on a grass surface (assumed emissivity = 0.98). Therefore, a small amount of downwelling atmospheric longwave irradiance would have been reflected into the IRTs either from the aluminum block or the adjacent grass surface. The target temperatures of the aluminum block ranged from ~10 °C to 45 °C, with standard errors for wired vs. wireless IRTs ≤ 0.43 °C, slope = 1.00, and intercept = -0.25 °C, and coefficient of determination (r^2) = 0.9987.

Micrometeorological measurements required for the TSEB model were obtained at a grass reference site maintained with well-irrigated fescue at ~0.12 m height, termed the Weather Pen (WP) (Howell et al., 2000). The WP site was adjacent to and ~200 m south of the N PVT, and ~1.6 km north of the S PVT. Although micrometeorological instruments were also deployed at each center pivot, WP data were used in the TSEB model at both the N PVT and S PVT to maintain consistency. Furthermore, commercial applications are unlikely to include full agricultural meteorological stations at each center pivot. Micrometeorological variables included incoming solar irradiance (R_s), T_a , relative humidity (RH), wind speed (U), and wind direction (ϕ_U). R_s was measured by a pyranometer (model PSP, Eppley Laboratories, Inc., Newport, RI), T_a and RH were measured in an enclosed ventilated white shelter at 2 m height above ground (model HMT330, Vaisala, Inc., Helsinki, Finland), U was measured by a cup anemometer at 2 m height above ground (model 03101, R.M. Young, Inc. Traverse City, Mich.), and ϕ_U was measured by a vane monitor at 10 m above ground (model 05103, R.M. Young, Inc. Traverse City, Mich.). Nearly all crop data had $h_c > 0.12$ m; therefore, U measured over fescue at the WP was adjusted using the logarithmic profile assumption for 2 m over cotton and sorghum and 3 m over corn (Howell, 1990). Precipitation was measured at each center pivot site by a tipping bucket rain gage (model TE525, Texas Electronics, Inc., Dallas, Tex.) and recorded by a datalogger (model CR10X, Campbell Scientific, Inc., Logan, UT). Tipping bucket rain gage measurements were sometimes verified by conventional

(manual) rain gages at the center pivot locations. All micrometeorological data were screened for quality following the procedures of Allen et al. (1998).

2.5. Statistical Analysis

Daily ET_c calculated by the TSEB model and SSWB method were compared by calculating the respective means and standard deviations (SD), and discrepancies were quantified by the root mean square error ($RMSE$), mean absolute error (MAE), mean bias error (MBE), regression slope, regression intercept, and regression coefficient of determination (r^2), and index of model agreement (IOA). The $RMSE$, MAE , and MBE were also reported as percentages of mean daily SSWB ET_c . The IOA is a first order version of the commonly used Coefficient of Model Efficiency (Nash and Sutcliffe, 1970), which is less sensitive to outliers (Legates and McCabe, 1999). The same statistics were also calculated for measured vs. calculated LAI (when data were available), and when comparing daily ET_c measured by lysimeter to the SSWB method to facilitate comparison with results of Evett et al. (2012), where ET_c values were cumulative over several days between neutron probe measurements. This was also done when comparing T_A at the WP and S PVT.

2.6. Sensitivity Analysis

A sensitivity analysis was conducted for selected input variables deemed as having the largest uncertainty in the TSEB model for three cotton canopy sizes (small, medium, and large). Input variables were grouped by time scales (i.e., how they varied over the season), and included seasonal (essentially time invariant), daily, and diurnal. Output variables included daily E , T , and ET_c . The sensitivity (S_M) of output variables (O) to input variables (I) was calculated after Oyarzun et al. (2007):

$$S_M = \frac{(O_+ - O_-)/O_B}{(I_+ - I_-)/I_B} \quad (14)$$

where I_B and O_B are the base values of input and output variables, respectively, and the + and – subscripts are the resulting values when the input variables are increased or decreased, respectively.

Input variables having seasonal to daily time scales, such as IRT deployment variables and canopy size, were varied $\pm 25\%$ of their base values, which was deemed as characterizing their maximum uncertainty (Howell et al., 1997; Anderson et al., 2004). Input variables having diurnal time scales, such as micrometeorological variables and surface temperatures, had smaller uncertainties within approximately $\pm 10\%$ because these were screened for quality (e.g., Allen et al., 1998; O'Shaughnessy et al., 2011b). Uncertainties of ϵ_c and ϵ_s were deemed 0.98 ± 0.01 after Campbell and Norman (1998) and field measurements, respectively, but these were both varied from 0.90 to 1.0.

3. Results

3.1. SSWB and Kc Method Test

Daily ET_c for each of the six access tubes in the NE and SE lysimeter fields was calculated by the SSWB and Kc approach, averaged, and compared with daily ET_c measured by lysimeter (Table 2, Figure 3). On most days, the NE lysimeter had larger ET_c compared with ET_c averaged from the SSWB in the NE field (means were 7.4 and 6.8 mm d^{-1} , respectively), but this was not the case for the SE lysimeter vs. the SSWB for the SE field (means were 5.7 and 6.0 mm d^{-1} , respectively). The same trends resulted in Evett et al. (2012), although scatter between lysimeter and SSWB ET_c values was slightly smaller (see their Table 2 and Figure 7). The larger discrepancies in the NE field were likely due to greater spatial variability of plant size during early season rapid growth. During this time, h_c (and probably LAI) in the NE lysimeter was larger compared with plants around the access tubes in the surrounding NE field, which corresponded to larger ET_c in the NE lysimeter. However, h_c variability was not as large between the SE lysimeter and surrounding field, and corresponding ET_c discrepancies were smaller. From these results, and considering that at least some discrepancies of ET_c between lysimeters and SSWB were related to local variations in plant size, the SSWB and Kc approach were deemed suitable to estimate daily ET_c in the center pivot experimental plots.

To further illustrate, examples of Kc data and their Fourier series functions were calculated for crops grown in the center pivot fields, including conventional and drought tolerant (DT) corn varieties, cotton, and grain sorghum (Figure 4). Peak Kc were larger for conventional compared with DT corn (Mounce et al., 2016). The corn crop seasons (2014 and 2015) had greater precipitation amounts compared with the cotton (2008) or sorghum (2011) seasons shown (Table 1). In fact, 2011 was the driest and 2015 was one of the wettest years on record at the study location, and this likely impacted the differences in scatter (i.e., r^2) in the different years due to uncertainty related to rainfall spatial variability and measurement error (Evetts et al., 2012).

3.2. Allometric LA /Model Test

Discrepancies between calculated and measured LA /were assessed for cotton (N08 season) and grain sorghum (S10 and S11 seasons) (Table 3, Figure 5). Overall, discrepancies were very similar to a previous study for cotton and grain sorghum, where the allometric model used to calculate LA /was developed and tested (Colaizzi et al., 2017). In the previous study, LA /measurements were also obtained at Bushland, Texas, but for crops planted in straight rows and usually irrigated by lateral move sprinklers. In the present study, LA /measurements were obtained from circular rows irrigated by center pivot LEPA drag socks. The similar discrepancies for the previous and present studies suggest that the allometric LA /model had application to different seasons, climatic, growing, and management conditions. In the present study, measured LA /for cotton varied from ~ 0.05 to $2.9 \text{ m}^2 \text{ m}^{-2}$, and for grain sorghum, measured LA /varied from ~ 0.25 to $4.0 \text{ m}^2 \text{ m}^{-2}$. These LA /measurements exemplified the range of sparse to full vegetation cover used to test the TSEB for these crops. Although LA /measurements were not available for corn, calculated LA /varied from ~ 0.5 to $7.0 \text{ m}^2 \text{ m}^{-2}$ (data not shown).

3.3. TSEB Model Test

Discrepancies of ETc calculated by the TSEB model and estimated by the SSWB method were assessed for conventional and drought tolerant corn, cotton, and grain sorghum (Table 4, Figure 6).

Discrepancies were similar for each crop season; therefore, data were pooled for both years for each crop. Overall, discrepancies were similar for each crop, which included widely varying climatic, growing, and management conditions (Baumhardt et al., 2016). The ET_c estimated by the SSWB method varied from ~ 0.5 to 14 mm d^{-1} (means 5.8 to 7.0 mm d^{-1}). These were similar to ET_c measured for each crop by large weighing lysimeters over a full season at the study location (Howell et al., 1997; 2004).

Mean ET_c by the SSWB method was larger for the conventional corn variety (7.0 mm d^{-1}) compared with the DT corn variety (5.9 mm d^{-1}) (Table 4). At the study location, Mounce et al. (2016) also reported that seasonal ET_c was larger for conventional vs. DT corn. However, mean ET_c calculated by the TSEB model were similar (6.4 and 6.5 mm d^{-1} , respectively), and discrepancies were larger for SSWB vs. TSEB ET_c for DT corn. For example, the respective conventional and DT IOA were 0.64 and 0.58 ; $RMSE$ were 25% and 31% , MAE were 20% and 25% , and MBE were -7.3% and 11% . The similar mean ET_c calculated by the TSEB model implied that T_R were similar for the two corn varieties, despite having different SSWB ET_c . This was sometimes supported by pairwise comparison tests (two-tailed Student t test) of simultaneous T_R measurements in conventional vs. DT plots in both the 2014 and 2015 seasons (i.e., where the pivot passed through sectors having plots with both varieties with identical irrigation rates) (Figure 7). Here, the center pivot field was divided into six pie-shaped sectors of experimental units (similar to Figure 2). Valid comparisons were available for five and three sectors in 2014 and 2015, respectively, where each sector contained a conventional and DT plot pair with the same irrigation rate (all 100%). The pooled comparisons included most daytime hours (~ 0800 to 1700 CST), resulting in T_R ($\sim 15^\circ\text{C}$ to $\sim 35^\circ\text{C}$) that reflected the wide range of diurnal climatic conditions at the semi-arid study location. There was insufficient evidence to reject the null hypothesis that mean T_R were statistically equal for plot pairs in three of the five sectors in 2014 (Figure 7a) and all three sectors in 2015 (Figure 7b). However, two of the sectors in 2014 did exhibit evidence that T_R for the DT variety was statistically larger compared with T_R of the conventional variety (Figure 7c and 7d). These exceptions

clearly point to the need for a more detailed analysis of T_R and the energy balances of conventional vs. DT varieties, and will be addressed in forthcoming studies.

Mean ET_c for cotton by the SSWB and TSEB were 5.9 and 5.7 mm d⁻¹, respectively, with most ET_c < 10 mm d⁻¹, similar to the DT corn variety (Table 4, Figure 6). The ET_c discrepancies for cotton were similar to the conventional corn variety, with $r^2 = 0.65$, $IOA = 0.69$, $RMSE = 25\%$, and $MAE = 19\%$, but the absolute MBE value was smaller compared to corn at -3.2%. Results were similar for grain sorghum, where mean SSWB and TSEB ET_c were 5.8 and 5.9 mm d⁻¹, respectively. However, the ET_c discrepancies were larger and similar to DT corn (except for MBE , which was smaller at 1.1%). The grain sorghum seasons contained two contrasting seasons (N10 and S11) (O'Shaughnessy et al., 2012b). In 2010, in-season precipitation and in-season ET_o in 2010 were somewhat above and below average (164 and 687 mm, respectively; Table 1). The 2011 season was the driest on record, where in-season precipitation and in-season ET_o were 8 and 812 mm, respectively (Table 1).

3.4. TSEB Model Sensitivity Analysis

All latent heat fluxes (summed to daily E , daily T , and daily ET_c) were most sensitive to input variables with a diurnal time scale, but less sensitive to input variables with daily or seasonal time scales (Table 5). Here, S_M of E , T , and ET_c were denoted $S_M(E)$, $S_M(T)$, and $S_M(ET_c)$, respectively. Of the diurnal input variables, latent heat fluxes were most sensitive to T_A and T_R in most cases with $|S_M| > 1.0$ for small (DOY 201), medium (DOY 215), and large (DOY 243) canopies. Timmermans et al. (2007) also reported that H was more sensitive to T_R and the T_R-T_A gradient, followed by the fraction of vegetation cover, compared with other TSEB input variables. The temperature gradient-resistance relation used to calculate H resulted in positive correlation (shown as positive S_M) between the latent heat fluxes and T_A , but negative correlation (negative S_M) between the latent heat fluxes and T_R . Latent heat fluxes were also relatively sensitive ($S_M > 1.0$) to ϵ_C and ϵ_S (Table 5, Figure 8). This was expected given that emissivity and temperature are both related to longwave flux by the Stefan-Boltzmann relation, and given the

large sensitivities of latent heat fluxes to T_R . For a large canopy when the soil was obscured, the large S_M for ϵ_C but not ϵ_S was also expected. However, uncertainty in ϵ_C may be smaller (i.e., 0.96 to 0.99; Idso et al., 1969; Campbell and Norman, 1998) than the range in values shown here, which would reduce uncertainty in E , T , and ET (Figure 8). Although ϵ_S may have greater uncertainty due to spatial variation of soil, and perhaps even more so due to crop residue on the surface, the impact of ϵ_S diminishes with increased vegetation cover. For all canopy sizes, E always had greater sensitivity compared with T or ET to both ϵ_C and ϵ_S . For the small and medium canopies, E was also relatively sensitive to R_S and RH . This may have been related to how the TSEB model solves the energy balance, where E is calculated as a residual. Somewhat surprisingly, all $|S_M| < 1.0$ for U_{-2m} and LAI , except for daily E when LAI was $0.56 \text{ m}^2 \text{ m}^{-2}$ (small canopy) or $1.66 \text{ m}^2 \text{ m}^{-2}$ (medium canopy).

The input variables considered as having seasonal time scales were related to IRT deployment (except for φ_{ROW} , which was related to center pivot angular position). Latent heat fluxes had greater sensitivities to IRT deployment variables for small and medium canopies (i.e., partial vegetation cover) compared to a large canopy (i.e., full vegetation cover). Latent heat fluxes were most sensitive to ϑ_R , and the largest $|S_M|$ was -0.86 for E and a small canopy, but all $|S_M| < 1.0$. The IRT deployment variables determine what fraction of vegetation appears in the IRT footprint (i.e., f_{VR}), which determines how T_R is partitioned into the canopy and soil components, and hence how E and T are partitioned in the TSEB model. The relatively low $|S_M|$ supported the generally accepted protocol for IRT deployment (Huband and Monteith, 1986; Wanjura and Upchurch, 2001), which of course seeks to maximize f_{VR} . For IRT arrays aboard center pivots, this is most practically achieved using oblique view angles to the crop row (i.e., $\vartheta_R = \varphi_R = 45^\circ$) and as large V_R as practical (here, $V_R = 2.0 \text{ m}$, which was larger than the 0.76-m crop row spacing).

The sensitivity analysis conducted here was to gauge the relative importance of input variables deemed to have the most uncertainty or measurement costs in the present TSEB model application.

These results implied that efforts aimed at obtaining quality temperature measurements (T_A and T_R) and to a lesser extent ε_s , R_s and RH would have the largest impact on the quality of E , T , and ET_c calculations using the present version TSEB model. This was congruent with previous TSEB model studies (Timmermans et al., 2007; Kustas et al., 2012), and which also motivated approaches using T_R and T_A measured at two or more times per day, such as the dual-temperature difference (DTD) algorithm (Anderson et al., 1997; Guzinski et al., 2013; Kustas et al., 2012; Norman et al., 2000). In most surface energy balance applications, however, T_A is assumed to be spatially invariable, which is likely not valid for heterogeneous landscapes (e.g., irrigated and non-irrigated areas, and even differentially irrigated plots such as those in the present study; Cammalleri et al., 2012). As discussed later, the addition of T_A (and perhaps RH) measurements to moving IRTs may well be a worthwhile area of investigation.

Input variables resulting in smaller $|S_M|$ should also be given due consideration in model applications. Note that the scope of the sensitivity analysis was limited to the impact of changing one variable at a time *within the TSEB model*, and not the possible interdependence of input variables in field conditions. For example, errors in any one IRT deployment variable would not be expected to substantially contribute to error in final calculated ET_c . But since all IRT deployment variables influence f_{VR} , small errors in more than one deployment variable may have synergistic effects and produce larger errors in final calculated fluxes in practice. Similarly, errors in LAI calculated by the allometric model at first may not be expected to have commensurate errors in calculated ET_c . But LAI is also related to w_C and h_C , which may also have larger synergistic effects throughout the TSEB model through f_{VR} . Furthermore, the relatively small $|S_M|$ values resulting for w_C , h_C and LAI were somewhat counterintuitive in light of the results of Evett et al. (2012), Timmermans et al. (2007), and data presented herein (Table 2; Figure 3), where ET_c was clearly impacted by differences in canopy size. On the other hand, the relatively small $|S_M|$ may have been related to the oblique IRT view angles, which

resulted in larger f_{VR} compared with a nadir view, such as aerial imagery described by Timmermans et al. (2007) and French et al. (2007; 2015).

4. Discussion

Several previous studies compared latent heat flux or ET_c calculated by the TSEB model to those measured by large weighing lysimeters and eddy covariance systems at the Bushland, TX study location. The previous studies usually resulted in smaller discrepancies between calculated and measured latent heat flux or ET_c compared with the present study (Table 4; Figure 6). However, the previous studies differed in several ways, perhaps most significantly because (1) ground-truth measurements were available at near instantaneous (usually 15-min) time steps and did not rely on a soil water balance or K_c curve fitting; (2) instruments used to measure or derive T_R were stationary (e.g., IRTs or pyrgeometers) and were not subject to uncertainty imposed by spatial variability of canopy size (i.e., w_G , h_G , or LAI); and (3) in most cases, other input variables such as meteorological (including precipitation) and plant measurements were obtained within a few meters of ground-truth and T_R measurements. We postulate that the larger ET_c discrepancies reported herein were primarily related to uncertainties arising from the spatial variability and measurement error of precipitation, LAI , and micrometeorological variables (particularly T_A).

A brief review of previous TSEB model results at the study location follows. Kustas et al. (2012) reported MAE from ~10 to 20%, and MBE from ~1 to 5% of measured mean latent heat flux. The study considered only instantaneous fluxes and did not include time scaling to daily values. Similarly, Anderson et al. (2012) reported $MAE \leq 8.4\%$ of measured means, and a Nash-Sutcliffe coefficient of model efficiency (similar to IOA) of ~0.92, but the study did include scaling near-instantaneous fluxes to daytime values. Although Cammalleri et al. (2014) reported $RMSE$ and MAE of 1.8 and 1.5 mm d⁻¹ between TSEB and eddy covariance derived ET_c , which were comparable to the present study, their

study derived T_R from MODIS satellite imagery having spatial resolutions much larger (~ 1 km) compared with the lysimeter fields (4.7 ha). Colaizzi et al. (2014) and Song et al. (2016) calculated ET_C using several TSEB model variants and T_R derived from stationary IRTs, where near-instantaneous ET_C calculations were summed or time scaled to daytime and 24 h values. In Colaizzi et al. (2014), the resulting calculated vs. measured ET_C discrepancies were similar for one-time-of-day T_R measured during midday or afternoon, but larger during morning hours ($13\% < RMSE < 24\%$; $10\% < MAE < 17\%$, and $1\% < MBE < 10\%$, where percentages were of measured means). Discrepancies were similar when time scaling was not used (i.e., all 15-min T_R measurements were used over 24 h, and calculated 15-min ET_C was summed to 24 h; $RMSE = 12\%$, $MAE = 9\%$, and $MBE = 7\%$). Song et al. (2016) reported similar results for 24 h summed ET_C . From these results, time scaling would not be expected to be a significant source of discrepancy between the TSEB and SSWB methods for calculating daily ET_C , except when T_R measurements were obtained during the first half of the morning (also see Morillas et al., 2014). This is despite latent heat flux components being relatively sensitive to T_{REF} ($|S_M| > 1.0$; Table 5). The sensitivity analysis in the present study also showed large $|S_M|$ for T_R , consistent with Timmermans et al. (2007). O'Shaughnessy et al. (2011b) showed $RMSE$ and MBE of uncalibrated wireless IRTs (used in the present study) were up to 0.79 and 1.52 °C, respectively, compared to a black body radiator in a temperature controlled room. However, wired IRTs (also used in the previous studies) showed greater discrepancy with a FLIR imager compared with wireless IRTs. Thus T_R measurement error, which could severely impact TSEB model results, would not explain smaller discrepancies reported in previous studies where wired IRTs were used.

In comparing soil water balance methods to estimate ET_C , Evett et al. (2012) reported that accounting for vertical F only reduced ET_C estimates by ~ 0.1 mm d⁻¹. In the present study, accounting for vertical F likely would have had negligible impact in reducing the TSEB vs. SSWB discrepancies (Table 4). However, uncertainties in other soil water balance components, including I , P , and R likely contributed

to at least some discrepancies reported here (Tables 2 and 4). In particular, P is well known to have large spatial variability in the region, especially during summertime convective thunderstorms, which have relatively small areas (a few km) of brief but intense rainfall. Evett et al. (2012) reported a 10 mm difference in P between the NE and SE lysimeters (~225 m distance apart) over 132 days. However, P variability greater than 20 mm has been observed within a ~500 m distance and within a single day at the study location. Furthermore, P recorded in rain gauges has been shown to be consistently below that measured by the lysimeters due to horizontal winds and the smaller catch area (the freeboard of the lysimeter boxes prevents R except for the largest ($> \sim 75$ mm) P events). Considering that the N PVT and S PVT field areas used in the present study were ~250 m and ~500 m in diameter, respectively, and each had a single rain gage at the field center, it was plausible that some discrepancy between TSEB ET_c and SSWB ET_c at daily time scales was caused by P spatial variability and measurement error of rain gages. In other studies that used soil water balances as ET_c ground truth for a TSEB model, French et al. (2007; 2015) reported mostly smaller $RMSE$ of 0.4 to 1.6 mm d⁻¹, where larger $RMSE$ occurred after leaf senescence of spring wheat, and for one of two cotton seasons. However, P was likely a much smaller component of the soil water balance at their arid study location of Maricopa, Arizona (USA).

As discussed earlier, differences in ET_c between a lysimeter and a SSWB in the surrounding field were linked to differences in canopy size, including w_c and h_c measurements, and probably LAI (Table 2; Figure 3; and Evett et al., 2012). Also, previous studies having high spatial resolution reflectance measurements could detect spatial variability of vegetation cover (which presumably included differences in canopy size) on the order of a few meters (French et al., 2007; Timmermans et al., 2007). In the present study, however, measurements of w_c and h_c were available only in 1.5 to 2.0 m areas in each plot, requiring that LAI be calculated by an allometric method and also requiring the assumption that w_c , h_c , and LAI were uniform for each plot. Therefore, small-scale (i.e., subplot) spatial variability in canopy size was not accounted for. Given the linkage with ET_c , the uncertainty in canopy size, especially

LAI , may have also contributed to discrepancies of TSEB vs. SSWB ET_c . Even if w_G , h_G , and LAI were available at sub-meter spatial resolution, the oblique IRT view angles likely shifted most variability in f_{VR} to earlier in the season during small or medium canopy cover, resulting in E , T , and ET_c being relatively insensitive to w_G , h_G , and LAI (Table 5). This was in contrast to studies using nadir views where f_{VR} would have been essentially equal to the fraction of vegetation cover throughout the season, and which resulted in relatively stronger ET_c response to canopy cover (Anderson et al., 2005; Li et al., 2005; French et al., 2007; Timmermans et al., 2007). As an alternative to acquiring high-spatial resolution images, and to leverage existing hardware, Casanova et al. (2014) described the preliminary development of a computer vision sensor (i.e., panchromatic and reflectance imaging sensor and firmware) to be used concurrently with IRTs aboard center pivots. A field prototype remains under development, but will be tested in future studies.

Spatial variability of microclimate in heterogeneous landscapes, and their impacts on thermal-based energy balance models, has been well-documented (e.g., Cammalleri et al., 2012; Choi et al., 2009; Kustas et al., 2012; Sanchez et al., 2008). In the present study, LE fluxes (E , T , and ET_c) were relatively sensitive to T_A and R_s regardless of canopy size ($S_M > 1.0$; Table 5). The LE fluxes were less sensitive to U_{-2m} and RH (although ET_o was relatively sensitive to U_{-2m} and T_A ; Porter et al., 2012; Moorhead et al., 2016). Since only WP data were used (to maintain consistency in TSEB model tests), and the WP site was ~200 m and 1.6 km from the N PVT and S PVT, respectively, microclimate spatial variability may have also contributed to some model discrepancies. A complete analysis of microclimate spatial variability at the WP, N PVT, and S PVT sites was beyond the scope of this study. However, we give a brief example by comparing T_A measurements from the WP and S PVT (Table 6; Figure 9). Both sites used similar instruments that were shielded from radiation at 2 m height above ground (the S PVT site used model HMP45C, Vaisala, Inc., Helsinki, Finland) and averaged to 15-min. Here, we show two years that contrasted sharply in climatic conditions, including record drought in 2011, and abundant

rainfall in 2015. These climatic conditions resulted from strong El Niño Southern Oscillation cycles (Baumhardt et al., 2016). For a given year, both sites had similar mean and SD of T_A . However, scatter between the two sites were less in 2011 compared with 2015; for example, respective $RMSE$ were 1.0 and 1.9 °C. Annual P in the respective years was 170 and 964 mm (Table 1); the greater scatter in 2015 may have been related to spatial variability in rainfall, which resulted in locally reduced T_A . As an aside, Cammalleri et al. (2012) described an approach to calculate T_A (when measurements were missing) using imagery and an atmospheric boundary layer model, and reported similar discrepancies (~ 1 K) for T_A modeled and measured at micrometeorological stations. For the range of $RMSE$ of T_A in the present study, and assuming the $RMSE$ of T_A and daily ETC are linearly related by S_M , then expected $RMSE$ in daily ETC for a medium size canopy may be 3 to 6 mm d⁻¹ (Table 5, where $S_M \sim 3.0$). This was larger than $RMSE$ of daily ETC calculated by TSEB vs. SSWB for all crops ($1.5 \leq RMSE \leq 1.8$ mm d⁻¹; Table 4). Since H calculations in most soil-plant-atmosphere energy balance models are based on an air-surface temperature gradient, measurement of T_A near IRT locations (i.e., along pivot spans) warrants further investigation.

5. Summary and Conclusion

A recent version of a TSEB was tested where daily ETC was calculated for several crops and seasons in a semiarid climate (Bushland, Texas, USA). Crops included two seasons each of conventional corn, DT corn, cotton, and grain sorghum over most of the growing season (including sparse to full canopy cover). The crops were irrigated by center pivots, and T_B was measured by wired and wireless IRT arrays aboard the center pivots. Daily ETC calculated by the TSEB model was compared to daily ETC estimated by a SSWB, where the soil water profile was measured by a field-calibrated neutron probe, and daily ETC values were interpolated between neutron probe measurement days by fitting single crop coefficients to each plot. Discrepancies between TSEB and SSWB were similar for each crop and season,

despite varying growing conditions primarily related to climate and management, where $0.56 \leq IOA \leq 0.69$, $1.5 \leq RMSE \leq 1.8 \text{ mm d}^{-1}$; $1.1 \leq MAE \leq 1.5 \text{ mm d}^{-1}$; and $-0.51 \leq MBE \leq 0.63 \text{ mm d}^{-1}$.

A sensitivity analysis of daily LE components (daily E , daily T , and daily ETC) calculated by the TSEB model to selected input variables was conducted. Input variables having seasonal and daily time scales were varied $\pm 25\%$. These variables included ϕ_{ROW} , IRT deployment variables (V_R , P_R , ϑ_R , and ϕ_R and FOV), and canopy size (w_C , h_C , and LA). Input variables having diurnal time scales were varied $\pm 10\%$ and included micrometeorological variables (R_s , U_{2m} , T_A , and RH), and T_{REF} and T_R . In addition, ϵ_c and ϵ_s were varied from 0.90 to 1.00. The sensitivity analysis was conducted for a small, medium, and large sized cotton canopy. Daily latent heat flux components were most sensitive to T_R , T_A , and R_s for all canopy sizes, ϵ_s for a small canopy, and ϵ_c for a large canopy (i.e., most $|S_M| > 1.0$). Although each daily LE component was relatively less sensitive to canopy size, possible interdependence of input variables (e.g., w_C , h_C , and LA) could enhance their impact under field conditions.

Discrepancies of daily ETC calculated by TSEB and SSWB were larger compared with previous TSEB model studies at this location. Based on the sensitivity analysis and previous studies, the larger discrepancies of the present study were mostly attributed to greater uncertainty of P , canopy size, and T_A , where uncertainties were related to both spatial variability and measurement error. Previous studies showed that P and canopy size impacted ETC estimated by the SSWB method, and canopy size and T_A impacted ETC calculated by the TSEB model. Although the sensitivity analysis indicated that T_R measurement error would also have a very deleterious impact in TSEB applications, calibration studies showed that wired IRTs such as those used in the previous studies were slightly less accurate compared with wireless IRTs used in the present study. Hence differences in T_R measurement error would not explain the smaller discrepancies reported in previous studies. Nonetheless, ongoing improvements in wireless IRT design are expected to reduce uncertainty in T_R measurements. Also, a computer vision sensor is presently being developed for testing at the study location to mitigate uncertainty in canopy

size and T_R partitioning to the T_C and T_S components. A current field study at the N PVT site includes measurement of the 1.0-m soil water profile by time-domain reflectometry averaged to 15-min time steps, which is expected to reduce uncertainty in ET_C estimated by soil water balance methods. Future TSEB model studies will include a larger number of rain gage and T_A sensors distributed throughout the field, along with E and T measurements by microlysimeter and sap flow gages, respectively.

Acknowledgements

Data presented herein was the result of numerous funding sources and dedicated efforts of technicians and student workers. Funding sources included the USDA-ARS National Program 211, Water Availability and Watershed Management; the USDA-ARS Ogallala Aquifer Program, a consortium between the USDA-ARS, Kansas State University, Texas AgriLife Research, Texas AgriLife Extension Service, Texas Tech University, and West Texas A&M University; a joint grant from the Bilateral Agricultural Research and Development (BARD) fund and the Texas Department of Agriculture (grant no. TIE04-01); a Cooperative Research and Development Agreement (CRADA) between USDA-ARS and Valmont Industries, Inc., Valley, Nebraska (Agreement No. 58-3K95-0-1455-M); and the United Sorghum Checkoff Program (grant nos. R0021-09 and R0012-10). We greatly appreciate the work performed by Luke Britten, Agricultural Science Technician, Brice Ruthhardt, Support Scientist, and the numerous temporary student workers at USDA-ARS Conservation and Production Research Laboratory, Bushland, Texas. Finally, we thank the Editor, Associate Editor, and two anonymous reviewers for their work; their comments and questions greatly improved the clarity and quality of the manuscript.

References

709 Ahmad, M.D., Turrall, H., Nazeer, A., 2009. Diagnosing irrigation performance and water productivity
 710 through satellite remote sensing and secondary data in a large irrigation system of Pakistan.
 711 Agric. Water Manage. 96, 551-564.

712 Alfieri, J.G., Kustas, W.P., Prueger, J.H., Hipps, L.E., Evett, S.R., Basara, J.B., Neale, C.M.U., French, A.N.,
 713 Colaizzi, P., Agam, N., Cosh, M.H., Chavez, J.L., Howell, T.A., 2012. On the discrepancy between
 714 eddy covariance and lysimetry-based surface flux measurements under strongly advective
 715 conditions. Adv. Water Resour. 50, 62-78.

716 Allen, R.G., Pereira, L.S., Raes, D., Smith, M., 1998. Crop evapotranspiration: Guidelines for computing
 717 crop water requirements. Irrigation and Drainage Paper No. 56. Rome, Italy: United Nations
 718 FAO.

719 Anderson, M.C., Norman, J.M., Diak, G.R., Kustas, W.P., Mecikalski, J.R., 1997. A two-source time-
 720 integrated model for estimating surface fluxes using thermal infrared remote sensing. Remote
 721 Sensing Environ. 60, 195-216.

722 Anderson, M.C., Neale, C.M.U., Li, F., Norman, J.M., Kustas, W.P., Jayanthi, H., Chavez, J., 2004.
 723 Upscaling ground observations of vegetation water content, canopy height, and leaf area index
 724 during SMEX02 using aircraft and Landsat imagery. Remote Sens. Environ. 92: 447-464.

725 Anderson, M.C., Norman, J.M., Kustas, W.P., Li, F., Prueger, J.H., Mecikalski, J.R., 2005. Effects of
 726 vegetation clumping on two-source model estimates of surface energy fluxes from an
 727 agricultural landscape during SMACEX. J. Hydrometeorol. 6, 892-909.

728 Anderson, M.C., Kustas, W.P., Alfieri, J.G., Gao, F., Hain, C., Prueger, J.H., Evett, S.R., Colaizzi, P., Howell,
 729 T.A., Chavez, J.L., 2012. Mapping daily evapotranspiration at Landsat spatial scales during the
 730 BEAREX08 field campaign. Adv. Water Resour. 50, 162-177.

731 Anderson, R.G., Alfieri, J.G., Tirado-Corbalá, R., Gartung, J., McKee, L.G., Prueger, J.H., Wang, D., Ayars,
 732 J.E., Kustas, W.P., 2017. Assessing FAO-56 dual crop coefficients using eddy covariance flux
 733 partitioning. *Agric. Water Manage.* 179, 92-102.

734 ASCE, 2005. The ASCE standardized reference evapotranspiration equation. In: Allen, R.G., Walter, I.A.,
 735 Elliott, R.L., Howell, T.A., Itenfisu, D., Jensen, M.E., Snyder, R.L. (Eds.), ASCE-EWRI Task
 736 Committee Report. Reston, Va.: ASCE.

737 Baumhardt, R.L., Mauget, S.A., Schwartz, R.C., Jones, O.R., 2016. El Niño Southern Oscillation effects on
 738 dryland crop production in the Texas High Plains. *Agron. J.* 108, 736-744.

739 Bellvert, J., Zarco-Tejada, P.J., Girona, J., Fereres, E., 2014. Mapping crop water stress index in a 'Pinot-
 740 noir' vineyard: comparing ground measurements with thermal remote sensing imagery from an
 741 unmanned aerial vehicle. *Prec. Agric.* 15, 361-376.

742 Berni, J.A.J., Zarco-Tejada, P.J., Sepulcre-Cantó, G., Fereres, E., Villalobos, F., 2009. Mapping canopy
 743 conductance and CWSI in olive orchards using high resolution thermal remote sensing imagery.
 744 *Remote Sens. Environ.* 113, 2380-2388.

745 Cammalleri, C., Anderson, M.C., Ciraolo, G., D'Urso, G., Kustas, W.P., La Loggia, G., Minacapilli, M., 2012.
 746 Applications of a remote sensing-based two-source energy balance algorithm for mapping
 747 surface fluxes without in situ air temperature observations. *Remote Sens. Environ.* 124, 502-515.

748 Cammalleria, C., Anderson, M.C., Gao, F., Hain, C.R., Kustas, W.P., 2014. Mapping daily
 749 evapotranspiration at field scales over rainfed and irrigated agricultural areas using remote
 750 sensing data fusion. *Agric. Forest Meteorol.* 186, 1-11.

751 Campbell, G.S., Norman, J.M., 1998. *An Introduction to Environmental Biophysics* (2nd ed.). New York,
 752 N.Y.: Springer-Verlag.

753 Casanova, J.J., O'Shaughnessy, S.A., Evett, S.R., Rush, C.M., 2014. Development of a wireless computer
 754 vision instrument to detect biotic stress in wheat. *Sensors.* 14, 17753-17769.

755 Choi, M., Kustas, W.P., Anderson, M.C., Allen, R.G., Li, F., Kjaersgaard, J.H., 2009. An intercomparison of
756 three remote sensing-based surface energy balance algorithms over a corn and soybean
757 production region (Iowa, U.S.) during SMACEX. *Agric. Forest Meteorol.* 149, 2082-2097.

758 Colaizzi, P.D., O'Shaughnessy, S.A., Gowda, P.H., Evett, S.R., Howell, T.A., Kustas, W.P., Anderson, M.C.,
759 2010. Radiometer footprint model to estimate sunlit and shaded components for row crops.
760 *Agron. J.* 102, 942-955.

761 Colaizzi, P.D., Evett, S.R., Howell, T.A., Li, F., Kustas, W.P., Anderson, M.C., 2012a. Radiation model for
762 row crops: I. Geometric model description and parameter optimization. *Agron. J.* 104, 225-240.

763 Colaizzi, P.D., Schwartz, R.C., Evett, S.R., Howell, T.A., Gowda, P.H., Tolk, J.A., 2012b. Radiation model for
764 row crops: II. Model evaluation. *Agron. J.* 104, 241-255.

765 Colaizzi, P.D., Kustas, W.P., Anderson, M.C., Agam, N., Tolk, J.A., Evett, S.R., Howell, T.A., Gowda, P.H.,
766 O'Shaughnessy, S.A., 2012c. Two-source energy balance model estimates of evapotranspiration
767 using component and composite surface temperatures. *Adv. Water Resour.* 50, 134-151.

768 Colaizzi, P.D., Agam, N., Tolk, J.A., Evett, S.R., Howell, T.A., Gowda, P.H., O'Shaughnessy, S.A., Kustas,
769 W.P., Anderson, M.C., 2014. Two-source energy balance model to calculate E, T, and ET:
770 Comparison of Priestley-Taylor and Penman-Monteith formulations and two time scaling
771 methods. *Trans. ASABE* 57, 479-498.

772 Colaizzi, P.D., Agam, N., Tolk, J.A., Evett, S.R., Howell, T.A., O'Shaughnessy, S.A., Gowda, P.H., Kustas,
773 W.P., Anderson, M.C., 2016a. Advances in a two-source energy balance model: Partitioning of
774 evaporation and transpiration for cotton. *Trans. ASABE* 59, 181-197.

775 Colaizzi, P.D., Evett, S.R., Agam, N., Schwartz, R.C., Kustas, W.P., 2016b. Soil heat flux calculation for
776 sunlit and shaded surfaces under row crops: 1. Model development and sensitivity analysis.
777 *Agric. Forest Meteorol.* 216, 115-128.

778 Colaizzi, P.D., Evett, S.R., Agam, N., Schwartz, R.C., Kustas, W.P., Cosh, M.H., McKee, L. 2016c. Soil heat
779 flux calculation for sunlit and shaded surfaces under row crops: 2. Model test. *Agric. Forest*
780 *Meteorol.* 216, 129-140.

781 Colaizzi, P.D., Evett, S.R., Brauer, D.K., Howell, T.A., Tolk, J.A., Copeland, K.S., 2017. Allometric method to
782 estimate leaf area index for row crops. *Agron. J.*, accepted 25 Dec 2016.

783 Evans, R.G., Sadler, E.J., 2008. Methods and technologies to improve efficiency of water use. *Water*
784 *Resour. Res.*, 44, W00E04.

785 Evett, S.R., 2008. Neutron moisture meters. In: Evett, S.R., Heng, L.K., Moutonnet, P., Nguyen, M.L.
786 (Eds.), *Field Estimation of Soil Water Content: A Practical Guide to Methods, Instrumentation,*
787 *and Sensor Technology.* IAEA-TCS-30. International Atomic Energy Agency, Vienna, Austria.

788 Evett, S.R., Howell, T.A., Schneider, A.D., Upchurch, D.R., Wanjura, D.F., 2000. Automatic drip irrigation
789 of corn and soybean. In: Evans, R.G., Benham, B.L., Trooien, T.P. (Eds.), *Proc. 4th Dec. Nat. Irrig.*
790 *Symp.*, ASAE, St. Joseph, MI, 401–408.

791 Evett, S.R., Tolk, J.A., Howell, T.A., 2003. A depth control stand for improved accuracy with the neutron
792 probe. *Vadose Zone J.* 2, 642–649.

793 Evett, S.R., Schwartz, R.C., Howell, T.A., Baumhardt, R.L., Copeland, K.S., 2012. Can weighing lysimeter ET
794 represent surrounding field ET well enough to test flux station measurements of daily and sub-
795 daily ET? *Adv. Water Resour.* 50, 79-90.

796 Falkenberg, N.R., Piccinni, G., Cothren, J.T., Leskovar, D.I., Rush, C.M., 2007. Remote sensing of biotic
797 and abiotic stress for irrigation management of cotton. *Agric. Water Manage.* 87, 23-31.

798 French, A.N., Hunsaker, D.J., Clarke, T.R., Fitzgerald, G.J., Luckett, W.E., Pinter, Jr., P.J., 2007. Energy
799 balance estimation of evapotranspiration for wheat grown under variable management
800 practices in central Arizona. *Trans. ASABE* 50, 2059-2071.

801 French, A.N., Alfieri, J.G., Kustas, W.P., Prueger, J.H., Hipps, L.E., Chávez, J.L., Evett, S.R., Howell, T.A.,
 802 Gowda, P.H., Hunsaker, D.J., Thorp, K.R., 2012. Estimation of surface energy fluxes using surface
 803 renewal and flux variance techniques over an advective irrigated agricultural site. *Adv. Water*
 804 *Resour.* 50, 91-105.

805 French, A.N., Hunsaker, D.J., Thorp, K.R., 2015. Remote sensing of evapotranspiration over cotton using
 806 the TSEB and METRIC energy balance models. *Remote Sens. Environ.* 158, 281-294.

807 Gago, J., Douthe, C., Coopman, R.E., Gallego, P.P., Ribas-Carbo, M., Flexas, J., Escalona, J., Medrano, H.,
 808 2015. UAVs challenge to assess water stress for sustainable agriculture. *Agric. Water Manage.*
 809 153, 9-19.

810 Gerik, T., Bean, B., Vanderlip, R., 2003. Sorghum growth and development. Texas Cooperative Extension,
 811 Rpt. B-6137. The Texas A&M University System, College Station, TX, 8 pp.

812 Gilmore, E.C., Rogers, J.S., 1958. Heat units as a method of measuring maturity in corn. *Agron. J.* 50, 611-
 813 615.

814 Guzinski, R., Anderson, M.C., Kustas, W.P., Nieto, H., Sandholt, I., 2013. Using a thermal-based two
 815 source energy balance model with time-differencing to estimate surface energy fluxes with day-
 816 night MODIS observations. *Hydrol. Earth Syst. Sci.* 17, 2809-2825.

817 Haberland, J.A., Colaizzi, P.D., Kostrzewski, M.A., Waller, P.M., Choi, C.Y., Eaton, F.E., Barnes, E.M.,
 818 Clarke, T.R., 2010. AGIIS, AGricultural Irrigation Imaging System. *Appl. Engr. Agric.* 26, 247-253.

819 Han, S., Evans, R.G., Kroeger, M.W., 1994. Sprinkler distribution patterns in windy conditions. *Trans.*
 820 *ASAE* 37, 1481-1489.

821 Howell, T.A., Schneider, A.D., Dusek, D.A., Marek, T.H., Steiner, J.L., 1995. Calibration and scale
 822 performance of Bushland weighing lysimeters. *Trans. ASAE* 38, 1019-1024.

823 Howell, T.A., Steiner, J.L., Schneider, A.D., Evett, S.R., Tolk, J.A., 1997. Seasonal and maximum daily
824 evapotranspiration of irrigated winter wheat, sorghum, and corn: Southern High Plains. Trans.
825 ASAE 40, 623-634.

826 Howell, T.A., Evett, S.R., Schneider, A.D., Dusek, D.A., Copeland., K. S., 2000. Irrigated fescue grass ET
827 compared with calculated reference grass ET. In: Evans, R.G., Benham, B.L., Trooien, T.P. (Eds.),
828 Proc. 4th Dec. Nat. Irrig. Symp., ASAE, St. Joseph, MI, 228-242.

829 Howell, T.A., Evett, S.R., Tolk, J.A., Schneider, A.D., 2004. Evapotranspiration of full-, deficit-irrigated,
830 and dryland cotton on the northern Texas High Plains. J. Irrig. Drain. Eng. 130, 277-285.

831 Howell, T. A., 1990. Wind profile parameter estimation using MathCAD. Agron. J. 82, 1027-1030.

832 Huband, N.D.S., Monteith, J.L., 1986. Radiative surface temperature and energy balance of a wheat
833 canopy: I. Comparison of radiative and aerodynamic canopy temperature. Boundary-Layer
834 Meteorol. 36, 1-17.

835 Hunsaker, D.J., Barnes, E.M., Clarke, T.R., Fitzgerald, G.J., Pinter Jr., P.J., 2005. Cotton irrigation
836 scheduling using remotely sensed and FAO-56 basal crop coefficients. Trans. ASAE 48, 1395–
837 1407.

838 Idso, S.B., Jackson, R.D., Ehler, W.L., Mitchell, S.T., 1969. A method for determination of infrared
839 emittance of leaves. Ecology. 50, 899-902.

840 Idso, S.B., 1981. A set of equations for full spectrum and 8 to 14 μ m and 10.5 to 12.5 μ m thermal
841 radiation from cloudless skies. Water Resour. Res. 17, 295-304.

842 Jackson, R.D., Idso, S.B., Reginato, R.J., Pinter, Jr., P.J., 1981. Canopy temperature as a crop water stress
843 indicator. Water Resour. Res. 17, 1133-1138.

844 Jackson, R.D., 1982. Canopy temperature and crop water stress. In: Hillel, D. (Ed.), Advances in Irrigation,
845 Vol. 1, Academic: New York, NY, 43–85.

846 Jackson, R.D., 1984. Remote sensing of vegetation characteristics for farm management. Proc. SPIE 475,
847 81-96.

848 Jones, H.G., 2004. Irrigation scheduling: advantages and pitfalls of plant-based methods. J. Exp. Bot. 55,
849 2427-2436.

850 Kustas, W.P., Norman, J.M., 1999. Evaluation of soil and vegetation heat flux predictions using a simple
851 two-source model with radiometric temperatures for partial canopy cover. Agric. Forest
852 Meteorol. 94, 13-29.

853 Kustas, W.P., Alfieri, J.G., Anderson, M.C., Colaizzi, P.D., Prueger, J.H., Evett, S R., Neal, C.M.U., French,
854 A.N., Hipps, L.E., Chavez, J.L., Copeland, K.S., Howell, T.A., 2012. Evaluating the two-source
855 energy balance model using local thermal and surface flux observations in a strongly advective
856 irrigated agricultural area. Adv. Water Resour. 50, 120-133.

857 Kustas, W.P., Nieto, H., Morillas, L., Anderson, M.C., Alfieri, J.G., Hipps, L.E., Villagarcía, L., Domingo, F.,
858 Garcia, M., 2016. Revisiting the paper “Using radiometric surface temperature for surface
859 energy flux estimation in Mediterranean drylands from a two-source perspective.” Remote Sens.
860 Environ. (in press).

861 Legates, D.R., McCabe, Jr., G.J., 1999. Evaluating the use of “goodness-of-fit” measures in hydrologic and
862 hydroclimatic model validation. Water Resour. Res. 35, 233-241.

863 Li, F., Kustas, W.P., Prueger, J.H., Neal, C.M.U., Jackson, T.J., 2005. Utility of remote sensing-based two-
864 source energy balance model under low- and high-vegetation cover conditions. J.
865 Hydrometeorol. 6, 878-891.

866 Li, H., Payne, W.A., Michels G.J., Rush, C.M., 2008. Reducing plant abiotic and biotic stress: Drought and
867 attacks of greenbugs, corn leaf aphids and virus disease in dryland sorghum. Environ. Exper. Bot.
868 63, 305-316.

869 Liu, S.M., Xu, Z.W., Wang, W.Z., Jia, Z.Z., Zhu, M.J., Bai, J., Wang J.M., 2011. A comparison of eddy
 870 covariance and large aperture scintillometer measurements with respect to the energy balance
 871 closure problem. *Hydrol. Earth Syst. Sci.* 15, 1291-1306.

872 Maes, W.H., Steppe, K., 2012. Estimating evapotranspiration and drought stress with ground-based
 873 thermal remote sensing in agriculture: a review. *J. Exp. Bot.* 63, 4671-4712.

874 McMaster, G.S., Wilhelm, W.W., 1997. Growing degree-days: one equation, two interpretations. *Agric.*
 875 *For. Meteorol.* 87, 291-300.

876 Moore, B.C., Coleman, A.M., Wigmosta, M.S., Skaggs, R.L., Venteris, E.R., 2015. A high spatiotemporal
 877 assessment of consumptive water use and water scarcity in the conterminous United States.
 878 *Water Resour. Manage.* 29, 5185-5200.

879 Moorhead, J.E., Gowda, P.H., Marek, G.W., Porter, D.O., Marek T.H., 2016. Spatial uniformity in
 880 sensitivity coefficient of reference ET in the Texas High Plains. *Appl. Engr. Agric.* 32, 263-269.

881 Moran, M.S., Clarke, T.R., Inoue, Y., Vidal, A., 1994. Estimating crop water deficit using the relation
 882 between surface-air temperature and spectral vegetation index. *Remote Sens. Environ.* 49, 246–
 883 263.

884 Morillas, L., García, M., Nieto, H., Villagarcía, L., Sandholt, I., Gonzalez-Dugo, M.P., Zarco-Tejada, P.J.,
 885 Domingo, F., 2013. Using radiometric surface temperature for surface energy flux estimation in
 886 Mediterranean drylands from a two-source perspective. *Remote Sens. Environ.* 136, 234-246.

887 Morillas, L., Villagarcía, L., Domingo, F., Nieto, H., Uclés, O., García, M., 2014. Environmental factors
 888 affecting the accuracy of surface fluxes from a two-source model in Mediterranean drylands:
 889 Upscaling instantaneous to daytime estimates. *Agric. For. Meteorol.* 189-190, 140-158.

890 Mounce, R.B., O'Shaughnessy, S.A., Blaser, B.C., Colaizzi, P.D., Evett, S.R., 2016. Crop response of
 891 drought-tolerant and conventional maize hybrids in a semiarid environment. *Irrig. Sci.* 34, 231-
 892 244.

893 Nash, J.E., Sutcliffe., J.V., 1970. River flow forecasting through conceptual models: Part 1. A discussion of
894 principles. J. Hydrol. 10, 282-290.

895 Norman, J.M., Becker, F., 1995. Terminology in thermal infrared remote sensing of natural surfaces.
896 Remote Sens. Rev. 12, 159-173.

897 Norman, J.M., Kustas, W.P., Humes, K.S., 1995. Source approach for estimating soil and vegetation
898 energy fluxes in observations of directional radiometric surface temperature. Agric. Forest
899 Meteorol. 77, 263-293.

900 Norman, J.M., Kustas, W.P., Prueger, J.H., Diak, G.H., 2000. Surface flux estimation using radiometric
901 temperature: A dual temperature difference method to minimize measurement errors. Water
902 Resour. Res. 36, 2263-2274.

903 O'Shaughnessy, S.A., Evett, S.R., 2010a. Canopy temperature based system effectively schedules and
904 controls center pivot irrigation of cotton. Agric. Water Manage. 97, 1310-1316.

905 O'Shaughnessy, S.A., Evett, S.R., 2010b. Developing wireless sensor networks for monitoring crop
906 canopy temperature using a moving sprinkler system as a platform. Appl. Eng. Agric. 26 (2), 331-
907 341.

908 O'Shaughnessy, S.A., Evett, S.R., Colaizzi, P.D., Howell, T.A., 2011a. Using radiation thermography and
909 thermometry to evaluate crop water stress in soybean and cotton. Agric. Water Manage. 98,
910 1523-1535.

911 O'Shaughnessy, S.A., Hebel, M.A., Evett, S.R., Colaizzi, P.D., 2011b. Evaluation of a wireless infrared
912 thermometer with a narrow field of view. Comput. Electron. Agric. 76, 59-68.

913 O'Shaughnessy, S.A., Evett, S.R., Colaizzi, P.D., Howell, T.A., 2012a. A crop water stress index and time
914 threshold for automatic irrigation scheduling of grain sorghum. Agric. Water Manage. 107, 122-
915 132.

916 O'Shaughnessy, S.A., Evett, S.R., Colaizzi, P.D., Howell, T.A., 2012b. Grain sorghum response to irrigation
 917 scheduling with the time-temperature threshold method and deficit irrigation levels. Trans.
 918 ASABE 55 (2), 451-461.

919 O'Shaughnessy, S.A., Evett, S.R., Colaizzi, P.D., Howell, T.A., 2013. Wireless sensor network effectively
 920 controls center pivot irrigation of sorghum. Appl. Eng. Agric. 29 (6), 853-864.

921 O'Shaughnessy, S.A., Evett, S.R., Colaizzi, P.D., Tolk, J.A., Howell, T.A., 2014. Early and late maturing grain
 922 sorghum under variable climatic conditions in the Texas High Plains. Trans. ASABE 57 (6), 1583-
 923 1594.

924 O'Shaughnessy, S.A., Evett, S.R., Colaizzi, P.D., 2015. Dynamic prescription maps for site-specific variable
 925 rate irrigation of cotton. Agric. Water Manage. 159, 123-138.

926 Osroosh, Y., Peters, R.T., Campbell, C.S., Zhang, Q., 2015. Automatic irrigation scheduling of apple trees
 927 using theoretical crop water stress index with an innovative dynamic threshold. Comput.
 928 Electron. Agric. 188, 193-203.

929 Oyarzun, R.A., Stöckle, C.O., Whiting, M.D., 2007. A simple approach to modeling radiation interception
 930 by fruit-tree orchards. Agric. Forest Meteorol. 142, 12-24.

931 Peng, S., Krieg, D.R., Hicks, S.K., 1989. Cotton lint yield response to accumulated heat units and soil
 932 water supply. Field Crops Res. 19, 253-262.

933 Peters, R.T., Evett, S.R., 2004. Modeling diurnal canopy temperature dynamics using one-time-of-day
 934 measurements and a reference temperature curve. Agron. J. 96, 1553-1561.

935 Peters, R.T., Evett, S.R., 2008. Automation of a center pivot using the temperature-time-threshold
 936 method of irrigation scheduling. J. Irrig. Drain. 134, 286-291.

937 Phene, C.J., Howell, T.A., Sikorski, M.D., 1985. A traveling trickle irrigation system. In: Hillel, D. (Ed.),
 938 Advances in Irrigation, Vol. 3, Academic: Orlando, FL, 1-49.

939 Playán, E., Salvador, R., Faci, J.M., Zapata, N., Martínez-Cob, A., Sánchez, I., 2005. Day and night wind
940 drift and evaporation losses in sprinkler solid-sets and moving laterals. *Agric. Water Manage.* 76-
941 139-159.

942 Porter, D.O., Gowda, P.H., Marek, T.H., Howell, T.A., Moorhead, J.E., Irmak, S., 2012. Sensitivity of grass
943 and alfalfa reference evapotranspiration to weather station sensor accuracy. *Appl. Engr. Agric.*
944 28, 543-549.

945 Sadler, E.J., Camp, C.R., Evans, D.E., Millen J.A., 2002. Corn canopy temperatures measured with a
946 moving infrared thermometer array. *Trans. ASAE* 45, 581-591.

947 Sánchez, J.M., Kustas, W.P., Caselles, V., Anderson, M.C., 2008. Modelling surface energy fluxes over
948 maize using a two-source patch model and radiometric soil and canopy temperature
949 observations. *Remote Sens. Environ.* 112, 1130-1143.

950 Schneider, A.D., Howell, T.A., 2000. Surface runoff due to LEPA and spray irrigation of a slowly
951 permeable soil. *Trans. ASAE* 43, 1089-1095.

952 Senay, G.B., Budde, M.E., Verdin, J.P., Rowland, J., 2009. Estimating actual evapotranspiration from
953 irrigated fields using a simplified surface energy balance approach. In: Thenkabail, P.S., Lyon,
954 J.G., Turrall, H., Biradar, C.M. (Eds.), *Remote Sensing of Global Croplands for Food Security*. CRC
955 Press, Boca Raton, FL, 317-330.

956 Slack, D.C., Martin, E.C., Sheta, A.E.A., Fox, Jr., F., Clark, L.J., Ashley, R.O., 1996. Crop coefficients
957 normalized for climatic variability with growing degree days. In: Camp, C.R., Sadler, E.J., Yoder,
958 R.E. (Eds.), *Proc. Int. Conf. Evapotranspiration and Irrigation Scheduling*, San Antonio, TX, 3-6
959 Nov 1996. ASAE, St. Joseph, MI, 892-898.

960 Song, L., Kustas, W.P., Liu, S., Colaizzi, P.D., Nieto, H., Xu, Z., Mae, Y., Li, M., Xu, T., Agam, N., Tolk, J.A.,
961 Evett, S.R., 2016. Applications of a thermal-based two-source energy balance model using

962 Priestley-Taylor approach for surface temperature partitioning under advective conditions. J.
 963 Hydrol. 540, 574-587.

964 Steiner, J.L., Kanemasu, E.T., Clark, R.N., 1983. Spray losses and partitioning of water under a center
 965 pivot sprinkler system. Trans. ASAE 26, 1128-1134.

966 Thomasson, J.A., Shi, Y., Olsenholler, J., Valasek, J., Murray, S.C., Bishop, M.P., 2016. Comprehensive
 967 UAV agricultural remote-sensing research at Texas A M University. In: Valasek, J., Thomasson,
 968 J.A., (Eds.), Proc. SPIE 0277-786X, 9866, Autonomous Air and Ground Sensing Systems for
 969 Agricultural Optimization and Phenotyping, 986602, Baltimore, MD, 17 May 2016.

970 Timmermans, W.J., Kustas, W.P., Anderson, M.C., French, A.N., 2007. An intercomparison of the Surface
 971 Energy Balance Algorithm for Land (SEBAL) and the Two-Source Energy Balance (TSEB) modeling
 972 schemes. Remote Sens. Environ. 108, 369-384.

973 Todd, R.W., Evett, S.R., Howell, T.A., 2000. The Bowen ratio energy balance method for estimating
 974 latent heat flux of irrigated alfalfa evaluated in a semi-arid, advective environment. Agric. Forest
 975 Meteorol. 103, 335-348.

976 Tolk, J.A., Evett, S.R., 2012. Lower limits of crop water use in three soil textural classes. SSSAJ. 76, 607-
 977 616.

978 Upchurch, D.R., Wanjura, D.F., Burke, J.J., Mahan, J.R., 1996. Biologically-Identified Optimal
 979 Temperature Interactive Console (BIOTIC) for managing irrigation. U.S. Patent No. 5539637.

980 USDA-NASS, 2014. Farm and Ranch Irrigation Survey (2013), Vol. 3, Special Studies, Part 1. Washington,
 981 D.C.: USDA National Agricultural Statistics Service. Available at:
 982 [https://www.agcensus.usda.gov/Publications/2012/Online_Resources/Farm_and_Ranch_Irrigati](https://www.agcensus.usda.gov/Publications/2012/Online_Resources/Farm_and_Ranch_Irrigation_Survey/)
 983 [on_Survey/](https://www.agcensus.usda.gov/Publications/2012/Online_Resources/Farm_and_Ranch_Irrigation_Survey/). Accessed 30 Aug 2016.

984 USDA-NRCS, 2016. Soil survey TX375: Potter County, Texas. Washington, D.C.: USDA Natural Resources
 985 Conservation Service. Available at: <http://websoilsurvey.nrcs.usda.gov>. Accessed 30 Aug 2016.

986 Wanjura, D.F., Upchurch, D.R., 2001. Infrared thermometer calibration and viewing method effects on
987 canopy temperature measurement. *Agric. Forest Meteorol.* 55, 309-321.

988 Wanjura, D.F., Upchurch, D.R., Mahan, J.R., 1992. Automated irrigation based on threshold canopy
989 temperature. *Trans. ASAE* 35, 153–159.

990 Woldt, W.E., Frew, E.W., Stachura, M., Smith, J., Mack, J., 2015. Conducting unmanned aircraft flight
991 operations under Federal Aviation Administration regulations. ASABE Paper No. 152147654,
992 Annual International Meeting, New Orleans, LA, 26-29 Jul 2015. ASABE: St. Joseph, MI.

993 Zarco-Tejada, P.J., González-Dugo, V., Williams, L.E., Suárez, L., Berni, J.A.J., Goldhamer, D., Fereres, E.,
994 2013. A PRI-based water stress index combining structural and chlorophyll effects: Assessment
995 using diurnal narrow-band airborne imagery and the CWSI thermal index. *Remote Sens. Environ.*
996 138, 38-50.

997 Zwart, S.J., Bastiaanssen, W.G.M., 2007. SEBAL for detecting spatial variation of water productivity and
998 scope for improvement in eight irrigated wheat systems. *Agric. Water Manage.* 89, 287-296.

a.

b.

a.

b.

c.

d.

a.

b.

a.

b.

c.

d.

a.

b.

c.

d.

a.

b.

c.

d.

e.

f.

a.

b.