Abstract: To investigate the feasibility of a spatially explicit, radiation-based regeneration model for the boreal forest, we tested the predictions of a three-dimensional simulator of photosynthetically active radiation transmission (%PAR), MIXLIGHT, and the growth response of understory Abies balsamea (L.) Mill. (balsam fir) and Picea glauca (Moench) Voss (white spruce) to %PAR in two large (>1 ha) mixed-species forest sites, one in eastern Canada at Lac Duparquet, Quebec, and one in western Canada at Calling Lake, Alberta. Overstory tree locations and dimensions were obtained from aerial photographs or ground measurements and allometric relationships. Seasonal %PAR calculated by MIXLIGHT for the Calling Lake site was very similar to seasonal %PAR measured by quantum sensors (\( n = 5 \), %PAR range = 15%–33%, \( r = 0.93 \)). Daily measurements of %PAR were also predicted well by simulations at both sites (\( n = 34–36 \), %PAR range = 1%–45%, \( r \geq 0.76 \)). Functional relationships, designed to saturate at the maximum height growth potential of these sites, were developed to predict sapling height growth from simulated seasonal %PAR and initial height (\( R^2 \geq 0.74 \)). These results demonstrate the potential of the MIXLIGHT simulator for estimating PAR at microsites within heterogeneous forests and for modeling understory tree growth.

Résumé : De façon à évaluer s’il est possible d’utiliser un modèle spatialement explicite de régénération basé sur le rayonnement en forêt boréale, les auteurs ont testé les prédictions d’un simulateur tridimensionnel de la transmission du rayonnement photosynthétiquement actif (%RPA), MIXLIGHT, et la réponse de croissance d’Abies balsamea (L.) Mill. (sapin baumier) et de Picea glauca (Moench) Voss (épinette blanche) au %RPA dans deux grands sites (>1 ha) de forêt mélangée, situés l’un au lac Duparquet (Québec) dans l’est canadien et l’autre à Calling Lake (Alberta) dans l’ouest canadien. La localisation et la dimension des arbres du couvert ont été obtenues à l’aide de photographies aériennes, de mesures de terrain et de relations allométriques. La valeur saisonnière du %RPA estimée par MIXLIGHT pour le site de Calling Lake était très proche des valeurs saisonnières du %RPA mesurées à l’aide de quantomètres (\( n = 5 \), amplitude %RPA = 15% – 33%, \( r = 0.93 \)). Des mesures journalières du %RPA ont également été bien prédites dans les deux sites par les simulations (\( n = 34–36 \), amplitude %RPA = 1% – 45%, \( r \geq 0.76 \)). Des relations fonctionnelles, conçues pour s’ajuster au potentiel maximal de croissance en hauteur de ces sites, ont été développées pour prédire la croissance en hauteur de jeunes tiges à partir de valeurs saisonnières simulées du %RPA et de la hauteur initiale (\( R^2 \geq 0.74 \)). Ces résultats démontrent que MIXLIGHT peut simuler le RPA dans des microsites au sein de forêts hétérogènes et modéliser la croissance des arbres du sous-bois.

Introduction

The complexity of mixed-species forest dynamics, coupled with interest in partial-cut silvicultural systems for managing these forests, has stimulated the development of spatially explicit, process-driven models of forest regeneration (Pacala et al. 1993; Bartelink 2000). These models grow trees according to the local availability of resources, which depends on the spatial configuration, size, and attributes of the trees’ neighbours. Photosynthetically active radiation (PAR: 400–700 nm) is typically the resource modeled, as there is consistent evidence that this is the critical resource in many forest types (e.g., Lieffers and Stadt 1994; Pacala et al. 1994; Wright et al. 1998).

PAR availability can be modeled by representing the overlying vegetation at a number of scales, from the entire canopy (Pierce and Running 1988; Black et al. 1991) to small
subvolumes of the canopy (Comeau et al. 1998), individual tree crowns (Canham et al. 1994; Cescatti 1997; Brunner 1998; Bartelink 2000; Stadt and Lieffers 2000; Groot 2004), shoots (Perttunen et al. 1998), or even single leaves (Myneni and Impens 1985). The data requirements and computation time increase significantly with the fineness of the scale. However, the canopy scale misses the finer scale spatial variability in PAR created by patch, strip and variable-retention harvests, or found beneath natural mixtures of species with opaque crowns (e.g., *Picea, Abies*) among open-crowned species (*Populus, Pinus*) in the mixedwood region of the boreal forest (Stadt et al. 1997). The subvolume or tree crown scale is therefore better suited for modeling regeneration in these forests.

Two approaches have been used to relate PAR availability to tree growth. In agricultural crops, biomass increment per unit area is a constant proportion of the energy intercepted in the PAR region (Monteith 1972). This relationship appears to hold for forest stands as well (Grace et al. 1987). The relationship between volume, radial and height growth, and absorbed PAR (APAR) at the individual tree level is also very strong, but may be nonlinear (Brunner and Nigh 2000; MacFarlane et al. 2002). Since the determination of APAR is computationally intense, an alternate approach is to relate radial and height growth to the seasonal transmission of above-canopy PAR (%PAR) available to each tree (Pacala et al. 1994; Wright et al. 1998). There is ample evidence that radial and height growth are correlated with %PAR (Lieffers and Stadt 1994; Pacala et al. 1994; Wright et al. 1998; Duchesneau et al. 2001; Claveau et al. 2002). However, the size of the crown should also be an important predictor, since this provides the radiation-absorbing surface. Because of its computational simplicity, we adopted the growth versus %PAR approach.

In earlier work, we described the calibration and stand-scale validation of PAR transmission models for overstory (Stadt and Lieffers 2000) and understory vegetation in western Canadian boreal forests (Stadt 2002). The present study tests the ability of these models, contained in the MIXLIGHT software package, to predict microsite (approx. 1 m²) variations in PAR transmission and investigates how effectively simulated %PAR can be used to predict the growth of understory trees in boreal forest stands from both western and eastern Canada.

### Materials and methods

#### Site information and mapping

The MIXLIGHT %PAR model was tested in a 1.2-ha (100 m × 120 m) stand in west-central Quebec and a 2.3-ha (102 m × 225 m) stand in north-central Alberta. Stands of these dimensions are necessary to minimize the interception of light from unmapped trees, which can be substantial because of low solar angles at these high latitudes.

The Quebec site was on the west shore of Lac Duparquet on clay soil. The stand was 130 years old, dominated by trembling aspen (*Populus tremuloides* Michx.), with paper birch (*Betula papyrifera* Marsh.), white spruce (*Picea glauca* (Moench) Voss), balsam fir (*Abies balsamea* (L.) Mill.), black spruce (*Picea mariana* (Mill.) B.S.P.), eastern white cedar (*Thuja occidentalis* L.), and jack pine (*Pinus banksiana* Lamb.) in the overstory (detailed location, climatic, and composition information is given in Table 1). The understory had dense mountain maple (*Acer spicatum* Lam.) and some hazel (*Corylus cornuta* Marsh.) of up to 95% total cover above some microsites. Understory balsam fir were abundant throughout the stand. The site was mapped in 1996 with reference to surveyed 10 m × 10 m grid stakes. Stems of all tree species ≥5 cm diameter at breast height (1.3 m; DBH) had been measured for DBH and plotted by the bear and distance from the stem to the nearest stake (C. Kelly and I. Ritchie, personal communication).

The Alberta site was in the central mixedwood natural region 20 km east of Calling Lake, Alberta, on glacial till. The north end of the plot was approximately 80 years old and dominated by trembling aspen, while the south end was 140 years old and dominated by white spruce. A heterogeneous region of mixed spruce and aspen occurred in the center of the plot. The understory vegetation was a sparse mixture of prickly rose (*Rosa acicularis* Lindl.), marsh-reed grass (*Calamagrostis canadensis* L.), and other shrubs and herbs (up to 35% total cover). Understory white spruce occurred throughout the stand.

The Calling Lake site was stem mapped from large-scale (1:1200) aerial photographs. Photos were acquired 30 March 1999 with a helicopter-mounted aerial camera system (Spencer and Hall 1988). The photos were scanned, aerotriangulated with edge and ground control, and paired into digital stereo models by Integrated Mapping Technologies (Vancouver, British Columbia). To aid in ground control and mapping, a 40 m × 40 m grid of ground control stakes with highly visible targets was surveyed prior to photography.

Crown measurement and mapping was undertaken with a 3-dimensional digital video system (International Systemap Corp., Vancouver, British Columbia). This system measures elevations as well as horizontal coordinates, using stereo parallax and the computer’s cursor as the floating dot. We measured the easting, northing, and elevation (i.e., *x*, *y*, *z*) coordinates of the top of each tree’s crown and the base of the stem. Tree height was estimated as the difference in the elevation coordinates. To estimate crown radius, we chose two points on opposite sides of the crown at its widest elevation and projected a horizontal circle around the crown, passing through these points. Each tree measurement included the species, the tree height, crown radius, and coordinates of the crown apex.

A ground survey of 68 trees (44 aspen, 24 white spruce) from a range of height and crown radius was performed to check the photo measurements. Correlation coefficients between photo and ground measurements were low for deciduous tree height (*r* = 0.59) because of a lack of contrast between the grey branches and snow-covered ground. However, for deciduous crown radius, conifer height, and crown radius, correlations were considerably better (0.84, 0.97, and 0.93, respectively). Root mean square errors for regressions of photo measurement on ground measurement for deciduous height, deciduous crown radius, conifer height, and conifer crown radius were 2.4, 0.3, 1.6, and 0.2 m, respectively. There was no significant difference between photo and ground measurements for any dimension (*p* > 0.415).
Relationships among tree and crown dimensions

The full set of crown dimensions for every tree is seldom collected in an inventory, so it is helpful to establish relationships linking tree height, crown length, crown radius, and DBH. We obtained data from several sources to do this. The Quebec data set included measurements on 534 trees from 24 mixed-species, clay soil sites within 80 km of Lac Duparquet. Every tree had measurements of DBH, height, crown length, and crown radius in four cardinal directions taken with a clinometer and measuring tape during 1999 (P. Bartemucci, personal communication). In Alberta, we used our 68 on-site ground survey trees (see previous section) to obtain similar data on DBH, height, and crown dimensions. We also obtained Alberta permanent sample plot data (Alberta Sustainable Resource Development 2002) for 4785 additional trees with crown length and DBH measurements, and temporary sample plot data (T. Vinge, Canadian Forest Products Ltd., personal communication) for 4133 additional trees with crown radius and DBH measurements. For height versus DBH functions, we used region-specific equations developed from measurements on 3510 felled trees by Huang et al. (1994). The range of these variables and sample size by species are shown in Table 2.

We examined linear and nonlinear equations in light of the physical and biological relationships that should exist between the dimensions and selected an equation for each relationship that had minimal and homogeneous residual variation. These were (eqs. 1–4)

\[ H = 1.3 + a \times [1 - \exp(-b \times DBH)]^c \]

\[ L = a + b \times DBH + c \times DBH^2 \]

\[ R = a + b \times DBH + c \times DBH^2 \]

\[ L = b \times H + c \times R \]

where \( H \) is tree height, \( L \) is crown length, \( R \) is crown radius, and \( a, b, \) and \( c \) are coefficients specific to each equation and species. We chose eq. 1 (a Chapman-Richards function) because the exponent \( c \) allowed for more flexibility and better fit than the two-parameter curves frequently used in mensuration (Huang et al. 1994; Husch et al. 2003). For the linear functions (eqs. 2–4), we sequentially removed intercept, linear, or quadratic terms that were not significant, and examined residuals for evidence of more complex relationships. Intercepts for eqs. 2–3 were restricted to prevent unreasonable values; intercepts \( a \) that were initially estimated at values
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### Table 2. Coefficients and statistics for equations used to predict crown dimensions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Species</th>
<th>$H$</th>
<th>$L$, $L = b \times H + c \times R$</th>
<th>$R$</th>
<th>$R^2$</th>
<th>RMSE</th>
<th>Mean (min–max)</th>
<th>$a$</th>
<th>$b$</th>
<th>$c$</th>
<th>$n$</th>
<th>Mean (min–max)</th>
<th>RMSE</th>
<th>$R^2$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Height ($H$)</strong>, $H = 1.3 + a \times (1 - \exp[-b \times DBH])$</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>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aspen</td>
<td>25.05</td>
<td>0.089</td>
<td>1.63</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>18.9 (5.5–30.8)</td>
<td>2.71</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>24.84</td>
<td>0.0808</td>
<td>1.241</td>
<td>1836$^2$</td>
<td>18.9 (2.2–31.9)</td>
<td>0.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balsam poplar</td>
<td>25.38</td>
<td>0.0501</td>
<td>0.927</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>17.8 (2.9–32.0)</td>
<td>2.36$^1$</td>
<td>17.8 (3.2–21.5)</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paper birch</td>
<td>18.00</td>
<td>0.162</td>
<td>2.24</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>14.4 (5.1–27.2)</td>
<td>2.92</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>27.97</td>
<td>0.0352</td>
<td>0.870</td>
<td>1176$^1$</td>
<td>11.9 (3.2–21.5)</td>
<td>0.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White spruce</td>
<td>25.19</td>
<td>0.082</td>
<td>2.19</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>18.4 (3.3–28.3)</td>
<td>2.69</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>29.88</td>
<td>0.0556</td>
<td>1.391</td>
<td>1176$^1$</td>
<td>20.3 (1.7–38.4)</td>
<td>0.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black spruce</td>
<td>19.17</td>
<td>0.128</td>
<td>2.27</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>13.9 (4.3–22.6)</td>
<td>1.84</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>12.2 (1.8–30.6)</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balsam fir</td>
<td>26.60</td>
<td>0.054</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>14.1 (5.9–23.9)</td>
<td>2.02</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>28.63</td>
<td>0.0523</td>
<td>1.447</td>
<td>161$^1$</td>
<td>15.8 (1.8–31.4)</td>
<td>0.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White cedar</td>
<td>18.52</td>
<td>0.036</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>11.7 (5.3–19.7)</td>
<td>1.64</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>27.97</td>
<td>0.0352</td>
<td>0.870</td>
<td>101$^1$</td>
<td>11.9 (3.2–21.5)</td>
<td>0.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jack pine</td>
<td>21.90</td>
<td>0.207</td>
<td>6.56</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>18.6 (4.6–27.5)</td>
<td>2.05</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **Crown length ($L$)**, $L = a + b \times DBH + c \times DBH^2$ | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Aspen       | 1.30 | 0.288 | –0.0022 | 86 | 6.8 (1.9–13.9) | 1.91 | 0.44 | 1.30 | 0.285 | –0.0028 | 359$^2$ | 6.0 (0.3–28.0) | 2.03 | 0.30 |
| Balsam poplar | 1.30 | 0.310 | –0.0021 | 667$^3$ | 7.5 (0.7–20.7) | 2.40 | 0.34 |
| Paper birch | 1.17 | 0.423 | –0.0046 | 68 | 6.5 (2.1–17.2) | 2.14 | 0.54 | 0.92 | 0.315 | 179$^3$ | 5.9 (0.8–19.2) | 1.78 | 0.34 |
| White spruce | 0.00 | 0.598 | –0.0045 | 63 | 11.8 (0–24.5) | 2.25 | 0.78 | 1.30 | 0.437 | –0.0012 | 25$^3$ | 12.7 (0.4–34.3) | 2.66 | 0.52 |
| Black spruce | 0.00 | 0.668 | –0.0080 | 59 | 8.2 (1.8–16.1) | 2.02 | 0.66 | |
| Balsam fir | 0.80 | 0.516 | –0.0014 | 71 | 8.7 (2.5–19.9) | 2.21 | 0.73 | 0.53 | 0.522 | 319$^3$ | 8.8 (0.6–25.3) | 2.46 | 0.56 |
| White cedar | 1.30 | 0.325 | –0.0023 | 88 | 7.1 (1.9–15.5) | 1.83 | 0.65 | |
| Jack pine | 1.30 | 0.254 | –0.0009 | 99 | 6.6 (2.9–15.9) | 1.64 | 0.56 | |

| **Crown radius ($R$)**, $R = a + b \times DBH + c \times DBH^2$ | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Aspen       | 0.56 | 0.056 | –0.0022 | 86 | 2.0 (0.2–4.9) | 0.51 | 0.75 | 0.03 | 0.109 | 1581$^3$ | 20.5 (9.0–33.8) | 0.49 | 0.48 |
| Balsam poplar | 0.60 | 0.062 | –0.0009 | 64$^4$ | 18.7 (9.0–28.5) | 0.46 | 0.57 |
| Paper birch | 0.67 | 0.059 | –0.0014 | 68 | 1.7 (0.6–4.7) | 0.42 | 0.68 | 0.00 | 0.083 | 14$^4$ | 18.2 (7.3–21.0) | 0.44 | 0.51 |
| White spruce | 0.59 | 0.035 | –0.0005 | 63 | 1.5 (0.5–3.4) | 0.45 | 0.46 | 0.47 | 0.047 | 234$^3$ | 18.7 (5.3–33.7) | 0.46 | 0.45 |
| Black spruce | 0.59 | 0.031 | –0.0011 | 59 | 1.1 (0.4–1.8) | 0.26 | 0.37 | |
| Balsam fir | 0.72 | 0.036 | –0.0014 | 71 | 1.3 (0.4–2.4) | 0.36 | 0.37 | 0.34 | 0.054 | 131$^3$ | 17.5 (6.4–27.5) | 0.44 | 0.46 |
| White cedar | 0.68 | 0.039 | –0.0009 | 88 | 1.5 (0.5–3.1) | 0.36 | 0.62 | |

**Notes:** Parameters shown in bold were fixed at zero or breast height (1.30 m) to prevent out-of-range (negative crown length or radius, crown length > height) values. Other parameters are significantly greater than zero at $\alpha = 0.05$. RMSE, root mean square error. DBH, diameter at breast height.

*DBH in centimetres; all other dimensions in metres.

†All Quebec crown data collected in 24 plots in the Lac Duparquet region.

‡Alberta height versus DBH coefficients and statistics from Huang et al. (1994).

§Alberta crown length and DBH data from the Alberta Land and Forest Division permanent sample plot program (Alberta Sustainable Resource Development 2002).

¶Alberta crown radius and DBH data from temporary sample plots in northern Alberta (T. Vinge, personal communication).

#Alberta crown length, height, and crown radius data collected at the Calling Lake site (see Materials and methods).
less than zero were subsequently fixed at zero. Likewise, for crown length, an intercept that exceeded 1.3 m was fixed at 1.3, since crown length at zero DBH cannot exceed breast height. Fixed intercept values are shown in bold in Table 2.

For developing the crown map at Lac Duparquet, our measured data consisted of mapped stem positions, a species identification, and tree DBH. We used eqs. 1–3 to estimate tree height, crown length, and radius. At Calling Lake, we had aerial photo-determined tree locations, species, height, and crown radius measurements, but required DBH and crown length data. We inverted eq. 1 to estimate DBH from photo-measured height and used eq. 4 to predict crown length from photo-measured height and crown radius.

PAR measurements

For PAR measurements, we constructed sensors, employing gallium arsenide phosphide photocells (G-2711-01, Hamamatsu Ltd., Bridgewater, New Jersey), following Fielder and Comeau (2000). The sensors used for daily PAR measurement were attached to inexpensive millivolt-precision dataloggers (Model H08-006-04, Onset Computer Corp., Pocasset, Massachusetts) and measured the current leakage of a 3-V power supply (two AA batteries) across the photocell in response to illumination (Stadt 2002). Sensors used for seasonal measurements were attached to microvolt-precision dataloggers (Model CR10X, Campbell Scientific, Edmonton, Alberta) and measured the current produced by the photocell because of illumination (Fielder and Comeau 2000). The sensor–datalogger combinations were checked against a commercial PAR sensor (LICOR 190SA, LICOR, Lincoln, NE) attached to a CR10X microvolt datalogger for 48 h on a rooftop before and after each growing season. Correlation between our sensors and the commercial one was satisfactory, even at very low PAR \((r \geq 0.98 \text{ for } 0–100 \mu \text{mol} \cdot \text{m}^{-2} \cdot \text{s}^{-1}, r \geq 0.95 \text{ for } 0–100 \mu \text{mol} \cdot \text{m}^{-2} \cdot \text{s}^{-1})\). Two sensors failed in the 2000 season as a result of corrosion due to a poor diffuser seal.

For the inside canopy measurements at the two sites, sensors were placed at 34–36 microsites, at least 25 m from any edge of the mapped region. At Lac Duparquet, 20 of the sensors were placed beneath the mountain maple shrub layer, while the other 16 were positioned above. Sensor positions were mapped by horizontal distance, bearing, and elevation difference from the nearest survey stake. The sensors were left to sample and record PAR every 20 s for one day with mixed sunny and cloudy weather (27 July 1999, 0900–1700 h EDT at Lac Duparquet; 24 August 2000, 0900–1800 h MDT at Calling Lake). In addition, five additional sensors at Calling Lake were sampled once per minute, and the average stored every hour by a precision datalogger (CR10X, Campbell Scientific, Edmonton, Alberta) for two months (27 June – 22 July and 28 August – 15 September 2000). These provided a seasonal estimate of the PAR at these microsites.

For the above-canopy PAR estimate \((P_i)\), another sensor was attached to a CR10X microvolt-precision datalogger and placed approximately 500 m away in a clearing with a nearly complete hemispherical sky view. A shadow-grid sensor, which measures direct \((P_d)\) and total \((P_t)\) PAR (Model BF2, Delta-T Devices Ltd., Cambridge, UK), was also attached to this “outside” datalogger at the Calling Lake site. For most of the growing season, the outside datalogger sampled its sensors every minute and averaged and stored data every hour. During days when the 34–36 inside-canopy microsites were being measured, sampling and storage frequency of PAR on the outside datalogger was increased to 20 s to match the frequency of these inside-canopy sensors. %PAR was calculated by averaging the PAR readings inside and outside the forest first, then dividing the inside average by the outside average to calculate the transmission fraction. This corresponds with the sequence that MIXLIGHT uses to calculate PAR transmission (see following section).

At many microsites at Lac Duparquet and some at Calling Lake, shrub vegetation also obscured the sensors’ sky view. For these, we made visual estimates of the total vertically projected percent vegetation cover (the percent ground area obscured by plants) to calculate the effect of this vegetation on %PAR (see following section).

PAR transmission modeling

MIXLIGHT is a spatially explicit PAR transmission simulator designed for predicting %PAR levels in mixed-species boreal forests (Stadt and Liefers 2000). MIXLIGHT represents tree stems and crowns as three-dimensional volumes (cylinders, cones, paraboloids, ellipsoids, combinations), defined by their crown dimensions (height, length, and radius) and located at their mapped crown position, then calculates PAR transmission by the weighted average gap probability along numerous rays traced across the upper hemisphere (480 rays were used in this study). A hemispherical sky radiation distribution is generated by tracking the sun’s position and using the measured or estimated fractions of direct and diffuse PAR for short intervals (e.g., hours or minutes) during the full simulation interval. Diffuse radiance is set to follow a standard overcast angular distribution (Steven and Unsworth 1980). This calculation of the sky angular distribution is modified from Canham (1988), and a similar approach is described in detail by Smolander and Stenberg (2001). Rays are traced from the sky hemisphere to the simulation location. Where a ray passes through a tree crown envelope, the transmission along the ray is calculated by the Poisson probability of encountering no leaves, given the crown’s leaf area density (LAD), an ellipsoidal leaf inclination distribution (controlled by parameter \(\chi\)) at the zenith angle \((Z)\) of the ray \((G(Z; \chi), \text{ Campbell and Norman } 1989)\), and the length of the ray through the crown \((S)\) (eq. 5).

\[
[5] \quad T(\alpha, Z) = \exp[-G(Z; \chi) S \text{ LAD}]
\]

Rays that hit boles below the live crown have their transmission set to zero. Rays passing below the edge of the plot have PAR transmission calculated on a canopy level (i.e., treating the entire stand as one large volume, similar to Black et al. 1991), using eq. 5 and a whole-plot estimate of \(G(Z; \chi), S, \text{ and LAD}\). The ray transmission values are weighted by the radiance of the part of the sky where they originated, then averaged to give the overall transmission value to this microsite.

LAD and inclination parameters were obtained from Stadt and Liefers (2000). This earlier study showed remarkably constant LAD for mature boreal trees from site to site. No adjustments were made to these parameters in the simulations reported here. We did not have data on leaf area density for some of the species occurring in low numbers in the Lac Duparquet site (black spruce, white cedar, and jack pine).
For these, we estimated leaf area density by visually comparing their crown density with similar species with known density.

PAR transmission through understory (shrub, herb) vegetation was modeled using a simple empirical equation, analogous to Beer’s Law, but using visually estimated total vegetation cover above the microsite, rather than LAI, as the input variable (eq. 6). Derivation and testing of this equation is described in Stadt (2002).

$$T = \left(1 - \frac{\text{cover}}{100}\right)^{0.52}$$

For the Lac Duparquet site, and in many anticipated uses of MIXLIGHT, only the total outside canopy PAR ($P_t$) was available. Both direct ($P_D$) and diffuse PAR ($P_D$) are necessary to develop the sky radiation distribution. We estimated the diffuse skylight fraction ($P_D/P_t$) from the clearness index ($K = \text{global irradiance} / \text{extraterrestrial irradiance}$ at the time of measurement), following Roderick (1999) and Spitters et al. (1986). Equation 7 was fit to the hourly $P_t$ and $P_D = P_t - P_D$ measurements made with the shadow grid sensor over the 2000 growing season at Calling Lake:

$$P_D/P_t = 1$$  for  $$S_g/S_0 < 1-a/b$$

$$P_D/P_t = a + b \frac{S_g}{S_0}$$  for  $$S_g/S_0 < 1-a/b$$

Global irradiance ($S_g$) was estimated by dividing the total PAR ($P_t$) reading by 2.04 µmol·m$^{-2}$·s$^{-1}$ (Meek et al. 1984), and the equations given by Spitters et al. (1986) were used to estimate extraterrestrial irradiance ($S_0$) for each hour. The linear regression fit for eq. 7 is given in Fig. 1.

The input to MIXLIGHT consisted of the list of trees with their crown dimensions and positions, species-specific estimates of leaf area density and leaf inclination (Table 3), the site slope, aspect, latitude and longitude, the radiation data (local apparent time, total PAR, and diffuse fraction) during the simulation period, the microsite positions, and the vertically projected cover of understory vegetation above the microsite. The software output was an estimate of the PAR transmission to each microsite during the simulation period, as well as the percentage of the total sky radiance used to compute %PAR in the spatially explicit mode (rays traced above the plot edge). We simulated %PAR on a daily and seasonal basis and compared simulated values with measurements.

Since the overall objective of this work was to model tree growth as a function of seasonal %PAR available to each tree, the ideal test of the %PAR simulations should also be conducted on a seasonal basis. We could only commit five PAR sensors and one datalogger for one season at one site, so we also measured %PAR at numerous microsites, with a range of overlying canopy structures, over a full day where partial sun and cloud produced a complex above-canopy angular PAR distribution. Our assumption was that if MIXLIGHT could adequately simulate %PAR under this wide range of conditions for one day, then it should also perform adequately over the growing season (Gendron et al. 1998).

### Tree growth measurements and analysis

At both sites, we selected understory saplings 0.2–7 m in height and without obvious leader damage, measured their total height ($H$) and the past three years’ height growth, and plotted their location with reference to the nearest grid stake. Initial height was determined by subtracting the increments. The range of these values is reported in Table 4. Mean annual height growth was compared with initial height and MIXLIGHT’s seasonal PAR transmission simulations for microsites located at the apices of the trees.

### Table 3. Leaf area density, leaf inclination, and crown shape parameters for tree species used in this study.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Species</th>
<th>Leaf area density ($m^2·m^{-3}$)</th>
<th>Ellipsoidal leaf inclination parameter ($\chi$)</th>
<th>Crown shape</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aspen</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>Ellipsoid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balsam poplar</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Ellipsoid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paper birch</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Ellipsoid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White spruce</td>
<td>1.88</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>Rocket</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black spruce</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>Rocket</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balsam fir</td>
<td>1.98</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Paraboloid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White cedar</td>
<td>1.80</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Paraboloid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jack pine</td>
<td>1.39</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Ellipsoid</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Data from Stadt and Lieffers (2000), except for black spruce, white cedar, and jack pine, for which data were estimated by comparison with similar species (see Materials and methods).
Tree height, %PAR, and their interaction were identified as critical factors for balsam fir growth; however, no functional relationship was fit by these authors. Their study included 89 balsam fir saplings, 0.3–3.3 m tall, from three sites in the clay belt region surrounding Lac Duparquet. Sapling height and height increments over a 4-year period (1995–1998) were measured. PAR transmission was measured at the tree apex on overcast days using quantum sensors (LI190SA, LI-COR, Lincoln, Nebraska) (Gendron et al. 1998).

Michaelis-Menten and negative exponential functions were fitted to the sapling growth response to %PAR and initial height (Pacala et al. 1994). These functions saturate at a maximum value, as is the trend for growth increments over a wide range of initial heights and light levels (Lieffers and Stadt 1994; Pacala et al. 1994; Wright et al. 1998). Negative exponential functions provided the best fits and most easily interpretable parameters for both the initial height response and the seasonal PAR response. These were combined in eq. 8 to predict annual height growth (\(\Delta H\)).

\[
\Delta H = \Delta H_{\text{max}} \left[ 1 - \exp \left( - \frac{H}{s_h} \right) \right] \left[ 1 - \exp \left( - \frac{\%\text{PAR} - a}{s_p} \right) \right]
\]

where \(\Delta H_{\text{max}}\) is the maximum height increment over an average growing season for tall saplings in full light; \(H\) is sapling height at the start of the year; \(a\) is a growth threshold for %PAR, since there may be no growth at low %PAR values; and \(s_h\) and \(s_p\) are scaling parameters for the height and seasonal PAR response, respectively (i.e., \(H\) and %PAR at 63% of \(\Delta H_{\text{max}}\)).

Statistical analysis

Statistical analysis was performed using the correlation, linear, and nonlinear regression model procedures in SAS (Version 8e) (SAS Institute Inc. 2001). For nonlinear regression, the Gauss–Newton method was used. Significance was defined at the 5% level.

Results

PAR predictions

Average seasonal %PAR transmission simulated by MIXLIGHT at the Calling Lake site was well correlated with measured values at the five microsites that were monitored for 2 months in 2000 (\(r = 0.93, p = 0.024\)), and a plot of predicted versus measured values approximated the 1:1 line (Fig. 2). Average daily simulated %PAR was also well correlated with measured daily values (Fig. 3; \(r = 0.81, n = 36, p < 0.001\) for Lac Duparquet; \(r = 0.76, n = 34, p < 0.001\) for Calling Lake). The relationship between simulated and measured values was very close to 1:1 for the Lac Duparquet site (Fig. 3a). At Calling Lake, however, MIXLIGHT tended to overestimate %PAR at the brighter microsites (Fig. 3b), which were located in a long, narrow gap.

Tree height growth

For the two balsam fir data sets from western Quebec (collected for this study and by Claveau et al. 2002), annual height growth (\(\Delta H\)) increased with simulated seasonal %PAR, reaching its maximum at about 40% PAR (Fig. 4a). Height growth also increased with initial sapling height (\(H\)). Although the amount of increase in height increment declined with increasing height (curve was concave downward), no maximum was evident in these data (data not shown). Likewise, at Calling Lake, white spruce annual height growth increased with simulated seasonal PAR transmission values (Fig. 4b) and with tree height (\(r = 0.55, n = 40, p < 0.001\)). A concave downward trend was also evident, both with increasing %PAR and with initial height, but no maximum increment was evident.

Since taller trees may receive more light because of their higher canopy position, we examined correlation between initial height and %PAR. In the Calling Lake and Claveau et al. (2002) data sets, correlation between initial height and %PAR was not significant (\(r = 0.23, p = 0.154\) and \(r = 0.03, p = 0.760\), respectively). Initial height and %PAR were correlated in our Lac Duparquet data (\(r = 0.89, p < 0.001\)), but not when this was combined with the data from Claveau et al. (2002) to fit eq. 8 (\(r = 0.09, p = 0.329\)).

A saturating trend was suggested by scatter plots of growth versus initial height and %PAR (Fig. 4). However, unconstrained fits of eq. 8 yielded unreasonably large values of the maximum potential height increment (\(\Delta H_{\text{max}}\)). None of the data sets contained points at sufficient height and high light to allow an accurate estimate this parameter. To constrain these values for predicting reasonable growth rates for tall trees in high light above the range of our data, we set \(\Delta H_{\text{max}}\) to the maximum slope of the site index curve (SI, breast height age 50) for the same ecosite. Site index is determined from the 100 largest diameter trees/ha (Huang 1997), which are usually the tallest trees and those receiving the most light. For white spruce on BM ecosites in the central mixed-

---

Table 4. Characteristics (min–max) of understory saplings used to develop the predictive model for height growth.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Species</th>
<th>Lac Duparquet, Quebec</th>
<th>Lac Duparquet Region*</th>
<th>Calling Lake, Alberta</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No. trees sampled</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initial height (m)</td>
<td>0.4–1.3</td>
<td>0.3–4.0</td>
<td>0.1–6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean annual height increment (cm/year)</td>
<td>1.8–28.8</td>
<td>0.2–35.0</td>
<td>1.5–38.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%PAR</td>
<td>3–27(^{†})</td>
<td>1–78(^{‡})</td>
<td>1–52(^{‡})</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{†}\)PAR transmission on an overcast day.

\(^{‡}\)Simulated seasonal %PAR using MIXLIGHT.

*Claveau et al. 2002.
wood region of Alberta, SI = 17.8 m, which gives $\Delta H_{\text{max}} = 37.4$ cm (Beckingham and Archibald 1996; Huang 1997). For balsam fir, $\Delta H_{\text{max}} = 38$ cm for SI = 17 m on MS23 ecosites (Grondin et al. 2000). This method of choosing $\Delta H_{\text{max}}$ is sensitive to the site index, $\Delta H_{\text{max}}$ varying ±2 cm for SI ±1 m.

With $\Delta H_{\text{max}}$ fixed at these site index derived values, eq. 8 predicted annual height growth of balsam fir and white spruce effectively (Figs. 4 and 5). Fir survives at very low %PAR values, so the %PAR threshold ($a$, eq. 8) was not significant and was therefore removed from the model. For spruce, no saplings were found at very low %PAR, consequently $a$ was significantly greater than zero. Some underestimation was evident at high growth rates (Fig. 5). This may be the result of increased allocation of resources to height growth for trees growing in the understory compared with the open-grown site index trees from which $\Delta H_{\text{max}}$ was derived (Duchesneau et al. 2001).

**Discussion**

%PAR modeling

MIXLIGHT was able to model the spatial variation in PAR transmission at the microlite level across two highly heterogeneous mixed-species boreal stands, one in eastern Canada and one in the west. Close correspondence between simulated and measured seasonal PAR was demonstrated in microsites monitored for most of the growing season, and similar values were obtained for full-day %PAR at both sites. This correspondence was valid for microsites with PAR transmission values from 1% to 45%. These results illustrate that the models used in MIXLIGHT for above-canopy radiation, overstory, and understory light penetration were effective for PAR prediction at daily and seasonal intervals.

The accuracy and precision of the MIXLIGHT simulator is similar to that reported for other spatially explicit radiation simulators that have been tested in forests (Canham et al. 1994, 1999; Cescatti 1997; Brunner 1998; Comeau et al. 1998; Groot 2004). However, we compared the daily or seasonal predictions of MIXLIGHT against direct PAR measurements rather than estimates of PAR derived from hemispherical photo analysis. Hemispherical photo predictions are generally well correlated with PAR, but are subject to considerable operator subjectivity (Wagner 1998) and are not effective for low-light microsites (Gendron et al. 1998; Machado and Reich 1999).

Like Norman and Welles (1983), Cescatti (1997), and Brunner (1998), MIXLIGHT uses the leaf area contained within an individual tree crown envelope for determining PAR transmission. The flexible leaf area envelope approach contrasts with SORTIE (Canham et al. 1994, 1999), where the crowns are represented as rectangular screens with a fixed transmission factor independent of the light angle (cf. eq. 5). There may be few differences among these models for predicting forest floor light levels, but the choice of crown shape becomes important for modeling the light profile with height. The leaf area approach also allows compatibility with coarser-scale models (e.g., Black et al. 1991) designed for simulating energy and mass transfer.

A number of problems make the development, application, and testing of a spatial PAR transmission model difficult. Crown representation is a major challenge. Geometric shapes chosen for the crown envelope seldom capture the full range of actual crown profiles. Highly flexible superellipsoids are quite effective (Cescatti 1997; Groot 2004), but obtaining measurements to fit unique shapes to each tree is currently time consuming. We anticipate the development of very fine resolution remote sensing techniques (Brandtberg et al. 2003; Omasa et al. 2003), which may allow recognition and precise characterization of individual tree crowns. Use of flexible crowns in a dynamic growth model also requires rules for controlling crown shape as the trees grow. The fixed geometric crown shapes used here (ellipsoids, paraboloids, cones, cylinders) with circular cross-sections had dimensions (length, width) that could be easily obtained or predicted from aerial-photo or ground-determined DBH or height, yet were adequate to model the daily and seasonal PAR attenuation by the trees.

Relatively strong relationships exist between stem diameter and tree height, but the relationships among crown dimensions (length, width) are more variable (Table 2). These dimensions are also controlled by PAR availability (Duchesneau et al. 2001; Claveau et al. 2002) and light quality (Gilbert et al. 2001), hydraulic constraints (Protz et al. 2000), abrasion from neighbour crowns (Rudnicki et al. 2003), winter temperatures (Lieffers et al. 2001), snow loading (King 1997), and likely site quality and moisture availability. Some work has recommended the use of both height and DBH to estimate crown dimensions (Pretzsch et al. 2002; Rudnicki et al. 2003). However, with the relatively small, complete data sets available (only 68 trees had all tree and crown dimensions measured in Alberta and 534 in Quebec), we were not able to improve on our simple functions of DBH or height alone (data not shown). Some improvement may be obtained by altering the crown length function for gap edges, since gap-
edge trees typically maintain longer crowns than interior trees. Our failure to compensate for gap-edge crown dimensions was likely the cause of overestimated daily light regimes within a large gap at Calling Lake.

Another issue is the occurrence of leaning trees. Conifers are strongly gravitropic, but northern deciduous species demonstrate a propensity to lean into any adjacent gap. Mapped stem positions may be less meaningful than mapped crown
positions. For this reason, the aerial photo techniques used to map the Calling Lake site are preferable to the ground-based stem map used at Lac Duparquet.

The assumption of random leaf area within each crown envelope has been disputed. Canham et al. (1994) suggested the shade-tolerant species may approach a random distribution since foliage can persist deep within the crown, but that shade-intolerant species bear foliage primarily at the crown perimeter. If this is true, intolerant species may be better modeled as a screen of foliage rather than a volume (Canham et al. 1994; Groot 2004). However, the distribution of wood area should also be considered, as branch area is larger in the centre of a crown than at the periphery (Stadt and Lieffers 2000).

Lastly, an important practical problem in testing a %PAR model is that the “outside” canopy sensors must frequently be located some distance away from the “inside” sensors. Clouds frequently shade one but not the other set, creating uncontrolled variability in the transmission measurements.

Integration of PAR measurements over time tends to address most of these problems. The longer the integration interval, the more likely cloud shadows will affect inside and outside sensors equally. The sun traverses more of the sky and is more likely to be occluded by clouds, resulting in a radiation distribution that is less skewed toward one direction. Consequently, the shading effect of more neighbouring trees around each microsite is considered, which tends to even out variability in crown size and position. For these reasons, simulations will generally become more precise as the integration interval increases (cf. Figs. 2, 3b).

A potential source of bias in this %PAR model is the effect of site quality on stand and tree leaf area. With only two sites measured in this study, it was not possible to examine the effects of moisture or nutrient regime on tree or stand leaf area density (LAD). Stadt and Lieffers (2000) estimated the average LAD for each species using optical techniques, but this study did not sample across the full range of ecosites. It is interesting to note that MIXLIGHT worked well in both of this study’s sites, using the same species-specific LAD values, despite the eastern site receiving twice the precipitation as the west. Better sites may be able to support more leaf area index by maintaining larger crowns or a higher tree density. Nevertheless, the particular mechanisms of site effects on canopy light transmission have yet to be elucidated.

**Growth modeling**

PAR was a limited resource for the predominant understory species in these mixed-species boreal forests (balsam fir at Lac Duparquet and white spruce at Calling Lake), as shown by the positive response of height growth with PAR transmission. Height growth also increased with initial sapling height, but correlation between height and %PAR in the combined data sets was not significant. Since crown size increases with tree height in young trees, this suggests that crown absorption of PAR (APAR) controls height growth for balsam fir and white spruce.

Using a simulation model to calculate APAR in pure stands (Brunner 1998), MacFarlane et al. (2002) found little response in height growth to APAR for shade-intolerant loblolly pine, while Brunner and Nigh (2000) found a moderate response of mid-tolerant Douglas-fir. Wright et al. (1998) and Claveau et al. (2002) also found stronger responses of height increment to %PAR available for tolerant compared with intoler-
ant species. In a review of strategies of shade-tolerant and shade-intolerant species, Messier et al. (1999) illustrate that since intolerant species are adapted to early colonization after larger-scale disturbances, height growth usually improves their PAR capture. These species therefore inflexibly allocate carbon to height growth even under shaded conditions. By contrast, shade-tolerant species are adapted to the understory, where additional height will not improve their access to light until they reach the upper canopy. These species allocate carbon to larger leaves, wider crowns, and roots to maximize their capture of limited resources. It is not surprising then that an effect of %PAR on height growth is more evident in shade-tolerant species.

For white spruce, the height growth versus simulated %PAR relationship reported here is similar at lower %PAR levels to the height growth versus the clear-day, stand-average PAR transmission relationship reported in an earlier study (Lieffers and Stadt 1994), and the height growth versus hemispherical photo-estimated %PAR relationship developed by Wright et al. (1998) in British Columbia (Fig. 5b). However, both of those studies found lower maximum growth at high light levels. This may be a consequence of the different methods used to estimate %PAR, or because initial height was not accounted for in these studies. It is also possible that differences in site index between the sites used in these studies account for the differences in growth.

Conclusions

The effectiveness of a three-dimensional PAR simulator, MIXLIGHT, was demonstrated for daily and seasonal PAR transmission in 75 microsites at two mapped forest stands in the eastern and western Canadian boreal forest. Simulated transmission was also found to be effective for predicting the height growth of understory trees in these stands. The results suggest a PAR-driven process model of regeneration would work well in these forests and provide the flexibility to simulate early tree growth under mixed-species and partial-cut management systems.
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