

## Corrigendum to

# “A distributed stream temperature model using high resolution temperature observations” published in Hydrol. Earth Syst. Sci., 11, 1469–1480, 2007

M. C. Westhoff<sup>1</sup>, H. H. G. Savenije<sup>1</sup>, W. M. J. Luxemburg<sup>1</sup>, G. S. Stelling<sup>2</sup>, N. C. van de Giesen<sup>1</sup>, J. S. Selker<sup>3</sup>, L. Pfister<sup>4</sup>, and S. Uhlenbrook<sup>5</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Water Resources Section, Faculty of Civil Engineering and Geosciences, Delft University of Technology, P.O. Box 5048, 2600 GA Delft, The Netherlands

<sup>2</sup>Fluid Mechanics Section, Faculty of Civil Engineering and Geosciences, Delft University of Technology, P.O. Box 5048, 2600 GA Delft, The Netherlands

<sup>3</sup>Department of Biological and Ecological Engineering, Oregon State University, 116 Gilmore Hall, Corvallis, OR 97331, USA

<sup>4</sup>Department Environment and Agro-biotechnologies, Centre de Recherche Public – Gabriel Lippmann, 41, rue du Brill, 4422 Belvaux, Luxembourg

<sup>5</sup>Department of Water Engineering, UNESCO-IHE, Westvest 7, 2611 AX Delft, The Netherlands

In our publication Westhoff et al. (2007), a typographic error was propagated, which was first seen in Boyd and Kasper (2003), and showed up in our Eq. (14). The correct equation is:

$$\Phi_{\text{atmospheric}} = 0.96 \varepsilon_{\text{atm}} \theta_{\text{VTS}} \sigma_{\text{sb}} (T_{\text{air}} + 273.2)^4. \quad (1)$$

With this notation, the total incoming longwave radiation is computed to be the weighted average of atmospheric longwave radiation and land cover radiation (Eq. 19 of Westhoff et al., 2007), where  $\theta_{\text{VTS}}$  determines their weights. The only difference between the Eqs. (14) and (19) is the emissivity,  $\varepsilon$ , which has a value of 0.96 for land cover longwave radiation and has a value  $<0.96$  for  $\varepsilon_{\text{atm}}$ .

Though once calibrated this change does not affect the quality of fit to observations, the correction restores physical interpretation of the parameters. Specifically, in the original formulation, there was a double counting of incoming longwave radiation, which resulted in a large (calibrated) value for  $\theta_{\text{VTS}}$  (of the order of 0.9) to achieve land cover longwave radiation within the correct range. With the correct formula,  $\theta_{\text{VTS}}$  will have the desired physical meaning, and therefore would be amenable to independent measurement

in the field. It bears noting that regardless of the correction, greater vegetation is still predicted to give rise to more incoming longwave radiation, since  $\varepsilon_{\text{atm}}$  is always smaller than 0.96.

References:

Boyd, M. and Kasper, B.: Analytical methods for dynamic open channel heat and mass transfer: methodology for the Heat Source Model Version 7.0, Watershed Sciences Inc., Portland, OR, USA, found at: <http://www.heatsource.info/HeatSourcev7.0.pdf>, 2003.

Westhoff, M. C., Savenije, H. H. G., Luxemburg, W. M. J., Stelling, G. S., van de Giesen, N. C., Selker, J. S., Pfister, L., and Uhlenbrook, S.: A distributed stream temperature model using high resolution temperature observations, Hydrol. Earth Syst. Sci., 11, 1469–1480, doi:10.5194/hess-11-1469-2007, 2007.



Correspondence to: M. C. Westhoff  
(m.c.westhoff@tudelft.nl)