

Ecohydrology of street trees: design and irrigation requirements for sustainable water use

Original

Ecohydrology of street trees: design and irrigation requirements for sustainable water use / Vico, G.; Revelli, Roberto; Porporato, Amilcare. - In: ECOHYDROLOGY. - ISSN 1936-0584. - STAMPA. - 7:2(2014), pp. 508-523.
[10.1002/eco.1369]

Availability:

This version is available at: 11583/2505973 since:

Publisher:

Wiley

Published

DOI:10.1002/eco.1369

Terms of use:

This article is made available under terms and conditions as specified in the corresponding bibliographic description in the repository

Publisher copyright

(Article begins on next page)



Ecohydrology

Ecohydrology of street trees: design and irrigation requirements for sustainable water use

Journal:	<i>Ecohydrology</i>
Manuscript ID:	ECO-12-0047.R2
Wiley - Manuscript type:	Research Article
Date Submitted by the Author:	n/a
Complete List of Authors:	Vico, Giulia; Duke University, Department of Civil and Environmental Engineering Revelli, Roberto; Politecnico di Torino, Department of Environment, Land, and Infrastructure Engineering Porporato, Amilcare; Duke University, Department of Civil and Environmental Engineering; Duke University, Nicholas School of the Environment
Keywords:	urban vegetation, street trees, soil moisture, stochastic rainfall, plant water stress, irrigation

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1 **Ecohydrology of street trees: design and irrigation**
2 **requirements for sustainable water use**

3 Giulia Vico
4 *Department of Civil and Environmental Engineering,*
5 *Pratt School of Engineering,*
6 *Duke University,*
7 *Durham, NC 27708,*
8 *USA; Department of Crop Production Ecology,*
9 *Swedish University of Agricultural Sciences,*
10 *Uppsala, 750 07,*
11 *Sweden**

12 Roberto Revelli
13 *Department of Environment,*
14 *Land and Infrastructure Engineering,*
15 *Politecnico of Torino,*
16 *Corso Duca degli Abruzzi 24,*
17 *10129 Torino,*
18 *Italy*

19 Amilcare Porporato
20 *Department of Civil and Environmental Engineering,*
21 *Pratt School of Engineering,*
22 *Duke University,*
23 *Durham, NC 27708,*
24 *USA; Nicholas School of the Environment,*
25 *Duke University,*
26 *Durham, NC 27708,*
27 *USA*

28 (Dated: December 5, 2012)

Abstract

While the beneficial effects of urban vegetation have long been recognized, growing conditions in urban environments, especially for street trees, are typically harsh and limited by low water availability. Supplemental irrigation may be used to preserve aesthetic quality and ability to provide ecosystem services of urban vegetation but requires careful management of available economic and water resources to reduce urban water footprint. To this purpose, decision-makers need quantitative tools, requiring few, physically-based parameters and accounting for the uncertainties and future scenarios of the hydroclimatic forcing. Focusing on in-row and isolated trees, a minimalist description of street tree water balance is proposed here, including rainfed and irrigated conditions, and explicitly accounting for tree water requirements, growing conditions (in terms of soil properties and extension of bare soil, permeable and impervious pavements surrounding the tree), and rainfall unpredictability. The proposed model allows the quantification of tree cooling capacity, water stress occurrence, and irrigation requirements, as a function of soil, plant, and climate characteristics, thus providing indications regarding the tree ability to provide ecosystem services and management costs. In particular, an analysis of different planting designs suggests that a balanced design consisting in bare soil and permeable pavement with size equal to the lateral canopy extension is optimal for water conservation, tree cooling capacity, and health. The proposed model provides useful indications towards the definition of site-specific guidelines for species selection and planting design, for sustainable urban vegetation.

KEY WORDS: urban vegetation; street trees; soil moisture; stochastic rainfall; plant water stress; irrigation

* giulia.vico@duke.edu

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

30

31

32

33

34

35

36

37

38

39

40

41

42

43

44

45

46

47

48

49

50

51

52

53

54

55

56

57

58

59

60

I. INTRODUCTION

While at the beginning of the 20th century only 14% of the world population lived in urban settings, this percentage is now 50% (Konijnendijk, 2000), and it is predicted that over 5 billion people will reside in metropolitan areas by the year 2030 (United Nations, 2005; Young, 2010). Increasing urban population causes the conversion of large parts of natural landscape to urban environments, with significant repercussions on local climate, regional hydrological cycle, as well as habitat and biodiversity presence (Kalnay and Cai, 2003; Rees and Wackernagel, 2008). Within the urban environment, vegetation plays important social, cultural, economic, and environmental roles, ranging from positive effects on human health and improved social dynamics, increased housing prices and business district activity (Jorgensen and Gobster, 2010; Kuo and Sullivan, 2001; Maas *et al.*, 2006; Payton *et al.*, 2008; Wolf, 2005), to beneficial environmental impacts such as reduced runoff, improved soil drainage, soil erosion control, watershed protection, and provision of wildlife habitats and ecological corridors (Fernandez-Juricic, 2000; Xiao and McPherson, 2002). Moreover, when managed properly, urban vegetation provides local ecosystem services such as urban heat island mitigation, cooling and reduction of energy demand in adjacent buildings (Imhoff *et al.*, 2010; Shashua-Bar *et al.*, 2009), and alleviation of air pollution and dust (Beckett *et al.*, 1998; McPherson *et al.*, 2011; Nowak *et al.*, 2006).

Despite the local variations in composition, pattern, and spatial extent of the urban landscape (Quattrochi and Ridd, 1998; Thorsson *et al.*, 2011), urban vegetation is generally subject to biophysical and ecological conditions that are radically different from the surrounding rural and natural environments, in particular regarding soil features and local climate (Coder, 1996; Dwyer *et al.*, 1992, 2002; Gill *et al.*, 2007; Home *et al.*, 2010; Konijnendijk, 2000; Lohr *et al.*, 2004; Swanwick *et al.*, 2003). Growth conditions are even more severe for isolated trees located in parking lots and in-row along streets, and soils are often characterized by high compaction levels and surface crusting, limiting water infiltration, drainage capacity, and oxygenation (Craul, 1999; Pauleit, 2003). Contamination by anthropogenic materials (e.g., calcium from nearby construction weathering and de-icing compounds) may further negatively impact soil quality (Pauleit, 2003). Finally, urban vegetation is subjected to the effects of dust and pollution (Takagi and Gyokusen, 2004) and may need to withstand stringent pruning requirements for aesthetic reasons, as well as vandalism

60 and root injuries due to nearby construction (Foster and Blaine, 1978; Hauer *et al.*, 1994).

61 Maintaining a viable urban vegetation requires significant resources (economic resources
62 for purchasing, planting, and maintenance of plants; supply of fertilizers and water for
63 irrigation). Thus decision makers are faced by the complex problem of evaluating the trade-
64 offs between the benefits of urban vegetation and the related costs, towards sustainable urban
65 tree design and management strategies (Clark *et al.*, 1997; Dwyer *et al.*, 2003; Ferrini and
66 Fini, 2011). In particular, species selection and planting design are key steps to facilitate
67 subsequent management and to enhance tree life span. Historically, species selection has
68 been mainly driven by aesthetic criteria (e.g., tree architectural features), often resulting in
69 the choice of non-native species, likely ill-adapted to the local climatic conditions (Balling
70 *et al.*, 2008) and potentially invasive (Niinemets and Penuelas, 2008). As a result, tree life
71 span in urban areas tends to be significantly reduced with respect to nearby rural areas
72 (Berrang *et al.*, 1985; Foster and Blaine, 1978; Nowak *et al.*, 1990). A more sustainable
73 species selection needs to represent a compromise between aesthetic appeal and functional
74 aspects and tolerance to the harsh conditions typical of urban sites (Pauleit, 2003; Richards,
75 1983; Sæbø *et al.*, 2003).

76 Among the limitations imposed by the urban environment, water deficit is generally
77 recognized as the principal limiting factor controlling the growth of urban trees (Clark and
78 Kjelgren, 1990; Cregg, 1995), particularly when combined with high air temperature and
79 low air humidity and insufficient nutrient availability (Flückiger and Braun, 1999). The
80 combination of poor soil infiltration, scarcity of the permeable surfaces (often concentrated
81 in the immediate vicinities of the tree trunk; Fig. 1a), and enhanced atmospheric water
82 demand results in frequent and intense episodes of plant water stress, which are not limited to
83 arid and semi-arid climates (Whitlow *et al.*, 1992). Plant water stress may negatively impact
84 vegetation growth and aesthetic quality, but also limit the beneficial cooling associated to
85 plant transpiration because of extended stomatal closure (Bowler *et al.*, 2010; Chen *et al.*,
86 2011; Jenerette *et al.*, 2011; Kjelgren and Clark, 1993; Porporato *et al.*, 2001). Furthermore,
87 water shortage interferes with plant defense mechanisms, increasing the predisposition to
88 parasite and pathogenic fungi attacks and tree mortality in general (Cregg and Dix, 2001;
89 Flückiger and Braun, 1999), with catastrophic losses in case of low species diversity, that
90 is typical of some but not all urban environments (Raupp *et al.*, 2006; Sjöman *et al.*, 2012;
91 Walker *et al.*, 2009). Hence, under specific climatic conditions, tree water requirements

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

92 and planting design, supplemental irrigation may be a necessity to sustain transpiration and
93 hence the beneficial effects of urban vegetation. Currently, water needs for public and private
94 landscape represent 40-70% of total municipal requirements (Hilaire *et al.*, 2008). Such high
95 water requirements are partly explained by past inadequate species selection and by poor
96 planting design, but also by water applications often exceeding plant demands (Balling
97 *et al.*, 2008; Salvador *et al.*, 2011). In light of recently reported water shortages (Jenerette
98 and Larsen, 2006), enhanced governmental restrictions on agricultural and municipal water
99 use (Brennan *et al.*, 2007; MacDonald *et al.*, 2010), and the projected climate change and
100 increase in urban population, quantitative tools are needed to address the 'urban water
101 challenge' (Pataki *et al.*, 2011a). Specifically, decision-makers increasingly require tools for
102 optimal species selection and planting design (Sæbø *et al.*, 2003; Sjöman and Nielsen, 2010),
103 to effectively manage available resources and limit city water footprints, particularly in
104 semi-arid regions.

105 The specificities of the urban environment make it difficult to exploit existing ecohydro-
106 logical knowledge relative to natural and managed rural ecosystems. Furthermore, while
107 some data have been published on irrigation requirements of container-grown ornamen-
108 tal plants under nursery conditions (Drunasky and Struve, 2005; Hagishima *et al.*, 2007),
109 data relative to water requirements of mature urban trees are still scarce (Pataki *et al.*,
110 2011b; Roberts and Schnipke, 1994). More importantly, as typical of other ecohydrological
111 problems, the question of sustainable water management is complicated by the inherent
112 intermittency and unpredictability of rainfall occurrence (Rodriguez-Iturbe and Porporato,
113 2004) and by the projected shifts in rainfall patterns in the next decades, which render the
114 available historical climatological data insufficient for an effective long-term planning of wa-
115 ter use. The few existing models describing soil water availability to urban trees are based
116 on yearly-averaged rainfall input (e.g., Lindsey and Bassuk (1991)) or driven by relatively
117 short meteorological observations (e.g., DeGaetano and Hudson (2000)), thus poorly char-
118 acterizing extreme events, such as long dry spells. In what follows, focusing on the case of
119 street trees, we propose an alternative approach explicitly including rainfall unpredictability
120 by means of a probabilistic description of rainfall occurrence, thus avoiding computationally
121 heavy simulations that needs to be forced by multi-decadal rainfall time series to include
122 extreme events. The proposed approach can be also applied for climate change scenario
123 analyses, for which only qualitative indications on projected changes are available at best.

Our minimalist model, based on the probabilistic description of soil moisture and irrigation (Porporato *et al.*, 2004; Rodriguez-Iturbe and Porporato, 2004; Vico and Porporato, 2010, 2011a), provides a quantitative tool to assess plant water status, effective cooling capacity, and irrigation requirements, as a function of species selection and tree size (in terms of plant water requirements), planting design (in terms of extension of permeable and impervious surfaces around the tree trunk), rainfall patterns, and implemented irrigation strategy. This model provides quantitative indications in support of strategic decision making for adequate species selection, planting design, and management practices to maintain urban vegetation ecosystem services while limiting water requirements, under current and future precipitation patterns.

II. MODEL DESCRIPTION

A. Planting geometry of isolated and in-row street trees

Within the variety of growing conditions of urban vegetation, we focus here on isolated or in-row trees growing in parking lots or along streets. In general, around these trees, it is possible to distinguish (up to) three areas with different permeability properties (Fig. 1a), which in turn impact the soil water balance of the tree rooting volume: i) an area of bare soil, A_B , often located immediately around the tree or shrub trunk; the infiltration capacity of the bare soil is determined by soil permeability, $\eta_B \leq 1$ (depending on soil properties, such as crusting, hydrophobicity, level of soil compaction, and mulching), and by soil saturation; ii) a partially permeable area, A_P , which allows the infiltration of a fraction $\eta_P < 1$ of the incoming rainfall; this area may be covered by tree grates or permeable pavement (e.g., interlocking concrete permeable pavement); and iii) an area of impervious pavement, A_I , which completely prevents water infiltration in the soil beneath, but that may generate a runoff towards the more permeable areas if adequately sloped and designed (i.e., in absence of curbs preventing water flow); the fraction of rainfall on the impervious surface that may potentially infiltrate in the more permeable areas is defined by the coefficient $\eta_I < 1$. Pervious concrete (similar to standard concrete but lacking the fine aggregates) is here assimilated to impervious pavements, on the basis of recent experimental results suggesting insignificant differences between pervious and impervious paving (Morgenroth

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

and Buchan, 2009; Viswanathan *et al.*, 2011). Fig. 1a shows a few examples of planting design: all the three above mentioned regions are apparent in III. In other locations, the bare soil may be reduced to a minimum (I), or the permeable pavement area may be altogether absent (VI), or a curb may prevent the free flowing of water from the impervious pavement to the permeable areas (IV). The extreme case of absence of permeable and impervious pavements, e.g., a tree located in a wide lawn (V) is equivalent to the case of an isolated tree in a natural environment. The lateral extensions of both canopy and root zone constitute further geometric constraints. To account for them, we define A_R as the area over which the root system extends horizontally and A_C the projected area of the canopy. The latter is relevant for the tree water balance because the vegetation canopy, in particular when leaf area index is high, may partially intercept rainfall, thus reducing the amount of water that can potentially infiltrate in the permeable areas or create a beneficial runoff from the nearby impervious surfaces. It is also useful to define the total area that contributes to the soil water balance pertaining a single tree, i.e., $A_T = A_B + A_P + A_I$.

As apparent in Fig. 1a), the specific geometry of the areas surrounding the tree is highly variable, in compliance with aesthetic and practical reasons. Spacing between adjacent trees often represents a compromise among providing adequate soil volumes and water availability (DeGaetano and Hudson, 2000), achieving the required ecosystem services (aesthetic quality, air cooling, and pollution reduction), and preserving the ability to exploit the area underneath for foot or vehicular traffic (e.g., McPherson (2001)). In the following quantitative analyses, we will focus on the case of circular symmetry, which works best for isolated trees. The radii r_i fully define the areas affecting the tree soil water balance, $A_i = \pi r_i^2$, where the subscript i may refer to bare soil ($i = B$), permeable ($i = P$) or impervious ($i = I$) pavements, canopy extension ($i = C$) or rooting zone ($i = R$). The geometry of the problem for this specific case is represented in Fig. 1b. The obtained results can be easily extended to other geometries, such as the squares employed in several locations (Fig. 1a).

B. Soil moisture balance over tree rooting volume

A previously proposed stochastic model of the soil water balance suitable for natural and agricultural environments (see e.g., Laio *et al.* (2001); Rodriguez-Iturbe *et al.* (1999); Vico and Porporato (2011a)) is here adapted to the case of isolated or in-row trees. The temporal

dynamics of the soil water content in the plant rooting zone can be effectively described by the following water balance

$$nA_RZ_R\frac{ds(t)}{dt} = R(t) + I(s(t)) - ET(s(t)) - LQ(s(t)). \quad (1)$$

The state variable $s(t)$ represents the relative soil moisture averaged over the soil volume A_RZ_R , where most of the plant roots are located and over which soil features are assumed uniform, with Z_R being the characteristic rooting depth, A_R the area over which the root system extends (see Fig. 1b), and n the soil porosity. The main input to the soil water balance, $R(t)$, is represented by rainfall, either directly falling over the permeable area or falling over nearby areas and being brought over by runoff. Water may also be supplied by irrigation applications, $I(s(t))$. The main losses occur through soil water evaporation and plant transpiration, $ET(s(t))$, runoff and deep percolation, $LQ(s(t))$. It is assumed that there is no interaction between the root volume and any existing water table. All the fluxes in Eq. (1) are interpreted at the daily time scale.

The actual volumetric input by rainfall to the rooting zone depends on the interaction among surface permeabilities (and runoff generating capacity), canopy, and root lateral extension. Regarding the impact of canopy, experimental evidence suggests that canopy interception may reduce both the frequency of effective (i.e., non-canopy intercepted) rainfall events and their effective depths (Daly *et al.*, 2008; Guswa, 2005). To quantify the volume of potentially infiltrating rainfall it is thus necessary to consider the geometry of the problem, by accounting for the fraction of area subjected to canopy interception effect, the extension and permeability of bare soil and permeable pavement, and the distance of the contributing permeable and impervious areas from the edge of the rooting zone, r_{nR} . Depending on root lateral extension, three cases need to be considered: i) the rooting zone extends under the entire permeable surface till the permeable/impervious surface interface (i.e., $r_R = r_B + r_P$), ii) the rooting zone does not extend under the entire bare soil and permeable area (i.e., $r_R < r_B + r_P$), and iii) the rooting zone extends also under the impervious surface (i.e., $r_R > r_B + r_P$ depicted in Fig. 1b). The occurrence of the latter case, i.e., the rooting zone extending also beyond the permeable/impervious surface interface, depends on soil type and compaction level, construction details, water availability and its location, and features of the nearby areas. The site-specificity of these features partly explains the contrasting conclusions from studies on root extension under impervious pavement, with stunted root

growth in certain locations and relatively well developed, but concentrated, roots in others (e.g., Reichwein (2003); Čermák *et al.* (2000)). Due to its complexity, the third case is not considered here, i.e., it is assumed that roots do not generally extend under impervious areas. For the purposes of defining the occurrence of water stress and irrigation requirements, assuming that roots do not extend under the impervious pavement results in conservative estimates of water stress frequency and severity, because the assumed smaller rooting zone has lower buffering capacity against water dynamics and does not allow the exploitation of other water stores that might be available with more extensive rooting systems.

In the first case (i.e., $r_R = r_B + r_P$), all the infiltrated water from the permeable area A_P and a fraction η_I of surface runoff generated by the nearby impervious surface A_I contribute to the rooting zone soil water content. For a generic rainfall event of depth $h(t)$, the water volume contributing to the soil water balance (1) can be quantified as

$$R(t) = (A_T^{(\eta)} - A_T^{(\eta^k)}) h(t) + A_T^{(\eta^k)} h'(t) \quad (2)$$

where $A_T^{(\eta)} = \sum_{i=B,P,I} \eta_i A_i$ and $A_T^{(\eta^k)} = \sum_{i=B,P,I} \eta_i k_{i,C} A_i$; $h(t)$ is the rainfall event depth, and $h'(t)$ is the effective rainfall depth below the canopy (i.e., after canopy interception; see II.C below). The coefficients $k_{i,C}$ (with $i = B, P, I$) are the fractions of the bare soil, permeable, and impervious areas respectively influenced by the presence of the canopy, while η_i are the respective surface permeability, driving the fraction of rainfall volume infiltrating in non-saturated soils. In this case, lateral water redistribution between the root volume and the nearby soil is neglected, even though it may contribute to root volume water depletion, unless artificial boundaries are present.

In the second case, where the lateral extension of roots is less than the bare soil and permeable pavement combined areas (i.e., $r_R < r_B + r_P$, as in the case depicted in Fig. 1b), the infiltration from the excess permeable surface and the runoff generated by the surrounding impervious pavement does not directly contribute to soil water content of the rooting zone, but rather it enhances water content outside the rooting volume. In absence of artificial boundaries, soil water beyond the rooting volume may be laterally redistributed according to existing soil water potential gradients. While a precise description of the soil water lateral redistribution lies beyond the scope of the proposed model, it is simply assumed here that only a fraction of the water volume infiltrating over a ring of width dr at a generic distance r from the edge of the rooting zone will finally contribute to the tree available

water. The contributed fraction is assumed to decrease exponentially with the distance from the rooting zone edge. Thus, the contribution of the infinitesimal ring of permeable surface is $dR_{P,nR}(t) = 2\pi\eta_P h(t)r_{nR}e^{-r}dr$, where the rainfall depth $h(t)$ is substituted by $h'(t)$ should the infinitesimal area $2\pi r_{nR}dr_{nR}$ be subject to canopy interception. With the further assumption to simplify the notation that the areas beyond the rooting zones are not subject to canopy interception (as discussed below, canopy seldom extends beyond the rooting zone), the total contribution of the permeable area beyond the rooting extension is $R_{P,nR}(t) = \int_{r_R}^{r_B+r_P} dR_{P,nR} = 2\pi\eta_P h(t) [1 + r_R - (1 + r_B + r_P)e^{-r_{nR}}]$, where $r_{nR} = r_B + r_P - r_R$ is the lateral extension of the area with permeable pavement beyond the rooting zone (Fig. 1b). Similarly, the water volume contributed by the nearby impervious surface to plant accessible soil moisture is here considered exponentially decreasing with increasing distance between the edge of the rooting area and the position of the permeable/impervious surface interface, i.e. $R_I(t) = e^{-r_{nR}}\eta_I h(t)A_I$ (where $k_{I,C}$ has been set to zero under the assumption that $r_C \leq r_R$; see below). Accordingly, the water volume contributed to the soil water balance for $r_R < r_B + r_P$ from a generic event of depth $h(t)$ is

$$R(t) = h'(t) \sum_{i=B,P} \eta_i k_{i,C} A_i + h(t) \left\{ 2\pi\eta_P [1 + r_R - (1 + r_B + r_P)e^{-r_{nR}}] + \eta_I A_I e^{-r_{nR}} \right\}. \quad (3)$$

Regarding the losses, the individual plant is responsible for a daily volumetric water uptake, which in general depends on species, amount of transpiring leaves (and hence tree size), plant activity (driven by temperature, solar radiation, and plant water status, in turn function of soil moisture), plant general conditions (e.g., impact of pollutants, diseases, and pest infestations), and atmospheric water demand (as defined by air temperature and humidity, and wind speed). As such, water uptake accounts for the specificities of the urban growing environment, including potentially higher temperatures and vapor pressure deficits (Kjellgren and Clark, 1993; Litvak *et al.*, 2012; McCarthy and Pataki, 2010; Wang *et al.*, 2011). Losses through soil water evaporation are driven by soil moisture in the superficial layers of the bare soil area and, to a lesser extent, under the permeable pavement. Because of the geometry typical of street trees, often implying relatively large trees growing on a rather small areas of bare or mulched soil, soil water evaporation is generally much less relevant than plant transpiration. Thus, in what follows, we focus on losses by plant transpiration. While most of the results presented below are valid for a generic transpiration function

$ET(s(t))$, for the quantitative results below a piecewise linear dependence of transpiration water volume on soil moisture is assumed (Rodriguez-Iturbe *et al.*, 1999), i.e.,

$$\rho_w ET(s(t)) = \begin{cases} T_{max} \frac{s(t)}{s^*} & s(t) < s^* \\ T_{max} & s(t) \geq s^* \end{cases}, \quad (4)$$

where T_{max} represents the mass of transpired water per tree per day when the plant is under well watered conditions (depending on species and amount of transpiring leaves), ρ_w is the density of water, and s^* is the soil moisture level corresponding to incipient plant water stress (i.e., below which plant transpiration is reduced because of stomatal closure). In what follows, we will often refer to the volumetric water losses per unit rooting volume, i.e., $\rho(s(t)) = (nZ_RA_R)^{-1} ET(s(t))$.

The other loss term included in the soil water balance (1), $LQ(s(t))$, combines losses through surface runoff and deep percolation from the bottom of the rooting volume. For simplicity, following Milly (2001) and Porporato *et al.* (2004), it is assumed that deep percolation and runoff take place instantaneously (at the daily time scale) whenever soil moisture reaches a threshold s_1 , typically slightly above soil field capacity. For soils within closed-bottom containers or other confined spaces, the threshold s_1 may approach soil saturation, to mimic the poor drainage typical of these growing conditions.

Finally, depending on tree water requirements, rainfall input, and landscaping strategy, an irrigation system may be implemented. This additional water input is included in the modeling scheme as detailed in Vico and Porporato (2010, 2011a). In particular, as opposed to fixed-schedule water applications, we consider the case of demand-based irrigation, where irrigation applications are triggered by soil moisture reaching a pre-set 'intervention point' \tilde{s} (Vico and Porporato, 2011a). If a certain water stress is considered tolerable, the intervention point can be set below the incipient stomatal closure s^* , thus performing a deficit irrigation (English and Raja, 1996). Currently deficit irrigation of urban vegetation is often applied as the result of municipal level water efficiency ordinances and limited technical or economic resources, rather than in response to environmental concerns (Parés-Franzi *et al.*, 2006). Several deficit irrigation applications are under active consideration (Delcambre and Rossignol, 1999; Shoosharian *et al.*, 2011; Suleiman *et al.*, 2011) and increasingly limited water availability will likely force the adoption of new guidelines for species selection and management, favoring species for which a limited water stress does not significantly impact

the tree aesthetic quality. Furthermore, depending on the employed irrigation technique, we distinguish between i) a more traditional irrigation, in which each irrigation application will provide instantaneously (at the daily time scale) a given amount of water, that restores soil moisture to a pre-set 'target' level, \hat{s} ; each irrigation application provides a volume $nZ_RA_R(\tilde{s} - \hat{s})$; and ii) the more sophisticated micro-irrigation, which is idealized here as a continuous supply of water that balances losses through evapotranspiration (i.e., providing a volume $ET(\tilde{s})$ per day), initiated when the soil moisture reaches the intervention point, thus maintaining soil moisture at the intervention point till the next (effective) rainfall event (Vico and Porporato, 2010). In an urban setting, the first strategy may correspond to rather labor-intensive activities, such as periodic water applications through plant water bags (Fig. 1a, V) or direct manual watering with hoses or trucked water. Conversely, micro-irrigation requires the installation of a permanent irrigation system (e.g., sub-irrigation and drip irrigation systems), allowing more frequent or even continuous water applications. As such, micro-irrigation is currently limited to specific locations where economic resources and infrastructures are available, and there is the need to maintain certain vegetation, e.g., for touristic reasons.

C. Inclusion of rainfall stochasticity

Rainfall unpredictability can be explicitly included in the above soil water balance by idealizing rainfall occurrence as a series of instantaneous events occurring according to a marked Poisson process, with average frequency λ . Rainfall event depths are assumed to be exponentially distributed, with average depth α (Rodriguez-Iturbe *et al.*, 1999; Rodriguez-Iturbe and Porporato, 2004). Within this framework, the effective rainfall depth under the canopy can be well described as a censored Poisson process, occurring according to frequency $\lambda' = \lambda e^{-\Delta/\alpha}$, where Δ is a vegetation-dependent depth-threshold (Rodriguez-Iturbe *et al.*, 1999). Rainfall events smaller than Δ are completely intercepted by the canopy. We further assume that the mean effective rainfall depth is reduced to $\alpha' = \kappa_C \alpha$ (Daly *et al.*, 2008). The presence of the canopy (and the existence of an interception threshold Δ) generates two, partially dependent, Poisson processes: i) the uncensored rainfall process providing water to areas unaffected by the canopy, which occurs with mean frequency λ , and ii) the censored Poisson process driving precipitation under the canopy, which occurs with mean frequency

λ' . Considering in a rigorous way both processes would undermine the analytical tractability of the whole problem. As an approximation, effective rainfall is assumed to reach the ground with average frequency λ_{eff} , representing the area-weighted average of λ and λ' , i.e.,

$$\lambda_{\text{eff}} = \left(1 - \frac{A_T^{(k)}}{A_T}\right) \lambda + \frac{A_T^{(k)}}{A_T} \lambda' \quad (5)$$

where $A_T^{(k)} = \sum_{i=B,P,I} k_{i,C} A_i$. This approximation works particularly well when the vegetation-dependent threshold Δ is small with respect to the average event depth α (so that λ' does not significantly differ from λ), a relatively common case even in presence of large canopies (Daly *et al.*, 2008; Guswa, 2005).

The effective rainfall contributing to the soil water balance occurs according to a modified, censored Poisson process, with frequency λ_{eff} , and providing water volumes extracted by an exponential distribution with average volume α_V , obtained by setting $h = \alpha$ and $h' = \kappa_C \alpha$ in Eqs. (2) and (3) for $r_R = r_B + r_P$ and $r_R < r_B + r_P$ respectively. The effective depth contributing to the soil water content in the rooting zone is given by

$$\alpha_{\text{eff}} = \alpha_V / A_R. \quad (6)$$

D. Soil moisture probability density function (pdf) and irrigation requirements

With the above simplifications and assuming stochastic steady state, it is possible to obtain analytically the soil moisture probability density function (pdf), $p(s)$, both in absence of irrigation and with a generic demand-based irrigation scheme, by exploiting the crossing properties of the soil moisture process. In fact, after the soil moisture process has reached the stochastic steady state (i.e., $\partial p(s)/\partial t = 0$), the frequency of upcrossing of a generic soil moisture threshold must equal the frequency of downcrossing of the same threshold. For a generic normalized loss function $\rho(s) = (nZ_R A_R)^{-1} ET(s)$ and including irrigation, the soil moisture pdf reads (Vico and Porporato, 2011a) is

$$p(s) = C \frac{e^{\int_{\tilde{s}}^s \left(\gamma - \frac{\lambda_{\text{eff}}}{\rho(u)}\right) du}}{\rho(s)} \left\{ 1 + \int_{\tilde{s}}^s [\gamma \theta(\hat{s} - u) - \delta(\hat{s} - u)] e^{\int_{\tilde{s}}^u \left(\gamma - \frac{\lambda_{\text{eff}}}{\rho(y)}\right) dy} du \right\}, \quad (7)$$

where $\gamma = nZ_R / \alpha_{\text{eff}}$, $\theta(\cdot)$ is the Heaviside function, and $\delta(\cdot)$ the Dirac delta function. The normalization constant C can be obtained by imposing $\int_{\tilde{s}}^{s_1} p(s) ds = 1$. For $\tilde{s} \rightarrow 0$ and $\hat{s} \rightarrow 0$,

the above pdf simplifies to the case of absence of irrigation. For $\hat{s} \rightarrow \tilde{s}$, the case of micro-irrigation is retrieved, even though a more straightforward derivation of the soil moisture pdf for micro-irrigation is also available (as detailed in Vico and Porporato (2010)). Eq. (7) can be easily particularized for the piecewise linear loss function in (4), which is used for the quantitative analyses below.

The crossing properties of the soil moisture process can also be exploited to obtain the average irrigation requirements in terms of irrigation frequency and required water volumes. Following Vico and Porporato (2010, 2011a), the average frequency of the irrigation treatment is the frequency of downcrossing of the threshold $\xi = \tilde{s}$, i.e., $\nu^\downarrow(\tilde{s}) = \rho(\tilde{s})p(\tilde{s})$, while the volume of irrigation water applied over a period of duration T_{seas} is given by the amount of water provided at each application times the number of applications over the period, i.e.,

$$V_t = nZ_RA_R(\hat{s} - \tilde{s})\nu^\downarrow(\tilde{s})T_{seas} = nZ_RA_R(\hat{s} - \tilde{s})\rho(\tilde{s})p(\tilde{s})T_{seas}. \quad (8)$$

E. Plant average transpiration and water stress

The above described stochastic framework allows also the quantification of plant average transpiration and the occurrence and severity of plant water stress, as a function of species, tree size, planting design, root zone features, and precipitation patterns, under unpredictable rainfall. Plant transpiration and water stress are key quantities to describe plant ability to provide ecosystem services: on the one hand, average transpiration over the season is a measure of the effective capacity of the tree to provide its potential cooling effect; on the other, water stress provides some indications regarding tree growth and aesthetic value as well as its health and susceptibility to pest attacks, even though the response to water stress is highly species-specific.

Average mass daily transpiration over the season can be obtained from the soil moisture pdf (7) as

$$\langle T \rangle = \int_{\tilde{s}}^{s_1} \rho_w ET(s)p(s)ds, \quad (9)$$

where $\rho_w ET(s)$ is defined in (4). The ratio $\langle T \rangle / T_{max}$ quantifies how the specific growing conditions (climate, planting geometry, irrigation) reduce the ability of the street tree to

provide cooling, with reference to the maximum potential cooling effect (proportional to T_{max}).

Regarding water stress, to account for frequency, duration, and intensity of plant water stress within a single indicator, we employ the 'dynamic water stress' or mean dynamic stress over the growing season $\bar{\theta}$ (Porporato *et al.* (2001)):

$$\bar{\theta} = \begin{cases} \left(\frac{\bar{\zeta}' \bar{T}^\downarrow(s^*)}{k T_{seas}} \right) (\nu^\downarrow(s^*) T_{seas})^{-\frac{1}{2}} & \text{if } \bar{\zeta}' \bar{T}^\downarrow(s^*) < k T_{seas} \\ 1 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \quad (10)$$

In the above definition, $\bar{\zeta}'$ is the average static water stress, $\bar{T}^\downarrow(s^*)$ is the average time spent by the soil moisture process below the threshold s^* , $\nu^\downarrow(s^*) T_{seas}$ is the average number of downcrossings of the threshold s^* over the period T_{seas} , and k is an index of plant resistance to water stress. The interested reader is referred to Porporato *et al.* (2001) for a discussion on the rationale behind these stress measures. The frequency of downcrossing of level s^* , $\nu^\downarrow(s^*)$, is linked to the soil moisture pdf as $\nu^\downarrow(s^*) = \rho(s^*) p(s^*)$, while the average time spent by the process below the same threshold, $\bar{T}^\downarrow(s^*)$, can be obtained as $\bar{T}^\downarrow(s^*) = \nu^\downarrow(s^*)^{-1} P(s^*)$, where $P(\cdot)$ is the cumulative density function. In turn, the average static stress, $\bar{\zeta}'$, is defined as mean level of plant water stress, provided that the plant is under stress, i.e.,

$$\bar{\zeta}' = P(s^*)^{-1} \bar{\zeta} = P(s^*)^{-1} \int_0^1 \zeta p_Z(\zeta) d\zeta, \quad (11)$$

where ζ depends on soil moisture as $\zeta(t) = \max\{s^{*-q} (s^* - s(t))^q, 0\}$, and $p_Z(\zeta)$ is the probability density function of the static stress, obtained from $p(s)$ through the derived distribution technique (see Porporato *et al.* (2001) for details). The parameter q is a measure of the nonlinearity of the effects of soil moisture on plant status, with higher q for plants more sensitive to a small change in water availability. While in principle this definition of water stress can be employed both in absence and in presence of irrigation, we limit the analyses of tree water stress to the case of absence of irrigation. In fact, the choice of the irrigation strategy should be based on considerations relative to acceptable plant water stress levels, thus making the quantification of water stress in irrigated settings less relevant.

F. Model parameterization

1. Tree size and water requirements

To fully characterize street tree water balance, information on tree level transpiration rates, canopy and root extensions are needed. Because little information is currently available for mature urban trees (Pataki *et al.*, 2011b), parameterization of the above model may require resorting to additional assumptions or to the combination of different sources of information, as discussed next.

Regarding tree water requirements, leaf level transpiration rates for specific species/location combinations can be obtained e.g. by means of gas exchange measurements, to quantify stomatal conductance. Upscaling such leaf area transpiration rate to the canopy level requires knowledge of the total tree transpiring leaf area (a function of tree size). For most of currently available data on transpiration rates in urban settings, the only information available on tree dimension is trunk diameter at breast height (DBH), with canopy extensions being reported only in some cases. To circumvent such lack of information, existing allometric relationship may be used to estimate canopy height and radius from DBH (see, e.g., McHale *et al.* (2009)); alternatively, realistic assumptions are to be made on canopy radius of the species under scrutiny. A selection of existing data on transpiration rate and canopy extension relative to the most common species in North American cities, growing in parks or along streets, is reported in Table I.

Regarding root dimensions, to our knowledge no dataset on plant transpiration includes information about root extension, depth, and role played by the specific geometry of the planting site. Thus the choice of related model parameters needs to rely on other indirect information and assumptions. In absence of external constraints, root and canopy radial extensions tend to be similar (Craul, 1985; Schenk and Jackson, 2002). Furthermore, as discussed in II.B, roots extending under impervious surfaces tend to contribute little to tree available soil water. Hence, analyses are limited to the case of roots not extending beyond the permeable/impervious interface, a conservative assumption for the quantification of water stress and irrigation requirements. As a result, in the following analyses, we assume that roots fully exploit the soil area below the permeable surfaces, but do not effectively extend beyond canopy area, nor below the impervious surface (i.e., $r_R = \min\{r_B + r_P, r_C\}$; Fig.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1b). It can be expected that the average rooting depth, Z_R , is generally smaller in an urban setting than under natural conditions, because of either the negative effect of soil compaction and low soil aeration or existing physical constraints (compacted or otherwise inhospitable layers, closed-bottom containers). A direct consequence of these limitations to rooting depth is that deeper planting soils may not fully compensate for narrow planting designs (Craul, 1985).

To explore the effect of species selection and tree size, a sensitivity analysis is conducted on the tree transpiration rate under well watered conditions (see III below). As hinted at above, for set climatic conditions (solar irradiance, air humidity and temperature), transpiration rate per tree is a function of tree species (via maximum stomatal conductance) and tree canopy size (via total leaf area). Literature data suggest that the variability of stomatal conductance is rather small across species belonging to the same functional group and adapted to similar climatic conditions (see, e.g., Körner *et al.* (1979) for a synthesis). Hence, in the sensitivity analysis on tree water requirements below, it is assumed that larger trees have a higher transpiration rates, thus providing indications both regarding species selection (via the typical size of mature trees) and the effect of tree growth over time. In absence of more detailed information, in what follows, we assume that total daily transpiration scales with tree canopy volume, which in turn (for an idealized spherical canopy), scales as r_C^3 . Hence, higher total transpiration corresponds to higher r_C ; in turn, r_C potentially affects root lateral extension (being $r_R = \min\{r_C, r_B + r_P\}$). Conversely, because of potential urban-specific constraints on root ability to extend downward (Grabosky *et al.*, 2001), it is assumed that tree dimension does not significantly influence average rooting depth (i.e., in all the analyses, Z_R is kept constant also when varying T_{max}).

2. *Planting design*

In the following simulations, it is assumed that the plant trunk is located within an area of bare soil of radius $r_B = 1$ m. The radius of the area influencing the tree water balance (through either direct infiltration or runoff) is $r_T = r_B + r_P + r_I$, a value that depends mainly on planting design and existence of curbs (Fig. 1). For non-isolated trees and in absence of pavement features impeding water free flow, r_T represents the semi-distance between adjacent trees, which in turn is set by desired tree density or level of canopy cover and

shade. We explore the impact of permeable pavement ring size r_P (and consequently the size of the impervious ring, $r_I = r_T - (r_B + r_P)$), both assuming set tree density (i.e., for set r_T) and altering the fraction of permeable vs. impervious surfaces around the isolated tree thus allowing the distance between adjacent tree to vary as well. In the first case, a distance between adjacent trees of 15 m (corresponding to $r_T = 7.5$ m) is used as an example. This value is in good agreement with typical municipal guidelines on street tree planting and well balances the needs to achieve an adequate canopy cover and to exploit the areas underneath for other uses. Furthermore, it is assumed that the bare soil area A_B does not present extensive crusting, so that $\eta_B = 1$. We consider a permeable pavement that allows the infiltration of a fraction of rainfall $\eta_P = 0.45$, while the impervious pavement contributes to the tree soil water balance with runoff representing a fraction $\eta_I = 0.1$ of the precipitated water.

3. Rainfall forcing

With the idealization of rainfall occurrence as a marked Poisson process, rainfall pattern is fully characterized by the average event depth α and the average event frequency λ . We focus to the summer period (May-September at intermediate latitudes in the Northern hemisphere), when trees are fully active, temperatures and atmospheric water demands tend to be high, and hence the risk of water stress is highest. Accordingly, rainfall parameters α and λ are averages for the same period rather than for the entire year. For a specific location, these parameters can be inferred from daily rainfall records. In section III, we explore the effect of the predicted intensification of extreme rainfall events and increased frequency of dry spells by climate change (see e.g. Easterling *et al.* (2000)), by decreasing λ while increasing α so that the total seasonal rainfall $R_{tot} = T_{seas}\alpha\lambda$ is maintained constant. Additional locations may be investigated by altering R_{tot} .

4. Rainfall interception

Because rainfall interception by urban canopies has not been experimentally characterized, we set rainfall interception threshold Δ at 3 mm, consistently with observations under natural canopies (Daly *et al.*, 2008; Guswa, 2005; Helvey and Patric, 1965). Qualitative con-

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

siderations suggest that this is a reasonable assumption for relatively dense urban canopies, while the question is more complex for individual trees. In fact, under optimal conditions, isolated trees may achieve higher leaf area index than forest trees, thanks to the light availability from the sides, but harsh urban growing environments may limit leaf and branch production thus resulting in lower-than-natural interception rates. In alternative to natural canopy data, species-specific interception thresholds can be inferred from empirical relationships linking leaf area index to canopy interception storage capacity (see e.g., Aston (1979); Thompson *et al.* (1981)).

5. Irrigation parameters

If irrigation is implemented, we assume that a deficit irrigation is performed for water conservation purposes. While the effects of water limitations are highly species-specific and deficit irrigation should account for these specific responses, Kopinga (1985) suggests that urban tree transpiration should be at least 75% of its well-watered value to maintain an acceptable vegetation health and aesthetic quality. Following this indication, in presence of irrigation, a deficit irrigation with intervention point $\tilde{s} = 0.75s^*$ is assumed (i.e., the minimum acceptable soil moisture level is set at $0.75s^*$). For traditional irrigation it is assumed that water applications are such that soil moisture level is restored to 80% of soil water holding capacity, i.e., the soil moisture target level is set to $\hat{s} = 0.8s_1$. While shallower irrigation applications may be more efficient for water conservation purposes, the assumed almost soil saturating irrigation application limits the frequency of required applications (Vico and Porporato, 2011b), with clear economic advantages when the water application is labor-intensive. Conversely, if a more sophisticated micro-irrigation system is in place, shallow and almost continuous water applications are possible. In this case, the irrigation event is idealized as a continuous application of water, fully balancing evapotranspiration losses at \tilde{s} till the next (effective) rainfall event.

III. IMPACT OF PLANTING GEOMETRY, SPECIES SELECTION, AND CLIMATE ON TREE WATER STATUS AND IRRIGATION REQUIREMENTS

To provide useful indications for adequate and sustainable species selection and planting design under different climatic scenarios, in this section we explore the effect of tree transpiration rate under well watered-conditions, extension of the permeable pavement ring, planting density, and rainfall pattern on effective rainfall input (Fig. 2), soil moisture (Fig. 3), tree effective cooling capacity and dynamic water stress in absence of irrigation (Fig. 4), as well as on irrigation requirements (in terms of water volumes and application frequencies; Figs. 5 and 6). The Wolfram Mathematica codes used to produce the results presented in this paper are available from the authors upon request.

A. Effect of permeable pavement extension on soil moisture probability density function

In the proposed idealization of the problem (Fig. 1b), the dimension of the permeable pavement plays a complex role on soil moisture dynamics, through its impact on the amount of rainfall contributing to tree available soil water, as well as the lateral extension of the root for large trees (with potentially wider rooting zones for higher r_P) and hence overall soil water storage volume (Fig. 2). Consequently, for a set tree density (i.e., a given r_T ; black lines in Fig. 2), average infiltrable water volume \bar{R} and average soil moisture increase with the area of permeable pavement, till the point beyond which the enhanced infiltrated water cannot be fully exploited because it infiltrates beyond the rooting zone (Fig. 2b, black line). A similar pattern is observed when the distance between adjacent trees is allowed to increase linearly with r_P (i.e., r_I is kept constant, while r_T increases; Fig. 2a, grey dashed line), even though the decline in contributing water is less sharp when $r_P > r_C - r_B$ (Fig. 2b, grey line).

For the case of set tree density, some examples of numerically generated soil moisture time series with no irrigation for three radii of permeable pavement and in presence of two irrigation strategies (and intermediate permeable pavement radius) are reported in Fig. 3a,c, along with the corresponding soil moisture pdf under stochastic steady state conditions (Eq. 7; Fig. 3b,d). As a consequence of the dependence of \bar{R} on r_P (Fig. 2b), there is an

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

intermediate dimension of the permeable pavement ring that maximizes soil water content. This is apparent in both the soil moisture dynamics and the corresponding pdfs, where the highest average soil moisture levels are obtained for r_P such that $r_B + r_P = r_C$ (which corresponds to $r_P = 2$ m in Fig. 3), while extremely low or high r_P result in very similar pdfs of soil moisture (Fig. 3b, dotted and solid lines). Assuming such intermediate r_P , Fig. 3 (bottom) illustrates the effect of irrigation applications (solid lines refer to micro-irrigation, dashed ones to traditional irrigation). Obviously, for both irrigation methods, the soil moisture process tends to spend more time at higher values than for rainfed conditions. Nevertheless, the almost soil saturating target level \hat{s} , imposed to traditional irrigation for practical reasons, causes wide fluctuations in soil moisture, mainly between the intervention point \tilde{s} and the target level \hat{s} , with excursions above the latter threshold caused by either very deep rainfall events (see the jump in soil moisture at around $t = 20$ d in the example reported in Fig. 3c) or precipitations immediately following an irrigation application (after $t = 120$ d in Fig. 3c). Conversely, the more sophisticated micro-irrigation results in the soil moisture process spending a finite amount of time at the intervention point \tilde{s} , while waiting for the next effective rainfall event. This fact is mirrored by the mixed pdf of soil moisture, consisting in a continuous part (solid line) and an atom of probability in \tilde{s} (solid bar), representing the non-zero probability that the soil moisture process is at \tilde{s} (Vico and Porporato, 2010).

B. Tree water stress with no irrigation

Tree water requirements, rainfall pattern, and fraction of permeable vs. impervious pavement around the tree nonlinearly affect tree cooling capacity, $\langle T \rangle / T_{max}$, and dynamic water stress, $\bar{\theta}$. For each T_{max} , there is an intermediated permeable area that maximize $\langle T \rangle / T_{max}$ and minimizes the value of $\bar{\theta}$, corresponding to $r_P = r_C - r_B$ (dashed line in Fig. 4a,d), which progressively increases with T_{max} (with which the canopy lateral extension grows with power 1/3; see II.F.4). Assuming a set tree density, for larger and more water-demanding trees (i.e., higher T_{max} ; Fig. 4a,d), dynamic water stress increases nonlinearly with decreasing permeable areas, in particular at low r_P .

The effect of shifts in the rainfall pattern is explored in Fig. 4b,f, where total rainfall over the growing season is held constant while increasing α and simultaneously decreasing

λ . Low r_P results in low cooling capacities and high water stress levels regardless of rainfall pattern, because it limits effective root lateral extension and hence tree available water storage capacity. For medium-to-high r_P , both very low and very high rainfall frequencies are detrimental for cooling capacity and plant water status: infrequent but deep rainfall events enhance losses through runoff and deep percolation, thus reducing the amount of water available for plant transpiration; conversely, frequent but shallow rainfall events are mostly intercepted by the canopy, thus limiting soil water recharge. Permeable pavement extension $r_P = r_C - r_B$ and intermediate λ are ideal for tree ability to provide ecosystem services. The effect of rainfall pattern becomes less and less marked for permeable pavement extending beyond the canopy in particular regarding cooling capacity, because, in this case, soil water recharge from outer areas quickly tapers off with increasing distance.

The assumption of set distance between adjacent trees is relaxed in Fig. 4c,f, where the combined effects of permeable and impervious pavement dimensions are explored for set species and climatic conditions. As expected, higher tree density (i.e., lower distances from the origin in Fig. 4c,f) has negative effects on tree cooling capacity and water status, because of the limited area that can be exploited for water collection and soil moisture recharge. More interesting is the quantification of the differential effect of an increase in either r_P or r_I . Similar reductions in cooling capacity and dynamic water stress can be achieved with a smaller increase in permeable pavement extension than in impervious pavement area, particularly at intermediate tree densities. Under these conditions, larger permeable areas allow a wider extension of roots as well as a more efficient collection of precipitated water, which could not be achieved with an equivalent amount of impervious surface, imposing limits to the amount of rainfall effectively contributing to meet tree water requirements. Hence, at intermediate tree densities (dashed line in Fig. 4c corresponds to $r_T = 7.5$ m), maximizing permeable areas may improve plant water status, while simultaneously limiting the negative effect caused by increased tree density. Conversely, extremely dense trees limit the lateral extension of non-competing roots and hence the buffering effects of soil volume regardless of the pavement permeability, while more isolated trees benefit the most from intermediate permeable area extension (the optimal width of the paved area corresponds to $r_P = r_C - r_B$).

C. Irrigation requirements and optimal irrigation strategy

If irrigation is implemented, irrigation requirements (water volumes and application frequency), as well as sustainability, cost, and feasibility of traditional vs. micro-irrigation strongly depend on species selection, tree size, rainfall pattern, and planting geometry (Figs. 5 and 6).

Fig. 5a shows how the required volumes for traditional irrigation increase almost linearly with transpiration rates T_{max} ; similar patterns are obtained for micro-irrigation, although with lower total water requirements than for traditional irrigation, and with less steep increases with increasing T_{max} (not shown). The pattern is more complex when altering rainfall timing while maintaining rainfall totals (Fig. 5b). For any rainfall frequency, the minimum water requirements are to be expected in connection with planting designs with $r_P = r_C - r_B$ (corresponding to those designs limiting tree water stress; Fig. 4). At this optimal permeable pavement width, the difference in terms of water requirements between micro-irrigation and traditional irrigation is maximized, in particular for more frequent rainfall events, with traditional irrigation requiring up to twice as much water as micro-irrigation (not shown). In fact, with more frequent rainfall events, it becomes more likely that an irrigation application is immediately followed by a rainfall event, the water input of which is then partially lost to runoff and deep percolation because of the relatively high soil moisture at the event time. Furthermore, infrequent but deep rainfall events may result in higher water requirements than less intermittent rainfall patterns, despite the lower intercepted fraction of water typical of the former rainfall pattern (Fig. 5b). Irrigation is often required during the inter-storm periods to sustain plant transpiration and, when rainfall occurs, saturation-excess may result in the loss of a significant fraction of the precipitated water. Finally, trees planted at high density (i.e., low $r_P + r_I$) will have higher average irrigation requirements than sparser trees, because in the former case the almost continuous canopy enhances rainfall interception and the precipitated water is split between adjacent trees. To facilitate soil water recharge and limit irrigation water requirements, permeable areas should be maximized at high tree density, while an intermediate $r_P = r_C - r_B$ should be sought for lower densities (Fig. 5c).

Required irrigation frequency for traditional irrigation determines its practical applicability in the urban context or whether a more sophisticated system is necessary. Irrigation frequency significantly increases with T_{max} , regardless of planting geometry (Fig. 6 a) and,

for a set T_{max} , the minimum frequency occurs at $r_P = r_C - r_B$. For altered rainfall patterns the main determinant of irrigation frequency is the extension of the permeable area, with extremely high irrigation frequencies for very low r_P (i.e., extremely small effective rooting volumes that cannot efficiently buffer plant water uptake). Conversely, at higher r_P , required irrigation frequency is less sensitive to changes in rainfall frequency and extension of permeable pavement (Fig. 6b).

D. Strategies for species selection and planting design

As apparent from the above results, the choice of tree species, size, and planting design requires considering several contrasting needs, the relevance of each one depending on the specific location. On the one hand, it is necessary to consider the provisioning of ecosystem services by the street tree, and how they are altered by growing conditions: average transpiration per tree provides a measure of the ability to providing a cooling effect, while dynamic water stress provides an indication regarding the tree aesthetic quality and health. On the other hand, for those species, planting designs, and climatic conditions where irrigation is necessary to preserve adequate ecosystem service provisions, irrigation requirements needs appropriate consideration.

To illustrate the usage of the proposed decision tool, we focus on the effect of permeable pavement dimensions on two trees, with 60 and 100 kg d⁻¹ tree⁻¹ water requirements (solid and dot-dashed gray lines respectively in Figs. 4a,d, 5a, and 6a). Under rainfed conditions, the less water demanding tree has an effective cooling capacity of 83% of its potential for $r_P = 1.8$ m, and at least 70% for other permeable pavement dimensions. Similarly, the dynamic water stress is lowest at such optimal r_P ($\bar{\theta} = 0.2$). Conversely, for the more demanding (and larger) tree, maximum cooling is 54% of potential, at $r_P = 2.4$ m. Smaller permeable pavement areas may reduce the cooling ability to 40% of potential, with dynamic water stress levels reaching 0.55. While in most species a certain level of dynamic water stress may not significantly limit aesthetic quality and longevity, it is not possible to provide a general threshold above which such ecosystem services can no longer be provided. In fact, the effects of medium-to-high dynamic stress on tree status strongly depend on the species-specific response to water limitation. Some species may lose their leaves in response to extended periods of water stress, other may sustain damages if exposed to frequent stress

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

episodes. Hence, in most cases, the definition of the conditions under which a supplemental irrigation should be implemented to preserve ecosystem services beyond cooling capacity will require the evaluation of species specific response to water stress indicators, ranging from the dynamic water stress, $\bar{\theta}$, to the length of periods of water stress, $\overline{T}^\downarrow(s^*)$ and their frequency, $\nu^\downarrow(s^*)$. While clearly extremely relevant for planning, information on the species-specific response to water stress tends to be difficult to access for urban planners, as recently discussed for the case of Scandinavia by Sjöman and Nielsen (2010).

When irrigation is necessary to preserve tree ecosystem services, the proposed model can provide quantitative information on irrigation requirements, as a function of tree water needs (Figs. 5 and 6). To assess irrigation feasibility, consideration needs to be given to required volumes and irrigation frequency. Maximum acceptable volumes depend on total water allocation and number of trees to be watered. For the cases under scrutiny, the most demanding tree would require between 6 and 8 m³ per season, depending on planting geometry (Fig. 5a), a figure that might not be acceptable under water shortage or when concerning a high number of plants. Furthermore, the previous results provide a quantitative basis to assess under which circumstances traditional irrigation is a feasible option or the more sophisticated micro-irrigation may be needed. As discussed in Vico and Porporato (2011b), regardless of existing conditions, micro-irrigation has lower water requirements (not shown), thanks to its higher efficiency. The water savings associated to micro-irrigation may translate in an economic advantage when water has high costs. Nevertheless, micro-irrigation has high installation and maintenance costs, in particular in urban settings where damages may occur because of vandalism and pedestrian traffic. Traditional irrigation applied through replenishment of tree bags or with direct irrigation with hose has low investment costs, but high application costs, associated to labor costs (and higher water expenses, when the cost of water is significant). Because of the relatively low required application frequency (Fig. 6a), traditional irrigation is likely to remain the most economically viable option in most cases. The only exceptions are trees with very high water demands or growing in locations with extremely low rainfall inputs, when the installation and maintenance costs of micro-irrigation are lower than the costs associated to high frequency applications of traditional irrigation, thus making the more sophisticated system advantageous also under the economic point of view. Aside from the water conservation and economic questions, other aspects may play a role in the choice of the most appropriate management strategies. In particular, in the ab-

sence of occasional deep rainfall events, micro-irrigation may be responsible for salt build-up in the soil, especially when using saline water for irrigation or in areas with winter de-icing compound applications. Also, there are some indications that irrigation may result in the development of shallower root systems (Bijoor *et al.*, 2012), with possible implications for tree stability and susceptibility to droughts. Finally, for long term planning, our framework can easily account for tree growth, which will be reflected on total tree water requirements, and can explicitly include changes in the rainfall pattern due to climate change scenarios, such as those investigated in Figs. 5b,e 5b, and 6b.

IV. CONCLUSIONS

A minimalist description of the soil water balance for urban trees was proposed, explicitly including rainfall unpredictability within a probabilistic framework, while still only requiring few, physically-based parameters characterizing rainfall pattern and vegetation response to water availability. The proposed model allows us to quantify the effect of species selection, tree size, and planting design on total average seasonal transpiration (and thus effective cooling capacity), tree water status (and thus health and aesthetic quality), and irrigation requirements. Hence, this minimalist description represents a first necessary step towards the definition of site-specific guidelines for species selection and planting design, to limit city water footprint while preserving street tree ability to provide ecosystem services. The planting design that maximizes cooling capacity while minimizing water stress occurrence and irrigation requirements may be achieved by bare soil and permeable pavement with combined area equal to the canopy extension. Because of the complex balance between root lateral extension and efficient soil water recharge by precipitated water, denser trees benefit more from permeable than impervious surfaces, while isolated trees benefit the most from intermediate permeable area extensions. When irrigation becomes necessary to maintain the desired ecosystem services, small permeable areas and trees planted at high density require higher irrigation input to maintain low water stress than a more balanced design. Because of its higher efficiency, micro-irrigation has lower total water requirements, and may be an adequate irrigation strategy for low permeable area extensions when the high required frequency of traditional irrigation may be unpractical and water savings by micro-irrigation are the highest. Intermediate rainfall frequencies and event depths allow the

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

727 minimization of water stress occurrence and severity, and irrigation requirements. Shifts
728 from this rainfall regime, particularly towards deeper but less frequent rainfall events, have
729 negative repercussions for tree cooling capacity and water stress, and enhance irrigation
730 requirements, especially for trees surrounded by wide permeable areas. This is true also for
731 trees with optimal or larger permeable pavements, even though the situation remains more
732 positive than for narrow permeable zones. The results presented here can provide helpful
733 indications for the definition of guidelines towards a sustainable design of urban vegetation
734 under current and future climate scenarios. The predictive power of the proposed model
735 would be greatly enhanced by a wider availability of data on plant water requirements under
736 urban-specific growing conditions.

23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

737 **ACKNOWLEDGMENTS**

738 We thank S. Saccomani and three anonymous reviewers for their constructive comments.
739 The support of the US National Science Foundation, through grant CBET-1033467, the
740 US Department of Agriculture, through grant 2011-67003-30222, and the US Department
741 of Energy through the Office of Biological and Environmental Research (BER) Terrestrial
742 Ecosystem Science (TES) Program, grant DE-SC0006967, is gratefully acknowledged. R.R.
743 acknowledges the support of Duke University during his visit in 2011. A.P. acknowledges
744 the "Lagrange Fellow" project by the CRT Foundation and the Institute for Scientific In-
745 terchange of Torino, Italy.

746 **REFERENCES**

747 Aston, A R (1979), "Rainfall interception by eight small trees," *Journal of Hydrology* **42**, 383–396.
748 Balling, R C, P. Gober, and N. Jones (2008), "Sensitivity of residential water consumption to
749 variations in climate: an intraurban analysis of Phoenix, Arizona," *Water Resour. Res.* **44** (10),
750 W10401.
751 Beckett, K P, P. H. Freer-Smith, and G. Taylor (1998), "Urban woodlands: their role in reducing
752 the effects of particulate pollution," *Environmental Pollution* **99** (3), 347–360.
753 Berrang, P, D. F. Karnosky, and B. J. Stanton (1985), "Environmental factors affecting tree health
754 in New York City," *J. Arbor.* **11** (6), 185–189.

- 755 Bijoor, N S, H. R. McCarthy, D. C. Zhang, and D. E. Pataki (2012), "Water sources of urban
756 trees in the los angeles metropolitan area," *Urban Ecosystems* **15** (1), 195–214.
- 757 Bowler, D E E, L. Buyung-Ali, T. M. M. Knight, and A. S. S. Pullin (2010), "Urban greening
758 to cool towns and cities: a systematic review of the empirical evidence," *Landscape and Urban*
759 *Planning* **97** (3), 147–155.
- 760 Brennan, D, S. Tapsuwan, and G. Ingram (2007), "The welfare costs of urban outdoor water
761 restrictions," *The Australian Journal of Agricultural and Resource Economics* **51**, 243–261.
- 762 Bush, S E, D. E. Pataki, K. R. Hultine, A. G. West, J. S. Sperry, and J. R. Ehleringer (2008),
763 "Wood anatomy constrains stomatal responses to atmospheric vapor pressure deficit in irrigated,
764 urban trees," *Oecologia* **156** (1), 13–20.
- 765 Chen, L, Z. Zhang, Z. Li, J. Tang, P. Caldwell, and W. Zhang (2011), "Biophysical control of
766 whole tree transpiration under an urban environment in Northern China," *J. Hydrol.* **402** (3-4),
767 388–400.
- 768 Clark, J R, and R. Kjelgren (1990), "Water as a limiting factor in the development of urban trees,"
769 *J. Arbor.* **16**, 203–208.
- 770 Clark, J R, N. P. Matheny, G. Cross, and V. Wake (1997), "A model of urban forest sustainability,"
771 *J. Arbor.* **23** (1), 17–30.
- 772 Coder, K (1996), *Cultural aspects of trees: traditions and myth*. (Cooperative Extension Service,
773 Forest Resources Unit, University of Georgia, Athens, GA).
- 774 Craul, P J (1985), "A description of urban soils and their desired characteristics," *J. Arbor.* **11** (11),
775 330–339.
- 776 Craul, P J (1999), *Urban soils: applications and practices* (John Wiley & Sons, New York, NY).
- 777 Cregg, B M (1995), "Plant moisture stress of green ash trees in contrasting urban sites," *J. Arbor.*
778 **21** (6), 271–276.
- 779 Cregg, B M, and M. E. Dix (2001), "Tree moisture stress and insect damage in urban areas in
780 relation to heat island effects," *J. Arbor.* **27** (1), 8–17.
- 781 Daly, E, A. C. Oishi, A. Porporato, and G. G. Katul (2008), "A stochastic model for daily
782 subsurface CO₂ concentration and related soil respiration," *Adv. Water Resour.* **31** (7), 987–994.
- 783 DeGaetano, A T, and S. R. Hudson (2000), "Specification of soil volume and irrigation frequency
784 for urban trees," *J. Urban Plan. Dev. ASCE* **126** (4), 153–165.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

785 Delcambre, A, and J. P. Rossignol (1999), "Characterization of moderate hydric stress on ash trees
786 (*Fraxinus americana*) in landscaped areas," in *International Symposium on Urban Tree Health*,
787 Acta Horticulturae, edited by M. Lemattre P. Lemaire F. Lemattre, pp. 353–360.

788 Drunasky, N, and D. K. Struve (2005), "*Quercus macrocarpa* and *Q. Prinus* physiological and
789 morphological responses to drought stress and their potential for urban forestry," Urban forestry
790 & Urban Greening **4**, 13–22.

791 Dwyer, J F, E. G. McPherson, H. W. Schroeder, and R. A. Rowntree (1992), "Assessing the
792 benefits and costs of the urban forest," J. Arbor. **18** (5), 227–234.

793 Dwyer, J F, D. J. Nowak, and M. H. Noble (2003), "Sustaining urban forests," J. Arbor. **29** (1),
794 49–55.

795 Dwyer, J F, D. J. Nowak, and G. W. Watson (2002), "Future directions for urban forestry research
796 in the United States," J. Arbor. **28**, 231–236.

797 Easterling, D R, G. A. Meehl, C. Parmesan, S. A. Changnon, T. R. Karl, and L. O. Mearns (2000),
798 "Climate extremes: observations, modeling, and impacts," Science **289** (5487), 2068–2074.

799 English, M, and S. N. Raja (1996), "Perspectives on deficit irrigation," Agricultural Water Man-
800 agement **32** (1), 1–14.

801 Fernandez-Juricic, E (2000), "Avifaunal use of wooded streets in an urban landscape," Conserv.
802 Biol. **14** (2), 513–521.

803 Ferrini, F, and A. Fini (2011), "Sustainable management techniques for trees in the urban areas,"
804 Journal of Biodiversity and Ecological Sciences **1** (1), 1–19.

805 Flückiger, W, and S. Braun (1999), "Stress factors of urban trees and their relevance for vigour
806 and predisposition for parasite attacks," Acta Horticulturae **496**, 325–334.

807 Foster, R S, and J. Blaine (1978), "Urban tree survival: trees in the sidewalk," J. Arbor. **4** (1),
808 14–17.

809 Gill, S E, J. F. Handley, A. R. Ennos, and S. Pauleit (2007), "Adapting cities for climate change:
810 The role of the green infrastructure," Built Environment **33** (1), 115–133.

811 Grabosky, J, N. Bassuk, L. Irwin, and H. Van Es (2001), "Shoot and root growth of three tree
812 species in sidewalks," Journal of Environmental Horticulture **19** (4), 206–211.

813 Guswa, A J (2005), "Soil-moisture limits on plant uptake: An upscaled relationship for water-
814 limited ecosystems," Adv. Water Resour. **28** (6), 543–552.

- Hagishima, A, K. Narita, and J. Tanimoto (2007), "Field experiment on transpiration from isolated urban plants," *Hydrol. Proc.* **21** (9), 1217–1222.
- Hauer, R J, R. W. Miller, and D. M. Ouimet (1994), "Street tree decline and construction damage," *J. Arbor.* **20** (2), 94–97.
- Helvey, J D, and J. H. Patric (1965), "Canopy and litter interception of rainfall by hardwoods of Eastern United States," *Water Resour. Res.* **1** (2), 193–206.
- Hilaire, R S, M. A. Arnold, D. C. Wilkerson, D. A. Devitt, B. H. Hurd, B. J. Lesikar, V. I. Lohr, C. A. Martin, G. V. McDonald, R. L. Morris, D. R. Pittenger, D. A. Shaw, and D. F. Zoldoske (2008), "Efficient water use in residential urban landscapes," *Hortscience* **43** (7), 2081–2092.
- Home, R, N. Bauer, and M. Hunziker (2010), "Cultural and biological determinants in the evaluation of urban green spaces," *Environment and Behavior* **42** (4), 494–523.
- Imhoff, M L, P. Zhang, R. E. Wolfe, and L. Bounoua (2010), "Remote sensing of the urban heat island effect across biomes in the continental USA," *Remote Sens. Environ.* **114** (3), 504–513.
- Jenerette, G D, S. L. Harlan, W. L. Stefanov, and C. A. Martin (2011), "Ecosystem services and urban heat riskscape moderation: water, green spaces, and social inequality in Phoenix, USA," *Ecological Applications* **21** (7), 2637–2651.
- Jenerette, G D, and L. Larsen (2006), "A global perspective on changing sustainable urban water supplies," *Glob. Planet. Change* **50** (3-4), 202–211.
- Jorgensen, A, and P. H. Gobster (2010), "Shades of green: measuring the ecology of urban green space in the context of human health and well-being," *Nature and Culture* **5** (3), 338–363.
- Kalnay, E, and M. Cai (2003), "Impact of urbanization and land-use change on climate," *Nature* **423** (6939), 528–531.
- Kjelgren, R K, and J. R. Clark (1993), "Growth and water relations of *Liquidambar styraciflua* l. in an urban park and plaza," *Trees-Structure and Function* **7** (4), 195–201.
- Konijnendijk, C C (2000), "Adapting forestry to urban demands - role of communication in urban forestry in Europe," *Landscape and Urban Planning* **52** (2-3), 89–100.
- Kopinga, J (1985), "Research on street tree planting practices in the Netherlands," in *5th Annual METRIA Conference* (Peensylvania State University, University Park, PA) pp. 72–84.
- Körner, C H, J. A. Scheel, and H. Bauer (1979), "Maximum leaf diffusive conductance in vascular plants," *Photosynthetica* **13** (1), 45–82.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

845 Kuo, F E, and W. C. Sullivan (2001), "Environment and crime in the inner city: does vegetation
846 reduce crime?" *Environment and Behavior* **33** (3), 343–367.

847 Laio, F, A. Porporato, L. Ridolfi, and I. Rodriguez-Iturbe (2001), "Plants in water-controlled
848 ecosystems: active role in hydrologic processes and response to water stress - II. Probabilistic
849 soil moisture dynamics," *Adv. Water Resour.* **24** (7), 707–723.

850 Lindsey, P, and N. L. Bassuk (1991), "Specifying soil volumes to meet the water needs of mature
851 urban street trees and trees in containers," *J. Arbor.* **17** (6), 141–149.

852 Litvak, E, H. R. McCarthy, and D. E. Pataki (2011), "Water relations of coast redwood planted
853 in the semi-arid climate of southern California," *Plant Cell Environ.* **34** (8), 1384–1400.

854 Litvak, Elizaveta, Heather R. McCarthy, and Diane E. Pataki (2012), "Transpiration sensitivity
855 of urban trees in a semi-arid climate is constrained by xylem vulnerability to cavitation," *Tree
856 Physiology* **32** (4), 373–388.

857 Lohr, V I, C. H. Pearson-Mims, J. Tarnai, and D. A. Dillman (2004), "How urban residents rate
858 and rank the benefits and problems associated with trees in cities," *J. Arbor.* **30** (1), 28–35.

859 Maas, J, R. A. Verheij, P. P. Groenewegen, S. de Vries, and P. Spreeuwenberg (2006), "Green
860 space, urbanity, and health: how strong is the relation?" *J. Epidemiol. Community Health* **60** (7),
861 587–592.

862 MacDonald, DH, N. D. Crossman, P. Mahmoudi, L. O. Taylor, M. D. Summers, and P. C. Boxall
863 (2010), "The value of public and private green spaces under water restrictions," *Landscape and
864 Urban Planning* **95** (4), 192–200.

865 McCarthy, H R, and D. E. Pataki (2010), "Drivers of variability in water use of native and
866 non-native urban trees in the greater los angeles area," *Urban Ecosystems* **13**, 393–414.

867 McHale, M R, I. C. Burke, M. A. Lefsky, P. J. Peper, and E. G. McPherson (2009), "Urban forest
868 biomass estimates: is it important to use allometric relationship developed specifically for urban
869 trees?" *Urban Ecosyst.* **12**, 95–113.

870 McPherson, E G (2001), "Sacramento's parking lot shading ordinance: environmental and economic
871 costs of compliance," *Landscape and Urban Planning* **57** (2), 105–123.

872 McPherson, E G, and R. A. Rowntree (1989), "Using structural measures to compare twenty-two
873 U.S. street tree populations," *Landscape Journal* **8** (1), 13–23.

874 McPherson, E G, J. R. Simpson, Q. F. Xiao, and C. X. Wu (2011), "Million trees Los Angeles
875 canopy cover and benefit assessment," *Landscape and Urban Planning* **99** (1), 40–50.

- Milly, P C D (2001), "A minimalist probabilistic description of root zone soil water," *Water Resour. Res.* **37** (3), 457–463.
- Morgenroth, J, and G. D. Buchan (2009), "Soil moisture and aeration beneath pervious and impervious pavements," *Arboriculture & Urban Forestry* **35** (3), 135–141.
- Niinemets, U, and J. Penuelas (2008), "Gardening and urban landscaping: significant players in global change," *Trends Plant Sci.* **13** (2), 60–65.
- Nowak, D J, D. E. Crane, and J. C Stevens (2006), "Air pollution removal by urban trees and shrubs in the United States," *Urban forestry & Urban Greening* **4**, 115–123.
- Nowak, D J, J. R. McBride, and R. A. Beatty (1990), "Newly planted street tree growth and mortality," *J. Arbor.* **16** (5), 124–130.
- Parés-Franzi, M, D. Sauri-Pujol, and E. Domene (2006), "Evaluating the environmental performance of urban parks in mediterranean cities: An example from the Barcelona metropolitan region," *Environmental Management* **38** (5), 750–759.
- Pataki, D E, C. G. Boone, T. S. Hogue, G. D. Jenerette, J. P. McFadden, and S. Pincetl (2011a), "Socio-ecohydrology and the urban water challenge," *Ecohydrology* **4** (2), 341–347.
- Pataki, D E, H. R. R. McCarthy, E. Litvak, and S. Pincetl (2011b), "Transpiration of urban forests in the Los Angeles metropolitan area," *Ecological Applications* **21** (3), 661–677.
- Pauleit, S (2003), "Urban street tree plantings: indentifying the key requirements," *Proceedings of the Institution of Civil Engineers-Municipal Engineer* **156** (1), 43–50.
- Payton, S, G. Lindsey, J. Wilson, J. R. Ottensmann, and J. Man (2008), "Valuing the benefits of the urban forest: a spatial hedonic approach," *J. Environ. Plan. Manag.* **51** (6), 717–736.
- Peters, E B, J. P. McFadden, and R. A. Montgomery (2010), "Biological and environmental controls on tree transpiration in a suburban landscape," *J. Geophys. Res. Biogeosci.* **115**, G04006.
- Porporato, A, E. Daly, and I. Rodriguez-Iturbe (2004), "Soil water balance and ecosystem response to climate change," *Am. Nat.* **164** (5), 625–632.
- Porporato, A, F. Laio, L. Ridolfi, and I. Rodriguez-Iturbe (2001), "Plants in water-controlled ecosystems: active role in hydrologic processes and response to water stress - III. Vegetation water stress," *Adv. Water Resour.* **24** (7), 725–744.
- Quattrochi, D A, and M. K. Ridd (1998), "Analysis of vegetation within a semi-arid urban environment using high spatial resolution airborne thermal infrared remote sensing data," *Atmospheric Environment* **32** (1), 19–33.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

907 Raupp, J M, A. B. Cumming, and E. C. Raupp (2006), "Street tree diversity in Eastern North
908 America and its potential for tree loss to exotic borers," *Arboriculture & Urban Forestry* **32** (6),
909 297–304.

910 Rees, W, and M. Wackernagel (2008), "Urban ecological footprints: why cities cannot be
911 sustainable—and why they are a key to sustainability," in *Urban Ecology*, edited by J. M. Marzluff,
912 E. Shulenberger, W. Endlicher, M. Alberti, G. Bradley, C. Ryan, U. Simon, and C. ZumBrunnen
913 (Springer US, Berlin) pp. 537–555.

914 Reichwein, S (2003), *Root growth under pavements - results of a field study*, Second International
915 Symposium on plant health in urban horticulture, Berlin, Germany, 27-29 August, 2003.

916 Richards, N A (1983), "Diversity and stability in a street tree population," *Urban Ecology* **7**,
917 159–171.

918 Roberts, B R, and V. M. Schnipke (1994), "The relative water demand of five urban tree species,"
919 *J. Arbor.* **20** (3), 156–159.

920 Rodriguez-Iturbe, I, A. Porporato, L. Ridolfi, V. Isham, and D. R. Cox (1999), "Probabilistic
921 modelling of water balance at a point: The role of climate, soil and vegetation," *Proc. R. Soc.*
922 *Lond. A* **455**, 3789–3805.

923 Rodriguez-Iturbe, R, and A. Porporato (2004), *Ecohydrology of water-controlled ecosystems - Soil*
924 *moisture and plant dynamics* (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, MA).

925 Sæbø, A, T. Benedikz, and T. B. Randrup (2003), "Selection of trees for urban forestry in the
926 Nordic countries," *Urban forestry & Urban Greening* **2**, 101–114.

927 Salvador, R, C. Bautista-Capetillo, and E. Playan (2011), "Irrigation performance in private urban
928 landscapes: a study case in Zaragoza (Spain)," *Landscape and Urban Planning* **100** (3), 302–311.

929 Schenk, H J, and R. B. Jackson (2002), "The global biogeography of roots," *Ecol. Monogr.* **72** (3),
930 311–328.

931 Shashua-Bar, L, D. Pearlmutter, and E. Erell (2009), "The cooling efficiency of urban landscape
932 strategies in a hot dry climate," *Landscape and Urban Planning* **92** (3-4), 179–186.

933 Shooshtarian, S, A. TehraniFar, A. Ghani, and M. Kiani (2011), "Effects of irrigation frequency
934 regimes on morphological and physiological characteristics of six sedum species," *African Journal*
935 *of Agricultural Research* **6** (26), 5694–5700.

936 Sjöman, H, and A. B. Nielsen (2010), "Selecting trees for urban paved sites in Scandinavia - A
937 review of information on stress tolerance and its relation to the requirements of tree planners,"

- Urban forestry & Urban Greening **9** (4), 281–293.
- Sjöman, Henrik, Johan Östberg, and Oliver Bühler (2012), “Diversity and distribution of the urban tree population in ten major nordic cities,” Urban Forestry & Urban Greening **11** (1), 31–39.
- Suleiman, M K, N. R. Bhat, S. Jacob, R. R. Thomas, and G. D’Cruz (2011), “Performance of selected native plants under deficit irrigation,” World Journal of Agricultural Sciences **7** (1), 19–25.
- Swanwick, C, N. Dunnett, and H. Woolley (2003), “Nature, role and value of green space in towns and cities: an overview,” Built Environment **29** (2), 94–106.
- Takagi, M, and K. Gyokusen (2004), “Light and atmospheric pollution affect photosynthesis of street trees in urban environments,” Urban Forestry & Urban Greening **2**, 167–171.
- Thompson, N, I. A. Barrie, and M. Ayles (1981), *The Meteorological Office Rainfall and Evaporation Calculation System (MORECS)*, Tech. Rep. (Met. Office).
- Thorsson, S, F. Lindberg, J. Björklund, B. Holmer, and D. Rayner (2011), “Potential changes in outdoor thermal comfort conditions in Gothenburg, Sweden due to climate change: the influence of urban geometry,” Int. J. Climat. **31** (2, Sp. Iss. SI), 324–335.
- United Nations, (2005), *United Nations Population Division, World Urbanization Prospects, Urban and Rural Population Estimates and Projections* (United Nations Publications Board, New York, NY).
- Čermák, J, J. Hruška, M. Martinková, and A. Prax (2000), “Urban tree root systems and their survival near houses analyzed using ground penetrating radar and sap flow techniques,” Plant Soil **219** (1-2), 103–116.
- Vico, G, and A. Porporato (2010), “Traditional and microirrigation with stochastic soil moisture,” Water Resour. Res. **46**, W03509.
- Vico, G, and A. Porporato (2011a), “From rainfed agriculture to stress-avoidance irrigation: I. A generalized irrigation scheme with stochastic soil moisture,” Adv. Water Resour. **34** (2), 263–271.
- Vico, G, and A. Porporato (2011b), “From rainfed agriculture to stress-avoidance irrigation: II. Sustainability, crop yield, and profitability,” Adv. Water Resour. **34** (2), 272–281.
- Viswanathan, B, A. Volder, W. T. Watson, and J. A. Aitkenhead-Peterson (2011), “Impervious and pervious pavements increase soil CO₂ concentrations and reduce root production of American sweetgum (*Liquidambar styraciflua*),” Urban forestry & Urban Greening **10** (2), 133–139.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

969 Walker, J S, N. B. Grimm, J. M. Briggs, C. Gries, and L. Dugan (2009), "Effects of urbanization
970 on plant species diversity in central arizona," *Frontiers in Ecology and the Environment* **7** (9),
971 465–470.

972 Wang, H, Z. Ouyang, W. Chen, X. Wang, H. Zheng, and Y. Ren (2011), "Water, heat, and airborne
973 pollutants effects on transpiration of urban trees," *Environmental Pollution* **159**, 2127–2137.

974 Whitlow, T H, N. L. Bassuk, and D. L. Reichert (1992), "A three-year study of water relations of
975 urban street trees," *J. Appl. Ecol.* **29** (2), 436–450.

976 Wolf, K L (2005), "Business district streetscapes, trees, and consumer response," *J. For.* **103** (8),
977 396–400.

978 Xiao, Q F, and E. G. McPherson (2002), "Rainfall interception by Santa Monica's municipal urban
979 forest," *Urban Ecosyst.* **6**, 291–302.

980 Young, R F (2010), "Managing municipal green space for ecosystem services," *Urban Forestry &*
981 *Urban Greening* **9** (4), 313–321.

Figure 1 a) Examples of street trees planting design, including the usage of a tree bag for irrigation purposes, and b) schematic representation of the geometry of the problem for the circular symmetric case. (Photo credits: S. Manzoni, A. Porporato, G. Vico)

Figure 2 a) Geometry of the problem and b) average volumetric rainfall input \bar{R} for varying permeable radial extensions r_P with fixed and decreasing tree density (black and gray lines respectively). Panel a) depicts lateral root extension r_R (solid line), radial extension beyond the rooting zone r_{nR} (dotted line), radial extension of the permeable and impervious pavements, r_P and r_I (dot-dashed and dashed lines respectively).

Figure 3 Examples of numerically generated soil moisture time series (a) in absence of irrigation and (c) in presence of micro- and traditional-irrigation, and corresponding probability density functions of soil moisture (b,d). In (a,b) r_P increases from 0 (absence of permeable pavement; solid line) to 2 m (dashed line), to 4 m (dotted line), while $r_I = r_T - (r_P + r_B)$ decreases accordingly. In (c,d) solid line refer to micro-irrigation, dashed line to traditional irrigation (in both cases $r_P = 2$ m). Other parameters are $Z_R = 0.5$ m, $n = 0.43$, $T_{max} = 70$ kg d⁻¹ tree⁻¹, $s^* = 0.28$, $s_1 = 0.62$, $\alpha = 12$ mm, $\lambda = 0.2$ d⁻¹, $\Delta = 3$ mm, $\kappa_C = 0.6$, $r_B = 1$ m, $r_T = 7.5$ m, $\eta_P = 0.45$, $\eta_I = 0.1$. In c,d), the irrigation parameters are $\tilde{s} = 0.75s^*$ and $\hat{s} = 0.8s_1$; the atom of probability (solid bar in d) is not to scale.

Figure 4 a-c) Dependence of tree effective cooling capacity with respect to potential, $\langle T \rangle / T_{max}$, and (d-f) dynamic water stress $\bar{\theta}$ (bottom) on planting geometry, species selection, and rainfall pattern: a, d) effect of permeable pavement dimension r_P and tree transpiration requirements T_{max} (r_C varies along with T_{max} from 2.5 to 3.8 m as $r_C = 0.73T_{max}^{\frac{1}{3}}$, where the constant is chosen so that $T_{max} = 70 \text{ kg d}^{-1} \text{ tree}^{-1}$ for a $r_C = 3 \text{ m}$ canopy); b, e) effect of r_P and rainfall frequency and depth, with constant total rainfall over the growing season $R_{tot} = 341 \text{ mm}$ (i.e., $\alpha = R_{tot}(T_{seas}\lambda)^{-1}$ decreases from 48 to 5 mm as λ increases); and c, f) effect of tree density and extension of permeable and impervious pavement (r_P and r_I respectively). The growing season length is assumed to be $T_{seas} = 142 \text{ d}$. For the definition of dynamic stress, $q = 1$, $k = 1$. All the other non-varying parameters are as in Fig. 3. In (a,d), the thick dashed line represent the permeable pavement extension such that $r_P + r_B = r_C$, while the gray horizontal lines represent the low and high water demanding trees discussed in III.D (solid and dotdashed lines respectively). In (c,f), the thick dashed line indicate the parameter combinations for which $r_T = 7.5 \text{ m}$ (i.e., the case explored in the other panels).

Figure 5 Seasonal water requirements V_t for traditional irrigation as a function of a) permeable pavement dimension r_P and tree transpiration requirements T_{max} , b) r_P and rainfall frequency and depth (with constant $R_{tot} = 341 \text{ mm}$), and c) extension of permeable and impervious pavement, r_P and r_I respectively. In a), the thick dashed line representst the permeable pavement extension such that $r_P + r_B = r_C$, while the gray horizontal lines represent the low and high water demanding trees discussed in III.D (solid and dotdashed lines respectively). In c), the dashed line corresponds to $r_T = 7.5 \text{ m}$ (i.e., to the case explored in the other panels). All the other non-varying parameters are as in Fig. 4.

Figure 6 Required application frequency $\nu^{\downarrow}(\tilde{s})$ for traditional irrigation as a function of a) permeable pavement lateral extension r_P and tree transpiration requirements T_{max} and b) r_P and rainfall frequency λ (with constant $R_{tot} = 341 \text{ mm}$ and variable α). In a), the thick dashed line represent the permeable pavement extension such that $r_P + r_B = r_C$, while the gray horizontal lines represent the low and high water demanding trees discussed in III.D (solid and dotdashed lines respectively). All the other non-varying parameters are as in Fig. 4.

Table I Main tree parameters for several species belonging to the most common genera in North American cities (as shown by data presented by Raupp *et al.* (2006) and McPherson and Rowntree (1989)); additional data mainly on transpiration for less common species can be found in Bush *et al.* (2008); Chen *et al.* (2011); Hilaire *et al.* (2008); Litvak *et al.* (2011); McCarthy and Pataki (2010))

Species	City (location) [†]	T_{max} (kg d ⁻¹ tree ⁻¹)	A_C (m ²)	DBH (cm)	Ref
<i>Acer campestre</i> L. ^a	Brno, Czech Rep. (S)	64.6	29.8	22.4	Čermák <i>et al.</i> (2000)
<i>Acer campestre</i> L. ^b	Brno, Czech Rep. (S)	140.7	58.9	40.3	Čermák <i>et al.</i> (2000)
<i>Fraxinus pennsylvanica</i>	Lincoln, NE (LP)	49.4 ^c	17.5 ± 1.36	15.3 ± 0.49	Cregg (1995)
<i>Fraxinus pennsylvanica</i>	Lincoln, NE (SP)	40.8 ^c	18.4 ± 1.24	13.5 ± 0.48	Cregg (1995)
<i>Fraxinus pennsylvanica</i>	Lincoln, NE, Campus (P)	70.1 ^c	22.4 ± 4.14	17.4 ± 1.63	Cregg (1995)
<i>Fraxinus pennsylvanica</i>	Saint Paul (P)	69.1 ± 25.8	75.9 ± 11.14	38.6 ± 11.4	Peters <i>et al.</i> (2010)
<i>Fraxinus pennsylvanica</i>	CTC Minneapolis, MN (P)	92.5 ± 34.5	101.6 ± 59.8	41.1 ± 2.0	Peters <i>et al.</i> (2010)
<i>Gleditsia tricanthos</i> ^d	Los Angeles Arboretum, CA (P)	89.9 ± 23.6	-	45.2 ± 5.5	Pataki <i>et al.</i> (2011b)
<i>Quercus rubra</i>	CTC Minneapolis, MN (P)	-	85.1 ± 30.1	42.9 ± 7.7	Peters <i>et al.</i> (2010)
<i>Ulmus parvifolia</i> ^d	Los Angeles Police Ac., CA (P)	67.7 ± 15.8	-	28.9 ± 2.5	Pataki <i>et al.</i> (2011b)
<i>Ulmus pumila</i>	Lauderdale Saint Paul, MN (P)	107.1 ± 38.1	90.8 ± 70.6	50.8 ± 12.6	Peters <i>et al.</i> (2010)
<i>Ulmus thomasii</i>	Saint Paul, MN (P)	80.4 ± 28.6	68.1 ± 36.3	44.4 ± 7.0	Peters <i>et al.</i> (2010)

[†] Location is P for parks and other extensively green areas, S for trees growing along streets or isolated in parking lots, LP or SP for large or small planter respectively. ^a Shaded tree with nearby sidewalk, with $r_R=3.6$ m; ^b Exposed tree with garden, with $r_R=5.3$ m; ^c Originally expressed in mmol m⁻² s⁻¹ and transformed in kg d⁻¹ tree⁻¹ assuming a 12-hr day and a leaf area index of 4 (in agreement with Cregg (1995)); ^d Irrigated

Figure 1





Figure 2



Peer Review

Figure3




Figure 4




Figure 5




Figure 6

