Spatiotemporal soil and saprolite moisture dynamics across a semi-arid woody plant gradient

Ryan J. Niemeyer^{a,b*}, Robert Heinse^c, Timothy E. Link^d, Mark S. Seyfried^e, Zion P. Klos^d,
Christopher J. Williams^f, and Travis Nielson^g

^aWater Resources Program, University of Idaho, Moscow, ID 83843, USA

^bNow at: Civil and Environmental Engineering, University of Washington, Seattle, WA 98195,
USA

^cPlant, Soil and Entomological and Sciences, University of Idaho, Moscow ID USA

^dCollege of Natural Resources, University of Idaho, Moscow, ID 83843, USA

^eUSDA-Agricultural Research Service, Northwest Watershed Research Center, Boise, ID 83712,
USA

^fDepartment of Statistical Science, University of Idaho, Moscow, ID 83843, USA

^gDepartment of Geosciences, Boise State University, Boise, ID 83725, USA

*Correspondence: Ryan Niemeyer, Dept. of Civil and Environmental Engineering, 201 More
Hall, University of Washington, Seattle, WA 98195, USA, email: rniemeyr@uw.edu

Financial support was provided by the NSF's IGERT Program (Award 0903479), United States
Geological Survey Northwest Climate Science Center Doctoral Fellowship, and by the National
Science Foundation's CBET Program (Award 0854553).

22 Mention of a proprietary product does not constitute a guarantee or warranty of the product by
23 USDA or the authors and does not imply its approval to the exclusion of the other products that
24 also may be suitable.

Abstract

Woody plant cover has increased 10-fold over the last 140+ years in many parts of the semi-arid western USA. Woody plant cover can alter the timing and amount of plant available moisture in the soil and saprolite. To assess spatiotemporal subsurface moisture dynamics over two water years in a snow-dominated western juniper stand we compared moisture dynamics horizontally across a discontinuous canopy, and vertically in soil and saprolite. We monitored soil moisture at 15 and 60 cm and conducted periodic electromagnetic induction and electrical resistivity tomography surveys aimed at sensing moisture changes within the root zone and saprolite. Timing of soil moisture dry down at 15 cm was very similar between canopy patches and interspace. Conversely, dry down at 60 cm occurred 22 days earlier in the interspace than under canopy patches. After rainfall, interspaces with more shrubs showed greater increases in soil moisture than interspaces with few shrubs. For the few rainfall events that were large enough to increase soil moisture at 60 cm, increases in moisture occurred almost exclusively below the canopy. Soil water holding capacity from 0 to 150 cm was a primary driver of areas that were associated with the greatest change in distributed electrical conductivity - an indicator of changes in soil moisture - across the growing season. Vegetation was also correlated with a greater seasonal change in electrical conductivity at these depths. The seasonal change in resistivity suggested moisture extraction by juniper well into the saprolite, as deep as 12 m below the surface. This change in deep subsurface resistivity primarily occurred below medium and large juniper trees. This study suggests how tree roots are both increasing infiltration below their canopy while also extracting moisture at depths of upwards of 12 m. Information from this study can help improve our understanding of juniper resilience to drought and the hydrologic impacts of semi-arid land cover change.

1. Introduction

The hydrologic impacts of woody plant encroachment in semi-arid environments such as with western juniper (*Juniperus occidentalis*) expansion into sagebrush ecosystems are poorly understood. Across the western USA over the last 140+ years, woodlands have encroached into sagebrush and grassland ecosystems principally due to grazing and fire exclusion (Tausch et al., 1981; Miller et al., 2005; Romme et al., 2009). This has been followed by restoration efforts to remove woody plants (e.g. Bureau of Land Management, 2015). Increases (decreases) in woody plant cover typically decrease (increase) total runoff (Bosch and Hewlett, 1982; Huang et al., 2006; Zégre et al., 2010; Zou et al., 2014; Qiao et al., 2015). However, documented hydrologic responses of woody plant removal are not always consistent in semi-arid areas. For example, while one would expect decrease in woody plant cover to increase streamflow, in one case tree die-off decreased streamflow (Guardiola-Claramonte et al., 2011) and in another tree expansion increased streamflow (Wilcox and Huang, 2010). In other cases reductions in woody plant cover were found to have a negligible effect on streamflow (Clary et al., 1974; Baker Jr, 1984; Baker Jr and Ffolliott, 2000). This leads some to conclude that woody plant removal in semi-arid regions has a negligible impact on streamflow (Hibbert, 1983; Kuhn et al., 2007; Ffolliott and Gottfried, 2012). These assertions are often based on the assumption that these plants can access water at deeper depths than herbaceous cover, thereby facilitating greater dry out of the subsurface which reduces subsequent streamflow (Zou et al., 2014). But few studies quantify these subsurface hydrologic processes at both shallow and deep depths. These uncertainties about woody plant impacts on streamflow have motivated this study that aims to improve our process-based understanding of the subsurface hydrological processes in these systems.

The impact of changes in woody plant cover on subsurface water processes is of particular importance to land managers and downstream users in water-limited systems. Soil water dynamics in the near-surface control the phenology and plant productivity in water-limited environments (Loik et al., 2004; Schwinning and Sala, 2004; West et al., 2007; Robinson et al., 2008; Breshears et al., 2009; Penna et al., 2013). Water dynamics in the deep soil and saprolite zones often control streamflow generation and groundwater recharge (Carey et al., 2010; Chauvin et al., 2011; Gabrielli et al., 2012), and provide a moisture pool for some deep rooted semi-arid plants (Breshears et al., 2009; Graham et al., 2010; Schwinning, 2010) including potential hydraulic lift to draw up deep moisture to shallow soil layers (Dawson, 1996; Armas et al., 2010). In the semi-arid western USA, where soil moisture is a limiting factor in primary productivity, understanding the duration of plant available water is particularly important. For example, an earlier reduction in plant available water can increase vegetation vulnerability to drought (Grieu et al., 1988; Littell et al., 2008). Earlier reductions in plant available water could be realized in future years which are projected to experience less precipitation and increased temperatures (Abatzoglou and Kolden, 2011), and a decreased snow to rain ratio that could further reduce streamflow (Berghuijs et al., 2014).

Elucidating how semi-arid woody plants alter subsurface fluxes is often done by comparing subsurface moisture dynamics between vegetation patches and interspace (e.g. Eddleman and Miller, 1991; Padien and Lajtha, 1992, Breshears et al., 1997b; Martens et al., 2000, Owens et al., 2006). Semi-arid conifer species are often organized into “patches” with the areas covered by trees being the “patches” embedded in an interspace “matrix” that is dominated by shrubs, grasses, and forbes (Miller et al., 2005). The interspace and patches are often characterized by differences in nutrient dynamics (Padien and Lajtha, 1992), radiation regime

(Breshears et al., 1997b; Martens et al., 2000), throughfall (Eddleman, 1986; Eddleman and Miller, 1991; Taucer, 2006; Owens et al., 2006), and snow deposition (Niemeyer et al., 2016). Theoretical work on interactions between patch and interspace vegetation posits that grasses use shallower soil moisture pools earlier in the growing season, whereas woody plants use deeper soil moisture pools later in the growing season (Walker and Noy-Meir, 1982; Peláez et al., 1994; Ryel et al., 2008). Empirical work has shown that indeed woody plants utilize moisture in both shallow and deeper layers while grasses and forbs use shallower moisture (Gifford and Shaw, 1973; Young et al., 1984; Sala et al., 1989; Peláez et al., 1994; Breshears et al., 1997a; Seyfried et al., 2005; Breshears et al., 2009). Previous studies in discontinuous juniper landscapes have observed both earlier depletion of soil water in the grass-dominated interspace compared to juniper patches (Young et al., 1984) and no difference in seasonal soil moisture depletion between the patches and interspace (Breshears et al., 1997a). To adequately understand differences in drought vulnerability between interspace and woody vegetation patches, we must adequately characterize spatiotemporal soil moisture dynamics.

Understanding how shifts in woody plant cover change soil moisture in both space and time requires the triangulation of multiple methods. Assessing differences in soil moisture regimes across patches/interspace or woodland/open plots are often limited to a small number of point-scale soil moisture measurements which are often focused on shallow (< 30 cm) soils (Gifford and Shaw, 1973; Young et al., 1984; Breshears et al., 1997a; Seyfried et al., 2005; Robinson et al., 2010; Roundy et al., 2014). This may adequately capture the changes in soil moisture through time in shallow layers but fails to ascertain how these shifts play out across a patches-interspace continuum or how these changes play out in deeper layers in the subsurface (Robinson et al., 2008). Deep moisture in the soil, saprolite, and bedrock is inherently

inaccessible for investigation using direct-contact sensors and hence is difficult to quantify. Geophysical methods such as electrical resistivity tomography (ERT) and electromagnetic induction (EMI) enable the collection of spatially contiguous datasets both horizontally and vertically (Sheets and Hendrickx, 1995; Robinson et al., 2008; Parsekian et al., 2015). For this study, we use the definitions of soil, saprolite, weathered bedrock, and fresh bedrock outlined by Anderson et al. (2007) to define the subsurface of the critical zone. From bottom to top, fresh bedrock is unaltered parent material. Weathered bedrock is fresh bedrock that has undergone initial weathering and additional fracturing, but still resembles the fresh parent material in appearance and property. Saprolite is thoroughly weathered rock that has not yet been transported. Finally, soil is defined as disaggregated transportable material (Anderson et al., 2007).

Here we present a study on the differences in subsurface moisture dynamics in space and time between juniper patches and interspace. Our approach was to combine high-temporal resolution soil moisture data with periodic spatial geophysical data to sense changes in moisture at depth and across the discontinuous canopy cover. This is the first study in patch-interspace cover to combine both high temporal resolution data, broad spatial data, and geophysical data at a depth of exploration greater than 5 m to ascertain how canopy patch and interspace subsurface moisture dynamics differ. Our specific objective is to understand how deeply-rooted trees and shallowly-rooted shrubs differ in their influence on seasonal subsurface moisture dynamics. Results show how these variations in soil and saprolite moisture can differ by depth and time in ways relevant to understanding juniper drought resilience and streamflow generation at the watershed scale.

2. Methods

To assess how the presence of trees affect soil moisture in space and time across a discontinuous canopy, we used a combination of continuous soil moisture and temperature measurements at shallow (< 1 m) soil depths and periodic geophysical measurements from peak soil wetness in early spring to the driest point in the water year before the onset of fall precipitation.

2.1 Site Description

This work was carried out at the Reynolds Creek Experimental Watershed (RCEW) and Critical Zone Observatory in the Owyhee Mountains, approximately 80 km southwest of Boise, ID, USA. RCEW is a moderately steep semi-arid watershed with elevation ranging from 1101 m to 2241 above m.s.l. (Hanson, 2001) and snow cover persisting 4 to 6 months of the year in the higher elevations. The specific site for this study (Fig. 1, 43.084° N, -116.743° W) was located around 1940 m above m.s.l. The average slope and aspect of the site are 26% and 246° respectively. The site for this study is near one of three areas in RCEW that were described as “juniper cover” during the original 1965 vegetation survey (Seyfried et al., 2001). The total juniper cover in RCEW was 24.5 ha in 1965, but has increased 10-fold across the watershed (Sankey et al., 2010). Geologically, the site overlays vesicular Miocene basalt with columnar jointing that is described further in Ekren et al. (1981). Average annual precipitation at the nearest climate station, located 730 m to the east and 50 m higher in elevation from the study site, is 554 mm. Parameter-elevation Regressions on Independent Slopes Model (PRISM) adjustment (Daly et al., 1994) of monthly precipitation from the climate station from 1962 to 2013 estimated the average annual precipitation at the study site to be 490 mm. Annual precipitation for water year (WY) 2013 and 2014 was 577 mm and 532 mm, respectively.

Average peak snow depth at the site is 110 cm, but for WY2013 and 2014 were 94 and 60 cm, respectively. Hourly snow depth, air temperature, relative humidity, shortwave radiation, and wind speed were measured at the meteorological station at the site with standard methods (see Hanson, 2001 for descriptions). Plant species present include a mix of western juniper (*Juniperus occidentalis*), low sagebrush (*Artemisia arbuscula*), mountain big sagebrush (*Artemisia tridentata*) as well as several grass and forb species. Our sample plot spanned approximately 1.2 ha and covered low and high density juniper areas to the north and south respectively (Fig. 1). The high (low) density area was defined by greater (lower) juniper stem density and lower (greater) sagebrush stem density.

< Figure 1 here please >

2.2 Continuous Soil Moisture Measurements

2.2.1 Soil Moisture Data Collection

To analyze changes in soil moisture through time between the canopy patches and interspace, we installed continuous soil moisture and temperature sensors in the vicinity of three trees in August of 2012, and one additional tree in June of 2013. The two trees in the high density juniper area were 4.0 m and 3.7 m tall, while the two trees in the low density juniper area were 2.6 m and 3.8 m tall (Fig. 1). Junipers at the study area had a median height of 2.9 m (n = 84), therefore with respect to height the four trees are slightly taller than most trees in the study area. Soil moisture at each tree was monitored by six sensors. Sensors were installed either under canopy patches or in the interspace. Canopy probes were installed at half the distance between the trunk and canopy edge and the interspace probes were located 1 m beyond the canopy edge. Four sensors were installed at 15 cm both under and outside of the canopy on the north and the west or east sides. Two probes were installed at 60 cm: one in the interspace and one under the

canopy, both on the east or west side of the trunk. All east or west probes were 5TM (15 cm probes) to measure water content and temperature or 5TE (60 cm probes) to measure water content, temperature, and electrical conductivity (Decagon Devices, Pullman, WA). All north probes were HydraProbe dielectric soil water probes (Stevens Water Monitoring Systems, Portland, OR).

2.2.2 Soil Moisture Data Analysis

Prior to data analysis we took several steps to pre-process the soil moisture data. Data for specific probes were excluded when the soil temperature at that probe dropped below 0° C, since probes are only sensitive to liquid water. This only occurred at 15 cm probes for 3.1% of the time, since the winter snowpack insulated the soil and prevented freezing. In addition, the collected time-series of soil moisture data had several gaps due to either a) battery or b) sensor failure. These continuous data were collected every 30 minutes, but averaged on an hourly basis prior to analysis. After the HydraProbe probes were installed, the two 15 cm values for the same tree and location (e.g. tree 3 interspace) were averaged during the same time step to analyze differences between location and trees.

To compare rainfall and snowmelt impacts on soil moisture, we plotted changes in volumetric water content at 15 cm (θ_{15}) and 60 cm (θ_{60}) to snow depth and precipitation. Snow depth was based on hourly measurements at the meteorological station and hourly time-lapse photos of snow stakes under and outside the canopy at two representative trees (see Niemeyer et al. (2016) for a more detailed description). All hourly snow depth measurements were averaged within either canopy or interspaces. There was a 54 day period from December 6th, 2013 to January 29th, 2014 when both time-lapse camera batteries failed. The gap in the data was filled with data from a snow depth sensor at the site climate station for the interspace, and with

simulated data for the canopy. Snow depth simulations under the juniper canopy were conducted with the Simultaneous Heat and Water (SHAW) model (Flerchinger and Saxton, 1989). See Niemeyer et al. (2016) for more simulation details.

To analyze the degree of influence of location (interspace vs. canopy), hydrometeorology, and antecedent soil moisture conditions, we calculated the change in soil moisture before and after each rainfall event. These rainfall events were separated by at least four hours to a) reach a relatively static soil moisture equilibrium, b) ensure all canopy throughfall had occurred, and c) not include decreases in the final θ due to evaporation or transpiration. We then calculated the change in θ_{15} ($\Delta\theta_{15}$) and θ_{60} ($\Delta\theta_{60}$) from the rainfall event. Because the data displayed heteroscedasticity (see Supplemental Figure 1) we used non-parametric statistical analyses. First, we used Wilcoxon rank-sum test (Wilcoxon and Wilcox, 1964) to compare $\Delta\theta_{15}$ and $\Delta\theta_{60}$ between the tree and interspace. Second, we assessed how $\Delta\theta_{15}$ differed between interspace and canopy measurements paired at the same tree, and how these differences played out across the two sets of trees in the low and high density juniper plots. For this we used a non-parametric factorial ANOVA that does not depend on normality or equality of variance assumptions (McKean and Vidmar, 1994). To further assess how event and location characteristics controlled $\Delta\theta$, we also used a non-parametric regression tree classification (Breiman et al., 1984) based on the following equation:

$$\Delta\theta = P_G + P_{int} + VPD + \theta_{ant} + tree + phase + location \quad (1)$$

where $\Delta\theta$ is $\Delta\theta_{15}$ or $\Delta\theta_{60}$, P_G is the event total precipitation, P_{int} is the mean rainfall intensity (mm hr^{-1}), VPD is the average event vapor pressure deficit measured at the climate station (kPa), θ_{ant} is the antecedent θ_{15} or θ_{60} before the event began, “tree” is which of the four instrumented trees the probe(s) were located, “phase” is the juniper classification (low or high juniper density),

and “location” is the sensor location (i.e. interspace or under the tree). The variables “tree”, “phase” and “location” were factor variables in the model.

To assess how the seasonal timing of soil moisture depletion differs between the canopy patch and interspace, we calculated the day at which θ_{15} and θ_{60} declined to half of the seasonal range ($\text{day}_{50\%}$). We estimated $\text{day}_{50\%}$ as follows:

$$\text{day}_{50\%} = [(\max(\theta) - \min(\theta)) \times 0.5] + \min(\theta) \quad (2)$$

where $\max(\theta)$ ($\min(\theta)$) is the maximum (minimum) θ_{15} and θ_{60} after the snow melted and before the snow first occurred in the fall. Typically it is assumed that halfway between θ at field capacity and θ at plant wilting point is when transpiration begins to decline (Hillel, 1980). Although the maximum θ is likely greater than field capacity, $\text{day}_{50\%}$ is still an adequate index for the timing of soil moisture dry down. On the dry end of θ , we assumed the soil reached plant wilting point. Due to the small sample size, we used a Wilcoxon rank-sum test to test for difference between the canopy and interspace $\text{day}_{50\%}$.

2.3 Distributed Periodic Measurements

To estimate how subsurface moisture changes across canopy and interspace cover, we employed periodic geophysical measurements through the growing season. First we conducted four EMI surveys to measure changes in near surface soil apparent electrical conductivity (EC_a) through a growing season. Second, to estimate changes in moisture in the critical zone that extends down through soil, saprolite, weathered bedrock, and fresh bedrock (Anderson et al., 2007) we conducted ERT surveys before the dry season started and at the end of the dry season to measure changes in resistivity that correlate with changes in moisture.

2.3.1 Electromagnetic Induction

2.3.1.1 EMI, Soil, and Rock Data Collection

To estimate soil moisture across the plot encompassing the low and high density juniper areas (Fig. 1), we used EMI. EMI has been used to estimate soil-water properties (Kachanoski and de Jong, 1988; Sheets and Hendrickx, 1995; Sherlock and McDonnell, 2003; Corwin and Lesch, 2005; Abdu et al., 2008). EMI can be exploited to ascertain spatial difference in soil texture (Doolittle et al., 1994; Triantafilis et al., 2001; Triantafilis and Lesch, 2005) and changes in soil water content in both space and time (Sherlock and McDonnell, 2003; Abdu et al., 2008; Tromp-van Meerveld and McDonnell, 2009). Changes in soil moisture are based on when measurable differences in soil electrical conductivity occur between wetter and drier soil states. Geo-referenced (SX BlueII, Geneq, Montreal, Canada) EC_a was collected with a CMD-1 electromagnetic induction (EMI) conductivity meter (GF Instruments, Brno, Czech Republic). The instrument has both a vertical co-planar (EMI_{75}) and horizontal co-planar (EMI_{150}) configurations which have approximate depths of exploration of 0 to 75 cm and 0 to 150 cm, respectively (McNeill, 1980). The two configurations were used to assess surface soil moisture with the EMI_{75} and deeper soil moisture with the EMI_{150} (Corwin and Lesch, 2005). The measured EC_a represents a depth-weighted conductivity across the soil depth of exploration (McNeill, 1980).

EMI surveys were conducted on four dates during the summer dry down in 2013 (Fig. 2). Thirteen, 200 m north-south survey transects spaced 5 m apart were established using a GPS to remain on the transect line. When a large tree was encountered, the survey line diverged around it, making effort to remain as close to the linear transect as possible. The instrument was held approximately 8 cm above the ground during the survey. Data underwent a quality control by removing measurements that had atypically high in-phase values observed when the instrument was near conductors such as stabilizing wires for the climate station or metal rods found at the

site. Typically 5 to 15 values (0.1 – 0.5% of total values) for each data set was removed. We transformed the raw EC_a data to a reference 25° C temperature based on the soil temperature at 60 cm for EMI_{150} and 15 cm and 60 cm for EMI_{75} . Soil temperatures at 60 cm were averaged across all monitoring points at the four instrumented trees. We used a standard conversion function for this transformation (Sheets and Hendrickx, 1995; Reedy and Scanlon, 2003).

To aid interpretation of “soft” geophysical EC_a data, we utilized “hard” subsurface information including soil and rock data (Sherlock and McDonnell, 2003; Abdu et al., 2008). First, we used the spatial statistical algorithm in the ESAP software package to identify eight soil sample locations across the entire EC_a distribution (Lesch et al., 2000). At each of these eight soil sampling locations (see Fig. 1), soil physical properties were characterized down to 90 cm or refusal by collecting samples at depth ranges of 0 to 10 cm, 10 to 30 cm, 30 to 60 cm, and 60 to 90 cm in April 2014. We were only able to sample to 65 cm for one sample, 72 cm for one sample, and 75 cm for two samples, most likely due to encountering rock fragments since subsurface exploration indicated rock fragments mixed with soil matrix throughout the top 1 m of soil. Subsurface exploration included: multiple auger samples both for the eight samples and other samples collected throughout the study period and across the study site and four pits with 1.2 m width, 0.8 m length, and 0.8 m depth dug in the high density juniper area to install buried tipping buckets. Particles larger than 2 mm were removed prior to soil analysis (USDA-NRCS-National Soil Survey Center, 2014). After sieving the soil we estimated sand, silt, and clay with the sedimentation method (Gee and Or, 2002) and soil organic matter (SOM) with the loss on ignition method (Nelson et al., 1996). For each depth interval, we calculated a) water content with the gravimetric method and b) bulk density assuming a particle density of 2.65 g cm^{-3} . We also measured the electrical conductivity of the soil solution (EC_e). Rock content was estimated

along transects based on surface rock coverage and subsurface exploration. First, we walked three north-south transects and three east-west transects to characterize the surface rock coverage. This included percent soil cover, percent rock cover, and rock size. We then inferred sub-surface rock content based on a) the surface rock content from the survey and b) previously mentioned subsurface exploration. The rock content was classified into 9 different classes from low to high that ranged from 0 to 35% rock content by volume (Table S1).

In addition to soil and rock data, we also collected tree and snow spatial data. A distributed tree canopy height model was derived from 1 m resolution LiDAR data flown during snow-free conditions in November of 2007 (Hudak et al., 2002). We conducted the snow survey the winter before the EMI measurements on March 14th, 2013; based on the continuous snow depth sensor at the climate station; this was approximately 15 days after the peak snow water equivalent date, and 67% of peak snow depth. We measured snow depth every 10 m along four 200-m north-south transects that were 20 m apart and spanned the plot. We established a stratified random sampling design by alternating a set of two offset snow depth measurements, either north/south or east/west offsets, 4 m away from each point. To measure snow depth under adjacent trees, we located the closest tree from each initial point, and quantified the canopy radius. On the north and south sides of the tree we measured snow depth at the trunk, half of the radius out from trunk, at the canopy edge, and 1 m outside the canopy edge. If no tree canopy was within a 10 m radius of the initial point, no tree snow depth was measured. To measure snow density and thereby calculate snow water equivalent, we established four snow pits, two in the low and high density juniper areas of the plot. In each pit we measured snow density with a snow cutter (Snowmetrics, Fort Collins, CO) every 10 cm of depth. We calculated an average snow density across the plot to calculate snow water equivalent from depth measurements.

2.3.1.2 Spatial Analysis

We used kriging to interpolate the EC_a , rock, soil, snow, and canopy data to a 2 m resolution. Many environmental variables are positively skewed and require transformation (Goovaerts, 1997). We therefore used a normal-score transformation for EC_a , which is commonly used (Abdu et al., 2008; Tromp-van Meerveld and McDonnell, 2009). We back transformed the normal-score kriged EC_a values for plotting purposes. We used the automap package in R (Hiemstra et al., 2009) to fit the semivariogram with an exponential, spherical, or Stein model, depending on which provided the best statistical fit. We calculated water holding capacity (WHC) for each grid by entering the clay and sand content into the Rosetta Pedotransfer Function (Schaap et al., 2001) to generate θ at both field capacity (θ_{fc}) and plant wilting point (θ_{pwp}). WHC was calculated by:

$$WHC = (\theta_{fc} - \theta_{pwp}) \times (1 - \text{rock}) \quad (3)$$

where rock is the rock content, which we assume has negligible water storage.

We conducted two statistical analyses with interpolated EC_a data. The first was to assess the controls on EC_a , the second to assess the controls on change in EC_a (ΔEC_a). To evaluate the controls on EC_a , we conducted a univariate regression analysis with EC_a as the dependent variable and θ , rock content, clay content, and sand content as independent variables. The second analysis was to assess the ΔEC_a from May to September and from August to September. These two time periods were chosen to estimate changes in moisture across the entire season for the former, and during the late season when vegetation was closest to drought stress, for the latter. To assess ΔEC_a we conducted a generalized least squares multiple regression model that includes spatial covariance since the errors can be correlated or have unequal variance (Goovaerts, 1997). The model was defined *a priori* as follows:

$$\Delta EC_a = WHC + \text{snow} + CH \quad (4)$$

where CH is the LiDAR-derived canopy height and snow is the interpolated snow water equivalent from the snow surveys. To assess the influence of proximity to vegetation and change in seasonal EC_a , we conducted a simple linear regression for the change in EC_a between the two time periods, both normalized by the September EC_a .

2.3.2 Electric resistivity tomography and seismic surveys

We conducted ERT surveys in August of 2013 (dry) and May of 2014 (wet) to assess changes in the resistivity related to subsurface moisture seasonal dynamics (Daily et al., 1992; Zhou et al., 2001). The resistivity survey was conducted with a multi-channel ERT system GeoTom MK-RES/IP/SP (GEOLOG2000, Starnberg, Germany) along 4 sequential lines of 25 electrodes for a total transect length of 99 m. We used a combination of Wenner, dipole-dipole, and Schlumberger electrode arrays with 1 m spacing and 10 pseudosection levels. Relative elevation for the topography correction was collected at a centimeter resolution for each electrode location. The apparent resistivities were inverted using the Boundless Electrical Resistivity Tomography (BERT) software (Günther et al., 2006). For the inversion, the datasets for the three arrays were combined to maximize the accuracy of the reconstruction (Friedel et al., 2006).

To help constrain the depths of soil, saprolite, and weathered bedrock, we conducted a seismic survey in September 2014 along the ERT transect. The seismic array consisted of four 24-channel Geode seismographs (Geometrics, San Jose, California, USA) with 10 Hz geophones at 1 m spacing. The seismic source was a 10 lb sledge hammer struck against an aluminum plate every 5 m. First arrival travel times were inverted using a fat-ray wavepath eikonal travel time inversion (Schuster and Quintus-Bosz, 1993) with the Rayfract software package (RAYFRACT,

Vancouver, Canada). We assumed $2,000 \text{ m sec}^{-1}$ as the boundary between saprolite and moderately weathered bedrock (Begonha and Braga, 2002; Olona et al., 2010; Befus et al., 2011; Holbrook et al., 2013) and 700 m sec^{-1} was a cutoff for soil to saprolite layer (Befus et al., 2011). Although these studies were all in granitic systems, unweathered granite has a seismic velocity of $4600 - 6000 \text{ m sec}^{-1}$, whereas unweathered basalt has $5400 - 6400 \text{ m sec}^{-1}$ (Press, 1966). Due to the similarity of seismic velocities of unweathered granite and basalt, and with a lack of data regarding velocities in landscapes derived from flood basalt parent material, we therefore assume the velocities within the weathered states (i.e. soil, saprolite, weathered bedrock) of granite and basalt are similar.

We validated the ERT and EMI surveys by comparing the August 2013 ERT and EMI surveys. We averaged the resistivity values from the top 1.5 m of the ERT inversion and the interpolated EMI₁₅₀ data that overlapped the ERT transect.

3. Results

3.1 Soil properties

The soil in the plot was predominantly fine-textured soil with the average clay content of 35% for the top 10 cm and 53% over the entire soil profile (0 to 90 cm). SOM was low at 0.03 g cm^{-3} and 0.02 g cm^{-3} in the top 10 cm and entire soil profile, respectively. Average soil column bulk density was 1.14 g cm^{-3} . These soils are non-saline, having an average EC_e of 0.63 dS m^{-1} for the entire soil profile.

3.2 Soil moisture

Figures 2B and 2C show the summer dry down in soil moisture occurring at similar periods at shallow soil depths (15 cm) but occurring earlier in interspaces both under low and

high density juniper stands. Based on a Wilcoxon rank-sum test, the canopy and interspace day_{50%} at 15 cm were May 22nd and 27th, respectively and did not statistically differ ($p = 0.58$). Conversely, at 60 cm the soil moisture dried out later under the canopy with a day_{50%} of July 14th compared to June 22nd in the interspace, which were statistically different ($p = 0.05$).

< Figure 2 here please >

In Figure 3, we see that precipitation event size drives $\Delta\theta_{15}$ and $\Delta\theta_{60}$, but varies between these two depths and with location (canopy vs. interspace). These data included 148 discernable rain events over the measurement period, the total of which was 264 mm. The median event was 4.6 mm, and the upper tertile ranged from 5.9 mm to 29.6 mm, comprising 64% of the total precipitation. A Wilcoxon rank-sum tests between canopy and interspace for $\Delta\theta_{15}$ and $\Delta\theta_{60}$ for this upper P_G tertile was only significant for $\Delta\theta_{60}$ ($p = 0.02$) with $\Delta\theta_{60}$ under the canopy increasing more after rainfall than interspace $\Delta\theta_{60}$. Conversely, although the average interspace $\Delta\theta_{15}$ was slightly larger than the canopy $\Delta\theta_{15}$ for events in the upper P_G tertile, the difference was not statistically significant ($p = 0.52$). Despite this result, by subtracting the interspace $\Delta\theta_{15}$ from the tree $\Delta\theta_{15}$ and separating the data by the location of the tree (low density and high density juniper areas), Figure 4 reveals a clear difference in moisture dynamics. For small events ($P_G < 5.9$ mm), the difference is negligible. But for larger events ($P_G > 5.9$ mm), tree $\Delta\theta_{15}$ increases more for canopy-interspace pairs in high density juniper where sagebrush density is lower (Fig. 4). Conversely, interspace $\Delta\theta_{15}$ for larger events increases more in canopy-interspace pairs in low density juniper with higher density sagebrush (Fig. 4). A non-parametric ANOVA with the difference in interspace and canopy $\Delta\theta_{15}$ as the dependent variable, and log P_G and juniper density (low or high) as independent variables, juniper density ($p = 0.003$) and the interaction term ($p = 0.0009$) were statistically significant, but log P_G was not ($p = 0.18$).

< Figure 3 here please >

< Figure 4 here please >

The regression tree (supplemental Figure 2) confirms the importance of P_G in driving changes in soil moisture, since it is in all three nodes in the $\Delta\theta_{60}$ regression tree and the root node in the $\Delta\theta_{15}$ regression tree. Increases in soil moisture increase with P_{int} , although this is likely in part related to the fact that P_{int} is linearly correlated with P_G ($R^2 = 0.60$, $p < 0.0001$). P_{int} was also retained in the $\Delta\theta_{15}$ tree, although it was a tertiary node and for low $\Delta\theta_{15}$ values. For large rainfall events in the $\Delta\theta_{15}$ tree, VPD was a secondary node where greater VPD decreased $\Delta\theta_{15}$.

3.3 Electromagnetic Induction

Figure 5 shows that as the dry season progresses, EC_a gradually decreases in both shallow and deeper layers in the soil. The median for both the EMI_{75} (0 – 75 cm) and EMI_{150} (0 – 150 cm) configurations declined almost by half from May to September, going from 28.6 to 12.0 $mS\ m^{-1}$ and from 41.5 to 21.6 $mS\ m^{-1}$, respectively. The frequency distribution of EC_a further narrowed as the dry season progressed (Fig. 5), with the interquartile range shrinking in both the EMI_{75} from 17.6 to 7.3 $mS\ m^{-1}$ and in the EMI_{150} from 23.2 $mS\ m^{-1}$ to 12 $mS\ m^{-1}$. Interestingly, despite an 18 mm precipitation event a day before the September survey, all quartile values decreased across the surveys in both the EMI_{75} and EMI_{150} .

< Figure 5 here please >

Univariate data analysis of EC_a and soil properties showed that the greatest correlation with EC_a was a negative correlation with sand content ($R^2 = 0.92$) (see supplemental Figure 3). EC_a was positively correlated with θ and clay content (supplemental Figure 3). On the other hand, rock content, which ranged from 0 to 35%, was not well correlated with EC_a . Considering

that soil moisture is the only time-variable property significantly correlated with EC_a , we reason that temporal changes in EC_a are a good predictor of θ changes across the study site.

For the kriged predictor variables, snow water equivalent ranged from 0 cm to 29 cm and the average for pixels with snow was 8.05 cm. WHC in the top 150 cm of the soil ranged from 43.2 cm to 67.2 cm and the mean was 52.0 cm. LiDAR derived vegetation canopy height ranged from 0 to 9.6 m, the mean for pixels greater than 1 m (i.e. pixels with juniper tree present) was 2.8 m.

We used fitted semivariogram models to interpolate EC_a measurements using spherical and Stein models (for semivariogram parameters see Table 1). The maps shown in Figure 6 revealed consistently higher EC_a in both EMI_{75} and EMI_{150} in the lower juniper density area of the plot compared to the higher density juniper area. Areas with high conductivity were areas with high clay content and low rock content, and conversely areas with low conductivity were areas with lower clay content and higher rock content. These areas in the southern part of the plot had EC_a lower than 40 mS m^{-1} for the EMI_{150} throughout the study period. The dry stream channel in the middle of the transect for the EMI_{150} shifted from high conductivity ($> 100 \text{ mS m}^{-1}$) to low conductivity ($< 50 \text{ mS m}^{-1}$).

< Figure 6 here please >

< Table 1 here please >

Comparisons of seasonal changes in EC_a with interpolated snow depth, WHC, and canopy height revealed that WHC was most strongly correlated with ΔEC_a (Table 2). WHC was significant for all models ($p < 0.001$). Canopy height was only significant ($p < 0.1$) for the EMI_{75} configuration from May to June and June to August, and the relationship changed from

positively correlated to negatively correlated respectively (Table 2). Snow was a significant ($p < 0.05$) variable for EMI_{75} for the May to September model.

< Table 2 here please >

Comparing the seasonal change in EC_a in EMI_{150} to presence of juniper canopy, there was a statistically significant, but weak correlation between the canopy height and the change in EC_a from August to September (Fig. 7B). For a linear regression between the change in EC_a from August to September vs. canopy height, the slope was $-0.029 \ln EC_a [mS m^{-1}] m^{-1}$ and the relationship was significant ($p < 0.0001$), although the correlation was poor ($R^2 = 0.02$). This indicates that for the change in EC_a for the EMI_{150} configuration, the larger the adjacent canopy height was, the greater the reduction in EC_a between August and September. Conversely, for the EC_a from May to September, there is no apparent correlation between the change in EC_a and proximity to juniper trees (Fig. 7A).

< Figure 7 here please >

3.4 Electrical Resistivity and Seismic Tomography

Dominant plant cover and seismic and ERT inversion results are depicted in Figure 8. Along the ERT transect, total canopy coverage (m^2) of all trees within 5 m of the transect per 1 m of transect was greater in the high density juniper area (0 – 35 m) at $5.1 m^2 m^{-1}$, compared to $1.7 m^2 m^{-1}$ in the low density juniper area (60 – 100 m) (Fig. 8A). Furthermore, the total cumulative height of all junipers within 2 m of the transect is 36.3 m in the high density area and 10.7 m in the low density juniper area. The number of sagebrush in the high density juniper area was $0.49 shrubs m^{-2}$ compared to $1.93 shrubs m^{-2}$ in the low density juniper area (Fig. 8A).

< Figure 8 here please >

The seismic data along the same transect was interpreted to show a relatively consistent boundary between soil and saprolite and a varying boundary between saprolite and weathered bedrock (Fig. 8B, 9). The depth of the soil ranged from 1.3 m to 3.0 m and was on average 2.1 m in the high density juniper segment of the transect (0 – 35 m) and 1.7 m in the low density juniper segment of the transect (60 – 100 m, Fig. 8B, 9). The interpreted average saprolite and weathered bedrock boundary was 12.9 m (Fig. 8B, 9). This interpreted depth below the high density and low density juniper areas, however, was deeper at 15.4 m and 13.4 m respectively. The interpreted saprolite and weathered bedrock boundary was shallowest near the dry stream channel (as shallow as 8.0 m).

< Figure 9 here please >

Time-lapse ERT surveys during wet (May) and dry (August) revealed areas of both low and high resistivity (Fig. 8C,D). Much of the high density juniper area was dominated by low resistivity subsurface values. Conversely, much of the low density juniper area was dominated by high resistivity values. However, the differences between the wet and the dry ERT surveys produced the most consistent increase in resistivity in the high density juniper area (0 – 35 m, Fig. 8E, Fig. 9). Comparing the change in resistivity averaged over the high density juniper area (0 – 35 m) and low density juniper area (60 – 100 m), Figure 10A shows that this relationship persists across all depths measured. The greatest change in resistivity for both low and high density juniper areas was at 4 – 6 m depths (Fig. 10A). Conversely, the lowest changes in resistivity in both areas were in shallow (< 2 m) and deep (> 10 m) depths. Furthermore, in Figure 9, increases in subsurface resistivity are more evident either directly under a clump of medium trees (15 – 35 m) or in proximity to a large juniper tree (0-5 m; 45-55 m). The presence of trees and change in resistivity is correlated since the subsurface resistivity increase with the

presence of more and taller trees (Fig. 10B). Finally, note that several areas decreased in resistivity between the wet and dry season (Fig. 8E, 9).

< Figure 10 here please >

Confirming the high and low resistivity measurements at the surface along the ERT transect were related to water content changes, the EMI_{150} EC_a interpolated data was well correlated with the top 1.5 m ERT survey, with the slope of $-9.9 \text{ mS log ohm}^{-1}$, at $p < 0.0001$ and $R^2 = 0.70$.

4. Discussion

Our expectation was that soil moisture after rainfall would increase more in the interspace than under the canopy due to canopy interception loss. Statistically there was no difference in the change in shallow moisture ($\Delta\theta_{15}$) after a rainfall event between the canopy and interspace. However, when data from the four trees were separated by trees in low and high density juniper areas, for larger precipitation events ($> 5.9 \text{ mm}$) greater increases in shallow soil moisture (15 cm) was observed in the interspace for low density juniper pairs with more interspace sagebrush and under the canopy in high density juniper pairs with fewer sagebrush in the interspace (Fig. 4). Furthermore, there were considerably greater increases in deeper soil moisture ($\Delta\theta_{60}$) under the canopy (Fig. 3).

At first, these results are counter-intuitive since juniper canopy storage capacity and interception loss is often high in juniper and assumed to be greater than grass or sagebrush species (Eddleman and Miller, 1991; Larsen, 1993; Owens et al., 2006; Kuhn et al., 2007; Ffolliott and Gottfried, 2012). What could lead to this counter-intuitive increase in both shallow and deep moisture below the juniper canopies following rainfall? There are three plausible

causes: 1) hydrophobicity focusing infiltration and allowing it to reach deeper layers, 2) roots and other preferential flowpaths increasing deep infiltration, and 3) increased infiltration due to focused input from stemflow. In regards to the first possible cause, Madsen et al. (2008) and Robinson et al. (2010) both observed elevated soil hydrophobicity compared to the interspace directly under Utah juniper (*Juniperus osteosperma*) and pinyon pine (*Pinus edulis*). We observed hydrophobicity below several juniper canopies at our site (water drop penetration greater than 1 min, data not shown). Although hydrophobic soils may appear to decrease infiltration locally, they can increase preferential infiltration through cracks in the hydrophobic layer (Robinson et al., 2010). Robinson et al. observed preferential flow causing deeper infiltration under tree canopies than in the interspace. Furthermore, in other studies surface infiltration was elevated at the base of shrubs or trees compared to the bare interspace (Johnson and Gordon, 1988; Blackburn et al. 1990; Pierini et al., 2014; Zou et al., 2014). Regarding the second possible cause, roots may facilitate increased infiltration since roots provide “pathways” for water to bypass the soil matrix. Roots have been observed to facilitate deeper infiltration in pinyon and juniper trees (Dasgupta et al., 2006) and in other ecosystems (Johnson and Lehmann, 2006; Niemeyer et al., 2014). Third, stemflow may result in elevated $\Delta\theta$. Stemflow concentrates (funnels) water at the tree base and increases preferential flow (Levia and Germer, 2015). Along a patch-interspace transect, after rainfall Fan et al. (2015) observed a greater increase in interspace water content in the top 1 m, except near the trunk, which they attributed to tree stemflow. However, multiple juniper and pinyon studies have quantified stemflow to be less than 5% of total precipitation (Eddleman and Miller, 1991; Owens et al., 2006).

It is likely that increases in shallow and deep moisture under the canopy after precipitation events are due to increased preferential flow from all three mechanisms. However,

Figure 4 does support root facilitation of preferential flow as the primary mechanism. The four instrumented trees were relatively the same size, therefore stemflow and hydrophobicity were likely similar. The primary difference is the density of sagebrush in the interspace. For tree-interspace pairs with fewer (more) sagebrush, greater increases in below canopy (interspace) shallow moisture occurred (Fig. 4). Therefore, in the areas with more sagebrush and likely more roots present in the soil, the greater the increase in θ . Figure 11 is a conceptual diagram for potentially how above ground cover influence below ground hydrologic processes. Semi-arid trees intercept more water than the interspace (Eddleman, 1986; Eddleman and Miller, 1991; Taucer, 2006; Owens et al., 2006), and this likely results in a greater amount of total infiltration into the surface of the soil in the interspace. Infiltration beyond the very shallow subsurface (< 10 cm) after large precipitation events is greater in the interspace than under the canopy when the interspace has a higher density of sagebrush, but greater under the canopy compared to an interspace with a lower density of sagebrush (Fig. 4). For large events, infiltration likely penetrates to greater depths (> 15 cm) in the soil profile under the canopy (Fig. 3B), due in part to preferential infiltration pathways along roots, hydrophobic soils, and a small amount of stemflow. Finally, deep tree roots both increase moisture movement to deeper layers and allow for moisture uptake from deeper layers in soil and saprolite at a later time.

< Figure 11 here please >

The observation that $\text{day}_{50\%}$ in the interspace at 15 and 60 cm occurs earlier than under the canopy was also noted by other studies. During two years of soil moisture data collection, Young et al. (1984) similarly found that soil moisture at 7.5 cm depth below juniper trees was depleted more slowly than in the interspace. Breshears et al. (1998) modeled soil moisture at 2 cm based on soil temperatures and observed drying to occur earlier in the interspace than under

the tree canopy. Interestingly, Roundy et al. (2014) in their measurements in the top 30 cm observed more days with a matric potential greater than -1.5 MPa after a juniper removal treatment (chaining and burning) compared to control plots with juniper. However, their study only assessed affects after 3 years of treatment. A longer time period after treatment with greater increases in herbaceous cover may decrease the differences between the control and treatment.

Studies using EMI or ERT to assess subsurface hydrologic patterns between paired patch and interspace are summarized in Table 3. Our study confirmed and expanded upon some of these studies. The EMI surveys in our study revealed that soil moisture in the upper 150 cm is driven both by soil factors, seasonality of precipitation, and presence of juniper trees. First, EC_a was positively correlated with clay content and negatively correlated with sand content (supplemental Figure 3), both principal determinants in WHC. Second, of the variables selected in this study, WHC was most strongly correlated with temporal changes in EC_a (Table 2). In addition, some aspects of the plot drove temporal shifts in EC_a . Similar to Western et al. (1999), when soils were near their peak moisture content, EC_a was more variable and more elevated around the intermittent stream channel (Fig. 6). The observation that there is no clear spatial pattern around tree locations and stand density in the change in EC_a from May to September (Fig. 7A, Table 2) could be that principal differences in soil moisture change is at deeper (> 150 cm) layers (Gifford and Shaw, 1973). This is supported by the result there were only small absolute differences between the tree and interspace $\Delta\theta_{15}$ from May to August (Fig. 2). The ΔEC_a from August to September was correlated with proximity to larger trees (Fig. 7B), although canopy height was not significant in the generalized least squares model (Table 2). Finally, some areas saw an increase ΔEC_a in the later month (Fig. 7B). Similarly, some areas in the ERT survey saw a decrease in resistivity (Fig. 8E, 9). This could be due to subsurface ion

accumulation (Friedman, 2005). Regardless, temporal patterns in ΔEC_a are associated with shifts in seasonal moisture.

< Table 3 here please >

The ERT surveys suggest that both large juniper and medium juniper clusters result in extraction of moisture from as deep as 12 m (Fig. 9, 10A). These results are not surprising considering juniper initially develop deep tap roots and then add above ground biomass (Young et al., 1984; Kramer, 1990; Barrett, 2007). Roots can both facilitate moisture movement to deep layers since infiltrating water often follows large roots (Johnson and Lehmann, 2006; Niemeyer et al., 2014) and extract deep moisture from those deep layers. There is a call by many to retain any junipers that are older than 150 years and pre-date euro-American settlement (Miller et al., 2005). Regardless of reasons for preserving or removing these trees, our study suggests that large juniper trees do extract subsurface moisture both in layers as deep as 12 m (Fig. 9) and potentially laterally beyond their canopy (Fig. 7B).

5. Conclusion

To understand how the presence and absence of individual trees across a landscape alter the hydrologic cycle, our study used both continuous shallow (< 60 cm) measurements and periodic deep (0.5 – 12 m) geophysical surveys to assess how subsurface moisture dynamics differ between juniper (canopy) and sagebrush (interspace). Our study is novel in that the maximum depth of exploration was 7 m deeper than the previously deepest study in a semi-arid patch-interspace setting (Table 3). This research revealed a counter-intuitive relationship between juniper and soil moisture: that soil moisture penetrates deeper and in greater amounts under the canopy than in the interspace where fewer sagebrush exist. Furthermore, it can be

inferred from our results that semi-arid woody plants have the potential to transpire subsurface moisture from deep layers, as well as facilitate its transport to those layers for storage.

Our study also demonstrates what other observational field studies have shown, that juniper thrive on rocky soils with low WHC (Miller et al., 2005). Studies of western juniper have observed that during pre-Euro-American settlement in the western USA, the trees were predominantly found on rocky ridge tops where fire does not propagate as easily. Likely these areas have lower WHC than soil in the mid-slope and valley and must extract water from deeper saprolite and weathered bedrock. Our study provides process-based evidence that indeed juniper trees extract water from deeper, non-soil layers. Interpolated WHC data revealed lower WHC in the upper 90 cm of the soil in the dense juniper area than the sparse juniper areas (Table 2). This suggests that the soil moisture required to sustain the juniper in the dense area must be obtained from deeper layers, both because of lower WHC in the upper 90 cm and because the trees are denser (i.e., increased transpiration demand). Deep moisture extraction by juniper means it may be more drought-tolerant than other species (Anderegg et al., 2013).

There still remains a need for future research in understanding the impact of land cover change on subsurface moisture. Most studies of woody plants in semi-arid regions have focused on shallow moisture layers (Breshears et al., 1997a; Robinson et al., 2010; Roundy et al., 2014). Deep moisture is important – often controlling streamflow generation (Carey et al., 2010; Chauvin et al., 2011; Gabrielli et al., 2012) and moderating drought impacts on vegetation (Anderegg et al., 2013). Our study revealed canopy patch and interspace shallow soil moisture regimes (i.e. at 15 cm) are quite similar, but deeper layer moisture dynamics are controlled by juniper trees. Future studies can further increase our understanding of how woody plant cover alters deep moisture in different climates and juniper densities, as well as what horizontal

distances and depths do individual woody plants access moisture, since juniper roots have been found to have lateral roots that extend well past the canopy edge (Barrett, 2007). As drought risk and precipitation intensity increases with a changing climate (Abatzoglou and Kolden 2011; Kumar et al., 2012), there is greater need to understand how much deep moisture trees transpire and how this affects streamflow generation and drought resilience in a changing climate. Despite these knowledge gaps, it is clear that semi-arid trees alter the subsurface moisture regime at depth and substantially impact the terrestrial hydrologic cycle of these systems.

Acknowledgement

The authors wish to thank Rebecca Niemeyer, Lucy Holtsnider, Jim Hoppie, Steve Van Vactor, and Mark Murdock for their help with fieldwork. We thank John Bradford for help conducting the seismic survey. We thank the Boise USDA-ARS unit who supplied transportation, accommodation, data and field support. We thank Ian Leslie and Anita Falen for help with soil sample processing. We would like to thank Wade Tinkham, Linda Tedrow, and Idaho EPSCoR for help with LiDAR processing. We thank the Reynolds Creek CZO NSF (EAR 1331872) for their field and data support. This work was funded by the National Science Foundation's IGERT (Award 0903479) and CBET (Award 0854553) programs, and the United States Geological Survey's Northwest Climate Science Center Doctoral Fellowship. We would also like to thank two anonymous reviewers for their helpful comments that improved the manuscript.

References

- Abatzoglou, J.T., Kolden, C.A., 2011. Climate change in western US deserts: potential for increased wildfire and invasive annual grasses. *Rangel. Ecol. Manag.* 64, 471–478.
- Abdu, H., Robinson, D.A., Seyfried, M., Jones, S.B., 2008. Geophysical imaging of watershed subsurface patterns and prediction of soil texture and water holding capacity. *Water Resour. Res.* 44, W00D18.
- Anderegg, L.D., Anderegg, W.R., Berry, J.A., 2013. Not all droughts are created equal: translating meteorological drought into woody plant mortality. *Tree Physiol.* 33, 672–683.
- Anderson, S.P., von Blanckenburg, F., White, A.F., 2007. Physical and chemical controls on the Critical Zone. *Elements.* 3, 315–319.
- Armas C., Padilla, F.M., Pugnaire, F.I., Jackson, R.B., 2010. Hydraulic lift and tolerance to salinity of semiarid species: consequences for species interactions. *Oecologia.* 162, 11–21.
- Baker Jr, M.B., 1984. Changes in streamflow in an herbicide-treated pinyon-juniper watershed in Arizona. *Water Resour. Res.* 20, 1639–1642.
- Baker Jr, M.B., Ffolliott, P.F., 2000. Contributions of watershed management research to ecosystem-based management in the Colorado River Basin. *Land Steward. 21st Century Contrib. Watershed Manag. Proc. RMRS-P-13 USDA For. Serv.* 117–128.
- Barrett, H., 2007. Western juniper management: a field guide. Oregon Watershed Enhancement Board.

683 Befus, K.M., Sheehan, A.F., Leopold, M., Anderson, S.P., Anderson, R.S., 2011. Seismic
 684 constraints on critical zone architecture, Boulder Creek watershed, Front Range,
 685 Colorado. *Vadose Zone J.* 10, 915–927.

686 Begonha, A., Braga, M.S., 2002. Weathering of the Oporto granite: geotechnical and physical
 687 properties. *Catena*. 49, 57–76.

688 Berghuijs, W.R., Woods, R.A., Hrachowitz, M., 2014. A precipitation shift from snow towards
 689 rain leads to a decrease in streamflow. *Nat. Clim. Change* 4, 583–586.

690 Blackburn, W.H., Pierson, F.B., Seyfried, M.S., 1990. Spatial and temporal influence of soil frost
 691 on infiltration and erosion of sagebrush rangelands. *Water Resour. Bull.* 26, 991–997.

692 Bosch, J.M., Hewlett, J.D., 1982. A review of catchment experiments to determine the effect of
 693 vegetation changes on water yield and evapotranspiration. *J. Hydrol.* 55, 3–23.

694 Breiman, L., Friedman, J., Stone, C.J., Olshen, R.A., 1984. Classification and regression trees.
 695 CRC press.

696 Breshears, D.D., Myers, O.B., Johnson, S.R., Meyer, C.W., Martens, S.N., 1997a. Differential
 697 Use of Spatially Heterogeneous Soil Moisture by Two Semiarid Woody Species: *Pinus*
 698 *Edulis* and *Juniperus Monosperma*. *J. Ecol.* 85, 289–299.

699 Breshears, D.D., Rich, P.M., Barnes, F.J., Campbell, K., 1997b. Overstory-imposed
 700 heterogeneity in solar radiation and soil moisture in a semiarid woodland. *Ecol. Appl.* 7,
 701 1201–1215.

702 Breshears, D.D., Nyhan, J.W., Heil, C.E., Wilcox, B.P., 1998. Effects of woody plants on
703 microclimate in a semiarid woodland: soil temperature and evaporation in canopy and
704 intercanopy patches. *Int. J. Plant Sci.* 159, 1010–1017.

705 Breshears, D.D., Myers, O.B., Barnes, F.J., 2009. Horizontal heterogeneity in the frequency of
706 plant- available water with woodland intercanopy–canopy vegetation patch type rivals
707 that occurring vertically by soil depth. *Ecohydrology.* 2, 503–519.

708 Bureau of Land Management, 2015. Notice of Intent To Prepare an Environmental Impact
709 Statement for the Proposed Bruneau-Owyhee Sage-Grouse Habitat Project, Owyhee
710 County, Idaho.

711 Carey, S.K., Tetzlaff, D., Seibert, J., Soulsby, C., Buttle, J., Laudon, H., McDonnell, J.,
712 McGuire, K., Caissie, D., Shanley, J., Kennedy, M., Devito, K., Pomeroy, J.W., 2010.
713 Inter-comparison of hydro-climatic regimes across northern catchments: synchronicity,
714 resistance and resilience. *Hydrol. Process.* 24, 3591–3602.

715 Chauvin, G., Flerchinger, G., Link, T.E., Marks, D., Winstral, A., Seyfried, M., 2011. Long-term
716 water balance and conceptual model of a semi-arid mountainous catchment. *J. Hydrol.*
717 400, 133–143.

718 Clary, W.P., Baker, M.B., O’Connell, P.F., Johnsen, T.N., Cambell, R.E., 1974. Effects of pinyon-
719 juniper removal on natural resource products and uses in Arizona. USDA–Forest Serv.
720 Res. Pap. RM- 128 Rocky Mt. For. Range Exp. Stn. Ft Collins CO.

721 Corwin, D.L., Lesch, S.M., 2005. Apparent soil electrical conductivity measurements in
722 agriculture. *Comput. Electron. Agric.* 46, 11–43.

723 Creutzburg, M.K., Henderson, E.B., Conklin, D.R., 2015. Climate change and land management
 724 impact rangeland condition and sage-grouse habitat in southeastern Oregon. *AIMS*
 725 *Environ. Sci.* 2, 203-236.

726 Daily, W., Ramirez, A., LaBrecque, D., Nitao, J., 1992. Electrical resistivity tomography of
 727 vadose water movement. *Water Resour. Res.* 28, 1429–1442.

728 Daly, C., Neilson, R.P., Phillips, D.L., 1994. A statistical-topographic model for mapping
 729 climatological precipitation over mountainous terrain. *J. Appl. Meteorol.* 33, 140–158.

730 Dasgupta, S., Mohanty, B.P., Köhne, J.M., 2006. Impacts of juniper vegetation and karst geology
 731 on subsurface flow processes in the Edwards Plateau, Texas. *Vadose Zone J.* 5, 1076–
 732 1085.

733 Dawson, T.E., 1996. Determining water use by trees and forests from isotopic, energy balance
 734 and transpiration analyses: the roles of tree size and hydraulic lift. *Tree Physiol.* 16, 263–
 735 272.

736 Doolittle, J.A., Sudduth, K.A., Kitchen, N.R., Indorante, S.J., 1994. Estimating depths to
 737 claypans using electromagnetic induction methods. *J. Soil Water Conserv.* 49, 572–575.

738 Eddleman, L.E., 1986. Canopy interception of precipitation. Water Resources Research Institute,
 739 Oregon State University.

740 Eddleman, L.E., Miller, P.M., 1991. Potential impacts of western juniper on the hydrologic
 741 cycle. In *Proceedings, symposium in ecology and management of riparian shrub*
 742 *communities.* 29–31.

743 Ekren, E.B., McIntyre, D.H., Bennett, E.H., and Malde, H.E., 1981. Geologic map of Owyhee
 744 County, Idaho, west of longitude 116 degrees W. U.S. Geological Survey Miscellaneous
 745 Investigations Series Map I-1256, 1:125,000.

746 Ffolliott, P.F., Gottfried, G.J., 2012. Hydrologic processes in the pinyon-juniper woodlands: A
 747 literature review. U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Rocky Mountain
 748 Research Station.

749 Flerchinger, G., Saxton, K., 1989. Simultaneous heat and water model of a freezing snow-
 750 residue-soil system I. Theory and development. Trans ASAE. 32, 565–571.

751 Fan, J., Scheuermann, A., Guyot, A., Baumgartl, T., Lockington, D.A., 2015. Quantifying
 752 spatiotemporal dynamics of root-zone soil water in a mixed forest on subtropical coastal
 753 sand dune using surface ERT and spatial TDR. J. Hydrol. 523, 475–488.

754 Franz, T.E., King, E.G., Caylor, K.K., Robinson, D.A., 2011. Coupling vegetation organization
 755 patterns to soil resource heterogeneity in a central Kenyan dryland using geophysical
 756 imagery. Water Resour. Res. 47, W07531.

757 Friedel, S., Thielen, A., Springman, S.M., 2006. Investigation of a slope endangered by rainfall-
 758 induced landslides using 3D resistivity tomography and geotechnical testing. J. Appl.
 759 Phys. 60, 100–114.

760 Friedman, S.E., 2005. Soil properties influencing apparent electrical conductivity: A review.
 761 Comput. Electron. Agric. 46, 45–70.

762 Gabrielli, C.P., McDonnell, J.J., Jarvis, W.T., 2012. The role of bedrock groundwater in rainfall-
 763 runoff response at hillslope and catchment scales. J. Hydrol. 450–451, 117–133.

764 Gee, G.W., Or, D., 2002. Particle-size analysis. In *Methods of soil analysis. Part 4, Physical*
 765 *Methods.* J.H. Dane and Topp, editors. Soil Science Society of America, Madison, WI.
 766 255–293.

767 Gifford, G.F., Shaw, C.B., 1973. Soil moisture patterns on two chained pinyon-juniper sites in
 768 Utah. *J. Range Manag.* 26, 436–440.

769 Goovaerts, P., 1997. *Geostatistics for natural resources evaluation.* Oxford University Press,
 770 New York, NY, USA. 512 pp.

771 Graham, R.C., Rossi, A.M., Hubbert, K.R., 2010. Rock to regolith conversion: Producing
 772 hospitable substrates for terrestrial ecosystems. *GSA Today.* 20, 4–9.

773 Grieu, P., Guehl, J.M., Aussenac, G., 1988. The effects of soil and atmospheric drought on
 774 photosynthesis and stomatal control of gas exchange in three coniferous species. *Physiol.*
 775 *Plant.* 73, 97–104.

776 Guardiola-Claramonte, M., Troch, P.A., Breshears, D.D., Huxman, T.E., Switanek, M.B.,
 777 Durcik, M., Cobb, N.S., 2011. Decreased streamflow in semi-arid basins following
 778 drought-induced tree die-off: A counter-intuitive and indirect climate impact on
 779 hydrology. *J. Hydrol.* 406, 225–233.

780 Günther, T., Rücker, C., Spitzer, K., 2006. Three-dimensional modelling and inversion of DC
 781 resistivity data incorporating topography—II. Inversion. *Geophys. J. Int.* 166, 506–517.

782 Hanson, C.L., 2001. Long-Term Precipitation Database, Reynolds Creek Experimental
 783 Watershed, Idaho, United States. *Water Resour. Res.* 37, 2831–2834.

784 Hibbert, A.R., 1983. Water yield improvement potential by vegetation management on western
785 rangelands. *Water Resour. Bull.* 19, 375–382.

786 Hiemstra, P.H., Pebesma, E.J., Twenhöfel, C.J., Heuvelink, G.B., 2009. Real-time automatic
787 interpolation of ambient gamma dose rates from the Dutch radioactivity monitoring
788 network. *Comput. Geosci.* 35, 1711–1721.

789 Hillel, D., 1980. *Fundamentals of Soil Physics*. Academic Press, New York, NY, USA. 413 pp.

790 Holbrook, W.S., Riebe, C.S., Elwaseif, M., Hayes, J.L., Basler-Reeder, K., Harry, D.L.,
791 Malazian, A., Dosseto, A., Hartsough, P.C., Hopmans, J.W., 2013. Geophysical
792 constraints on deep weathering and water storage potential in the Southern Sierra Critical
793 Zone Observatory. *Earth Surf. Process. Landf.* 39, 366–380.

794 Huang, Y., Wilcox, B.P., Stern, L., Perotto-Baldivieso, H., 2006. Springs on rangelands: runoff
795 dynamics and influence of woody plant cover. *Hydrol. Process.* 20, 3277–3288.

796 Hudak, A.T., Lefsky, M.A., Cohen, W.B., Berterretche, M., 2002. Integration of lidar and
797 Landsat ETM+ data for estimating and mapping forest canopy height. *Remote Sens.*
798 *Environ.* 82, 397–416.

799 Jayawickreme, D.H., Van Dam, R.L., Hyndman, D.W., 2008. Subsurface imaging of vegetation,
800 climate, and root-zone moisture interactions. *Geophys. Res. Lett.* 35, L18404.

801 Johnson, C.W., Gordon, N.D., 1988. Runoff and erosion from rainfall simulator plots on
802 sagebrush rangeland. *T. ASABE* 31, 421–427.

803 Johnson, M.S., Lehmann, J., 2006. Double-funneling of trees: Stemflow and root-induced
804 preferential flow. *Ecoscience*. 13, 324–333.

805 Kachanoski, R.G., de Jong, E., 1988. Scale dependence and the temporal persistence of spatial
806 patterns of soil water storage. *Water Resour. Res.* 24, 85–91.

807 Kramer, S., 1990. Development and morphology of juvenile western juniper (*Juniperus*
808 *occidentalis* Hook.). Oregon State University.

809 Kuhn, T., Cao, D., George, M., 2007. Juniper removal may not increase overall Klamath River
810 Basin water yields. *Calif. Agric.* 61, 166–171.

811 Kumar, M., Wang, R., Link, T.E., 2012. Effects of more extreme precipitation regimes on
812 maximum seasonal snow water equivalent. *Geophys. Res. Lett.* 39, L20504.

813 Larsen, R.E., 1993. Interception and water holding capacity of western juniper. Oregon State
814 University.

815 Lesch, S.M., Rhoades, J.D., Corwin, D.L., 2000. ESAP-95 version 2.01 R. User manual and
816 tutorial guide. Res. Rpt. 146.

817 Levia, D.F., Germer, S., 2015. A review of stemflow generation dynamics and
818 stemflow- environment interactions in forests and shrublands. *Rev. Geophys.* 53, 673-
819 714.

820 Littell, J.S., Peterson, D.L., Tjoelker, M., 2008. Douglas-fir growth in mountain ecosystems:
821 water limits tree growth from stand to region. *Ecol. Monogr.* 78, 349–368.

822 Loik, M.E., Breshears, D.D., Lauenroth, W.K., Belnap, J., 2004. A multi-scale perspective of
823 water pulses in dryland ecosystems: climatology and ecohydrology of the western USA.
824 *Oecologia* 141, 269–281.

825 Madsen, M.D., Chandler, D.G., Belnap, J., 2008. Spatial gradients in ecohydrologic properties
826 within a pinyon-juniper ecosystem. *Ecohydrology* 1, 349–360.

827 Martens, S.N., Breshears, D.D., Meyer, C.W., 2000. Spatial distributions of understory light
828 along the grassland/forest continuum: effects of cover, height, and spatial pattern of tree
829 canopies. *Ecol. Model.* 126, 79–93.

830 McKean, J.W. Vidmar, T.J., 1994. A Comparison of Two Rank-Based Methods for the Analysis
831 of Linear Models. *Am. Stat.* 48, 220–229.

832 McNeill, J.D., 1980. Electromagnetic terrain conductivity measurement at low induction
833 numbers. Geonics Limited, Ontario, CA.

834 Miller, R.F., Bates, J.D., Svejcar, T.J., Pierson, F.B., Eddleman, L.E., 2005. Biology, ecology,
835 and management of western juniper (*Juniperus occidentalis*). Corvallis USA Or. State
836 Univ. Agric. Exp. Stn. Tech. Bull.

837 Nelson, D.W., Sommers, L.E., Sparks, D.L., Page, A.L., Helmke, P.A., Loeppert, R.H.,
838 Soltanpour, P.N., Tabatabai, M.A., Johnston, C.T., Sumner, M.E., others, 1996. Total
839 carbon, organic carbon, and organic matter. *Methods Soil Anal. Part 3-Chem. Methods.*
840 961–1010.

841 Niemeyer, R.J., Fremier, A.K., Heinse, R., Chávez, W., DeClerck, F.A.J., 2014. Woody
842 vegetation increases saturated hydraulic conductivity in dry tropical Nicaragua. *Vadose*
843 *Zone J.* 13, 1–11.

844 Niemeyer, R.J., Link, T.E., Seyfried, M.S., Flerchinger, G.L., 2016. Surface water input from
845 snowmelt and rain throughfall in western juniper: Potential impacts of climate change
846 and shifts in semi-arid vegetation. *Hydrol. Process.* doi: 10.1002/hyp.10845.

847 Olona, J., Pulgar, J.A., Fernandez-Viejo, G., Lopez-Fernandez, C., Gonzalez-Cortina, J.M.,
848 2010. Weathering variations in a granitic massif and related geotechnical properties
849 through seismic and electrical resistivity methods. *Surf. Geophys.* 8, 585–599.

850 Owens, M.K., Lyons, R.K., Alejandro, C.L., 2006. Rainfall partitioning within semiarid juniper
851 communities: effects of event size and canopy cover. *Hydrol. Process.* 20, 3179–3189.

852 Padien, D.J., Lajtha, K., 1992. Plant spatial pattern and nutrient distribution in pinyon-juniper
853 woodlands along an elevational gradient in northern New Mexico. *Int. J. Plant Sci.* 425–
854 433.

855 Parsekian, A.D., Singha, K., Minsley, B.J., Holbrook, W.S., Slater, L., 2015. Multiscale
856 geophysical imaging of the critical zone, *Rev. Geophys.* 53, 1–26.

857 Peláez, D.V., Distel, R.A., Bóo, R.M., Elia, O.R., Mayor, M.D., 1994. Water relations between
858 shrubs and grasses in semi-arid Argentina. *J. Arid Environ.* 27, 71–78.

859 Penna, D., Brocca, L., Borga, M., Dalla Fontana, G., 2013. Soil moisture temporal stability at
860 different depths on two alpine hillslopes during wet and dry periods. *J. Hydrol.* 477, 55–
861 71.

862 Pierini, N.A., Vivoni, E.R., Robles-Morua, A., Scott, R.L. & Nearing, M.A., 2014. Using
863 observations and a distributed hydrologic model to explore runoff thresholds linked with
864 mesquite encroachment in the Sonoran Desert. *Water Resour. Res.* 50, WR015781.

865 Press, F., 1966. Seismic velocities. In: Clarke, S.P. (Eds.) *Handbook of Physical Constants-*
866 *Revised Edition.* Geological Society of American Memoir 97, New York, New York,
867 USA. 195-218.

868 Qiao, L., Zou, C.B., Will, R.E., Stebler, E., 2015. Calibration of SWAT model for woody plant
869 encroachment using paired experimental watershed data. *J. Hydrol.* 523, 231–239.

870 Reedy, R.C., Scanlon, B.R., 2003. Soil water content monitoring using electromagnetic
871 induction. *J. Geotech. Geoenvironmental Eng.* 129, 1028–1039.

872 Robinson, D.A., Campbell, C.S., Hopmans, J.W., Hornbuckle, B.K., Jones, S.B., Knight, R.,
873 Ogden, F., Selker, J., Wendroth, O., 2008. Soil moisture measurement for ecological and
874 hydrological watershed-scale observatories: A review. *Vadose Zone J.* 7, 358–389.

875 Robinson, D.A.L., Ryel, I., Jones, R.J., Scott, B., 2010. Soil water repellency: A method of soil
876 moisture sequestration in pinyon–juniper woodland. *Soil Sci. Soc. Am. J.* 74, 624–634.

877 Romme, W.H., Allen, C.D., Bailey, J.D., Baker, W.L., Bestelmeyer, B.T., Brown, P.M.,
878 Eisenhart, K.S., Floyd, M.L., Huffman, D.W., Jacobs, B.F., others, 2009. Historical and

879 modern disturbance regimes, stand structures, and landscape dynamics in pinon-juniper
880 vegetation of the western United States. *Rangel. Ecol. Manag.* 62, 203–222.

881 Roundy, B.A., Young, K., Cline, N., Hulet, A., Miller, R.F., Tausch, R.J., Chambers, J.C., Rau,
882 B., 2014. Piñon-juniper reduction increases soil water availability of the resource growth
883 pool. *Rangel. Ecol. Manag.* 67, 495–505.

884 Ryel, R.J., Ivans, C.Y., Peek, M.S., Leffler, A.J., 2008. Functional Differences in Soil Water
885 Pools: a New Perspective on Plant Water Use in Water-Limited Ecosystems. In *Progress*
886 *in Botany*. U. Lüttge, W. Beyschlag, and J. Murata, editors. Springer Berlin Heidelberg,
887 Berlin, Heidelberg. 397–422.

888 Sala, O.E., Golluscio, R.A., Lauenroth, W.K., Soriano, A., 1989. Resource Partitioning between
889 Shrubs and Grasses in the Patagonian Steppe. *Oecologia*. 81, 501–505.

890 Sankey, T.T., Glenn, N., Ehinger, S., Boehm, A., Hardegree, S., 2010. Characterizing western
891 juniper expansion via a fusion of Landsat 5 Thematic Mapper and lidar data. *Rangel.*
892 *Ecol. Manag.* 63, 514–523.

893 Schaap, M.G., Leij, F.J., van Genuchten, M.T., 2001. ROSETTA: a computer program for
894 estimating soil hydraulic parameters with hierarchical pedotransfer functions. *J. Hydrol.*
895 251, 163–176.

896 Schuster, G.T., Quintus-Bosz, A., 1993. Wavepath eikonal traveltime inversion: Theory.
897 *Geophysics*. 58, 1314–1323.

898 Schwinning, S., Sala, O., 2004. Hierarchy of responses to resource pulses in arid and semi-arid
899 ecosystems. *Oecologia*. 141, 211–220.

900 Schwinning, S., 2010. The ecohydrology of roots in rocks. *Ecohydrology*, 3, 238–245.

901 Seyfried, M.S., Harris, R., Marks, D., Jacob, B., 2001. Geographic database, Reynolds Creek
 902 Experimental Watershed, Idaho, United States. *Water Resour. Res.* 37, 2825–2829.

903 Seyfried, M.S., Schwinning, S., Walvoord, M.A., Pockman, W.T., Newman, B.D., Jackson,
 904 R.B., Phillips, F.M., 2005. Ecohydrological control of deep drainage in arid and semiarid
 905 regions. *Ecology*. 86, 277–287.

906 Sheets, K.R., Hendrickx, J.M., 1995. Noninvasive soil water content measurement using
 907 electromagnetic induction. *Water Resour. Res.* 31, 2401–2409.

908 Sherlock, M.D., McDonnell, J.J., 2003. A new tool for hillslope hydrologists: spatially
 909 distributed groundwater level and soilwater content measured using electromagnetic
 910 induction. *Hydrol. Process.* 17, 1965–1977.

911 Taucer, P.I., 2006. The effects of juniper removal on rainfall partitioning in the Edwards Aquifer
 912 region: large-scale rainfall simulation experiments. Texas A&M University.

913 Tausch, R.J., West, N.E., Nabi, A.A., 1981. Tree age and dominance patterns in Great Basin
 914 pinyon-juniper woodlands. *J. Range Manag.* 34, 259–264.

915 Triantafilis, J., Huckel, A.I., Odeh, I.O.A., 2001. Comparison of statistical prediction methods
 916 for estimating field-scale clay content using different combinations of ancillary variables.
 917 *Soil Sci.* 166, 415–427.

918 Triantafilis, J., Lesch, S.M., 2005. Mapping clay content variation using electromagnetic
 919 induction techniques. *Comput. Electron. Agric.* 46, 203–237.

920 Tromp-van Meerveld, H.J., McDonnell, J.J., 2009. Assessment of multi-frequency
 921 electromagnetic induction for determining soil moisture patterns at the hillslope scale. *J.*
 922 *Hydrol.* 368, 56–67.

923 USDA-NRCS-National Soil Survey Center, 2014. Kellogg Soil Survey Laboratory Methods
 924 Manual. Soil Survey Investigation Report No. 42 (version 5).

925 Walker, B.H., Noy-Meir, I., 1982. Aspects of the stability and resilience of savanna ecosystems.
 926 In: Huntley, B.J., Walker, B.H. (Eds.) *Ecology of tropical savannas*. Springer, Verlag,
 927 Berlin-Heidelberg, Germany. 556–590.

928 West, A.G., Hultine, K.R., Burtch, K.G., Ehleringer, J.R., 2007. Seasonal variations in moisture
 929 use in a piñon–juniper woodland. *Oecologia.* 153, 787–798.

930 Western, A.W., Grayson, R.B., Blöschl, G., Willgoose, G.R., McMahon, T.A., 1999. Observed
 931 spatial organization of soil moisture and its relation to terrain indices. *Water Resour. Res.*
 932 35, 797–810.

933 Wilcox, B.P., Huang, Y., 2010. Woody plant encroachment paradox: Rivers rebound as degraded
 934 grasslands convert to woodlands. *Geophys. Res. Lett.* 37, L07402.

935 Wilcoxon, F., Wilcox, R.A., 1964. Some rapid approximate statistical procedures. *Lederle*
 936 *Laboratories*.

937 Winstral, A., Marks, D., Gurney, R., 2009. An efficient method for distributing wind speeds over
 938 heterogeneous terrain. *Hydrol. Process.* 23, 2526–2535.

939 Young, J.A., Evans, R.A., Easi, D.A., 1984. Stem flow on western juniper (*Juniperus*
940 *occidentalis*) trees. *Weed Sci.* 32, 320–327.

941 Zégre, N., Skaugset, A.E., Som, N.A., McDonnell, J.J., Ganio, L.M., 2010. In lieu of the paired
942 catchment approach: Hydrologic model change detection at the catchment scale. *Water*
943 *Resour. Res.* 46, W11544.

944 Zhou, Q.Y., Shimada, J., Sato, A., 2001. Three-dimensional spatial and temporal monitoring of
945 soil water content using electrical resistivity tomography. *Water Resour. Res.* 37, 273–
946 285.

947 Zou, C.B., Turton, D.J., Will, R.E., Engle, D.M., Fuhlendorf, S.D., 2014. Alteration of
948 hydrological processes and streamflow with juniper (*Juniperus virginiana*) encroachment
949 in a mesic grassland catchment. *Hydrol. Process.* 28, 6173–6182.

950

951 **Table 1:** Semivariogram parameters for fitted EC_a models for both EMI₇₅ and EMI₁₅₀ for each
 952 month.

	EMI ₇₅ (0 – 75 cm)					EMI ₁₅₀ (0 – 150 cm)				
month	model	nugget	range (m)	sill	kappa	model	nugget	sill	range (m)	kappa
May	spherical	0	9.7	0.53	-	Stein	0.03	0.44	19.4	10
June	spherical	0.06	18.1	0.59	-	spherical	0.002	0.62	16.1	-
Aug	Stein	0.03	11.4	0.50	10	Stein	0.03	0.54	11.0	10
Sept	Stein	0.02	12.8	0.47	1.1	Stein	0.01	0.48	14.7	1.6

953

954

Table 2: Multiple generalized least squares regression coefficients for ΔEC_a models for both EMI_{75} and EMI_{150} . Canopy height (CH) is derived from LiDAR data, water holding capacity (WHC) is calculated with a pedotransfer function from interpolated maps of sand and clay, and snow is from interpolated snow surveys.

ΔEC_a model	variables – EMI_{75} (0-75 cm)			variables – EMI_{150} (0-150 cm)		
	CH	WHC	snow	CH	WHC	snow
May – June	0.009+	0.383***	0.0004	-0.003	0.297***	0.0004
June – August	-0.009+	1.743***	-0.003	-0.004	1.406***	-0.001
August – Sept	0.002	0.101***	0.0008	0.002	0.138***	-0.0004
May – Sept	0.001	2.247***	-0.003*	-0.0003	1.848***	-0.002

+p < 0.1, *p > 0.05, **p < 0.01, ***p < 0.001

Table 3: Summary of relevant studies of time-lapse hydrologic dynamics across patch-interspace cover with geophysical methods (the current study is added for completeness). Some studies used electrical magnetic induction (EMI) and some used electrical resistivity tomography (ERT). The vegetation within the patch and interspace are described based on the studies themselves. The ‘key results’ section describe key differences in timing and depth of water use between patches and interspace.

study	geophysical method	location / landscape / study size	patch/ interspace	maximum depth of exploration (m)	key results related to subsurface moisture dynamics
Abdu et al., 2008	EMI	Southwestern Idaho, USA / sagebrush steppe and aspen / 38 ha	patch: aspen or shrubs interspace: grasses	1.5	trees and shrub patches use deeper moisture than interspace due to patches located where soil water holding capacity is high
Jayawickreme et al., 2008	ERT	near East Lansing, Michigan, USA / maple forest and grassland / 125 m transect	patch: maple forest interspace: grassland	5	soil moisture depletion greater and deeper under forest (up to 3 m) compared to grass (< 1 m), late season evapotranspiration occurred in grasses and not forests after tree senescence
Franz et al., 2011	EMI	Central Kenya / degraded savannah / 6.3 ha	patch: succulent interspace: bare or annual grass	1.5	more rapid soil moisture use in grasses than succulents
Fan et al., 2015	ERT	Southeast Queensland, Australia / sand dune area covered by open mixed forests / 22 m transect	patch: exotic slash pine, native wallum banksia interspace: grass	4	in upper 1 m, greater wetting occurred under grasses after rain, greater water depletion occurred under tree patches than interspace grass
This study	ERT, EMI	Southwestern Idaho, USA / sagebrush steppe with western juniper / 1.2 ha, 100 m transect	patch: western juniper interspace: low sagebrush and grasses	12	in top 1.5 m early and mid-summer dry down was similar between tree patches and interspace, but late summer dry down was greater near tree patches, trees extract water at depths up to 12 m

Figure Captions

Figure 1: Aerial photo of study site with elevation contours in meters (black lines), trees with soil moisture probes (blue dots), climate station (yellow triangle), soil sample locations (orange squares), demarcation of dry stream channel (dotted white lines) and ERT transect (solid red line). The map area is the approximate boundary for the EMI survey. The “0” point of the ERT transect is on the east (right) side of the transect.

Figure 2: This figure contains A) snow depth and precipitation per day, volumetric water content at 15 cm (θ_{15}) and 60 (θ_{60}) cm soil depth measured under the canopy and in the interspace at two trees both in the B) low density juniper and C) high density juniper. These θ data are an average for both trees in each density area. Red (orange) arrows indicate when EMI (ERT) surveys occurred.

Figure 3: Plot of change in volumetric water content ($\Delta\theta$) at 15 cm (A) and 60 cm (B) after rainfall events plotted against total event precipitation, colored with average event rainfall intensity.

Figure 4: Difference in the change in volumetric water content at 15 cm ($\Delta\theta_{15}$) between tree and interspace after a single rainfall event. Paired tree and interspace θ_{15} measurements are at the same tree. Tertiles of total event precipitation plotted on the x-axis. For events with values above $y = 0$, increase in θ_{15} was greater under the tree. Events with values below $y = 0$, increase in θ_{15} was greater in the interspace. Green (brown) boxplots indicate high juniper/low sagebrush (low

juniper/high sagebrush) plot areas, respectively. A non-parametric ANOVA revealed that for precipitation events larger than 5.9 mm, low and high juniper are statistically different.

Figure 5: Histograms of EC_a data transformed to a reference $25^{\circ} C$ for both A) EMI_{75} (0 – 75 cm) and B) EMI_{150} (0 – 150 cm) across May, June, August, and September.

Figure 6: Maps of soil apparent electrical conductivity (EC_a , after the normal-score kriged EC_a values had been back transformed) for EMI_{75} (0 – 75 cm) and EMI_{150} (0 – 150 cm) in sequential months from May, June, August, and September, with demarcation of dry stream channel (dotted grey lines).

Figure 7: Change in EC_a (0 to 150 cm, after back transformation of the normal-score kriged EC_a data) from (A) May to September 2014 and (B) August to September 2014, both values normalized (divided by) the September EC_a survey. Tree canopy height (CH) plotted in the background.

Figure 8: This figure shows A) tree location and diameter as well as sagebrush density along the ERT transect, B) inversions of seismic data, C) inversion from ERT survey in May 2014, D) inversion from ERT survey in August 2013, and E) change in resistivity from ERT inversions from May (wet) to August (dry) data. The dry stream channel is at 40 m.

Figure 9: Change in ERT between May and August, with contour lines delineating the soil – saprolite layer (brown line) and the saprolite – weathered bedrock layer (black line), based on

seismic inversion reconstructions. For juniper canopy and trunk (green triangles and brown rectangles) and sagebrush canopy and trunk (teal asterisk and brown “x”), both the canopy height and diameter are plotted approximately to scale. All juniper within 5 m of the ERT transect are plotted.

Figure 10: A) Change in resistivity at depth across the high density juniper (0 – 35 m along transect – green dots) vs. low density juniper (60 – 100 m along transect – brown dots) areas, and B) vertically averaged change in resistivity vs. cumulative tree height within 5 m of surface.

Figure 11: Conceptual figure of throughfall, infiltration, and water uptake processes between the canopy and interspace in low and high density juniper areas.

Figures for Niemeyer et al. “Spatiotemporal soil and saprolite moisture dynamics across a semi-arid woody plant gradient”

Figure 1: Aerial photo of study site with elevation contours in meters (black lines), trees with soil moisture probes (blue dots), climate station (yellow triangle), soil sample locations (orange squares), demarcation of dry stream channel (dotted white lines) and ERT transect (solid red line). The map area is the approximate boundary for the EMI survey. The “0” point of the ERT transect is on the east (right) side of the transect.

Figure 2: This figure contains A) snow depth and precipitation per day, volumetric water content at 15 cm (θ_{15}) and 60 (θ_{60}) cm soil depth measured under the canopy and in the interspace at two trees both in the B) low density juniper and C) high density juniper. These θ data are an average for both trees in each density area. Red (orange) arrows indicate when EMI (ERT) surveys occurred.

Figure 3: Plot of change in volumetric water content ($\Delta\theta$) at 15 cm (A) and 60 cm (B) after rainfall events plotted against total event precipitation, colored with average event rainfall intensity.

Figure 4: Difference in the change in volumetric water content at 15 cm ($\Delta\theta_{15}$) between tree and interspace after a single rainfall event. Paired tree and interspace θ_{15} measurements are at the same tree. Tertiles of total event precipitation plotted on the x-axis. For events with values above $y = 0$, increase in θ_{15} was greater under the tree. Events with values below $y = 0$, increase in θ_{15} was greater in the interspace. Green (brown) boxplots indicate high juniper/low sagebrush (low juniper/high sagebrush) plot areas, respectively. A non-parametric ANOVA revealed that for precipitation events larger than 5.9 mm, low and high juniper are statistically different.

Figure 5: Histograms of EC_a data transformed to a reference 25°C for both A) EMI_{75} (0 – 75 cm) and B) EMI_{150} (0 – 150 cm) across May, June, August, and September.

Figure 6: Maps of soil apparent electrical conductivity (EC_a , after the normal-score kriged EC_a values had been back transformed) for EMI_{75} (0 – 75 cm) and EMI_{150} (0 – 150 cm) in sequential months from May, June, August, and September, with demarcation of dry stream channel (dotted grey lines).

Figure 7: Change in EC_a (0 to 150 cm, after back transformation of the normal-score kriged EC_a data) from (A) May to September 2014 and (B) August to September 2014, both values normalized (divided by) the September EC_a survey. Tree canopy height (CH) plotted in the background.

Figure 8: This figure shows A) tree location and diameter as well as sagebrush density along the ERT transect, B) inversions of seismic data, C) inversion from ERT survey in May 2014, D) inversion from ERT survey in August 2013, and E) change in resistivity from ERT inversions from May (wet) to August (dry) data. The dry stream channel is at 40 m.

Figure 9: Change in ERT between May and August, with contour lines delineating the soil – saprolite layer (brown line) and the saprolite – weathered bedrock layer (black line), based on seismic inversion reconstructions. For juniper canopy and trunk (green triangles and brown rectangles) and sagebrush canopy and trunk (teal asterisk and brown “x”), both the canopy height and diameter are plotted approximately to scale. All juniper within 5 m of the ERT transect are plotted.

Figure 10: A) Change in resistivity at depth across the high density juniper (0 – 35 m along transect – green dots) vs. low density juniper (60 – 100 m along transect – brown dots) areas, and B) vertically averaged change in resistivity vs. cumulative tree height within 5 m of surface.

Figure 11: Conceptual figure of throughfall, infiltration, and water uptake processes between the canopy and interspace in low and high density juniper areas.