Evaluation of Hydrologic Components of Community Land Model4 and Bias Identification

Enhao Du^{1*}, Alan Di Vittorio¹, William D. Collins^{1,2}

1. Climate Science Department, Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory

2. Department of Earth and Planetary Science, University of California,
Berkeley

*Corresponding author:

Enhao Du

Earth Sciences Division

Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory

One Cyclotron Road - M/S 74R316C

Berkeley, California 94720-8268

Phone: +1 805-205-7437

Email: enhaodu@gmail.com

Abstract

Runoff and soil moisture are two key components of the global hydrologic cycle that should be validated at local to global scales in Earth System Models (ESMs) used for climate projection. We have evaluated the runoff and surface soil moisture output by the Community Climate System Model (CCSM) along with 8 other models from the Coupled Model Intercomparison Project (CMIP5) repository using satellite soil moisture observations and stream gauge corrected runoff products. A series of Community Land Model (CLM) runs forced by reanalysis and coupled model outputs was also performed to identify atmospheric drivers of biases and uncertainties in the CCSM. Results indicate that surface soil moisture simulations tend to be positively biased in high latitude areas by most selected CMIP5 models except CCSM, FGOALS, and BCC, which share similar land surface model code. With the exception of GISS, runoff simulations by all selected CMIP5 models were overestimated in mountain ranges and in most of the Arctic region. In general, positive biases in CCSM soil moisture and runoff due to precipitation input error were offset by negative biases induced by temperature input error. Excluding the impact from atmosphere modeling, the global mean of seasonal surface moisture oscillation was out of phase compared to observations in many years during 1985-2004. The CLM also underestimated runoff in the Amazon, central Africa, and south Asia, where soils all have high clay content. We hypothesize that lack of a macropore flow mechanism is partially responsible for this underestimation. However, runoff was

overestimated in the areas covered by volcanic ash soils (i.e. Andisols), which might be associated with poor soil porosity representation in CLM. Our results indicate that CCSM predictability of hydrology could be improved by addressing the compensating errors associated with precipitation and temperature and updating the CLM soil representation.

Key words

CLM4, surface soil moisture, runoff, historical evaluation, bias test

1. Introduction

The Community Land Model (CLM) serves as the land model for the Community Climate System Model (CCSM) [Collins *et al.*, 2006] and includes land biogeophysics, hydrology, and biogeochemistry. Hydrology comprises key processes that link and integrate atmosphere, ocean, vegetation, and human systems. Increasing greenhouse gas concentrations and potential global warming may affect water cycle dynamics, which in turn provide feedbacks to the atmosphere and land surface. As a tool for predicting future states of ecosystems and climate, land surface model development requires rigorous calibration and validation against observations.

The growing demand for assessing the potential impacts of projected climate change on human systems [Field *et al.*, 2014] highlights the importance of understanding surface hydrological responses within fully coupled Earth System Models (ESMs), in addition to evaluating the accuracy of standalone land surface models. While the IPCC AR5 has implemented a new framework for assessing these impacts [Field *et al.*, 2014] a recent study with the newly developed integrated Earth System Model (iESM), which directly couples the Global Change Assessment Model (GCAM) with the Community Earth System Model (CESM) [Collins *et al.*, 2014], has quantified the unintended consequences of not implementing complete consistency among land use and land cover components of the economic Integrated Assessment Models (IAMs) and the biophysical ESMs [Di Vittorio *et al.*, 2014]. The next steps for assessing climate impacts include implementing and examining feedbacks between ESM water supply and IAM water demand and management. In the context of the iESM, closer examination of the surface hydrology of the fully coupled CCSM/CESM will enable development of a more consistent framework for incorporating human-earth water cycle feedbacks into projections of water availability and use.

Runoff is an important component of the hydrological cycle, but runoff trend detection at the global scale is a difficult task. Even the sign of the trends are uncertain, as recent estimates of global runoff trends in the twentieth century from various modeling studies are both positive [Gedney *et al.*, 2006; Labat *et al.*, 2004; Piao *et al.*, 2007] and negative [Dai *et al.*, 2009; Shi *et al.*, 2011]. Positive trends may be a result of increased continental precipitation, stomatal closure due to rising CO₂ concentration, land use changes, or decline of land ice content [Alkama *et al.*, 2013]. Decreasing trends in global runoff could be a consequence of climate forcing changes with minor effects from nitrogen deposition and land use change [Shi *et al.*, 2011]. These uncertainties in runoff simulations are largely due to different model implementations of atmosphere-plant-soil system

interactions and the range in responses from these parameterizations to model-specific climate forcings.

Soil moisture has been demonstrated to affect regional climate via evaporation and evaporative cooling [Seneviratne *et al.*, 2013]. For example, atmospheric circulation over the land surface is largely affected by soil moisture during summer [Owe *et al.*, 2008]. In particular, surface soil moisture controls partitioning between sensible and latent heat, and affects partitioning between overland flow and infiltration [Hou *et al.*, 2012]. However, surface soil moisture is among the most complex hydrologic variables to simulate as it interacts with the atmosphere, plant canopy and roots, and vadose zone. This complexity is likely evidenced by studies showing that peak variability in soil moisture occurs at the surface [Decker and Zeng, 2009].

Our evaluation procedures comply with the benchmarking framework proposed by Luo *et al.* [2012]. We focus on runoff and soil moisture because observation-based, gridded, global datasets have recently become available for these two key hydrologic variables [Fekete and Vorosmarty, 2002; Liu *et al.*, 2012]. Other variables such as river discharge and soil water storage of CLM4 [Lawrence *et al.*, 2011] and earlier versions (3-3.5) were reported to match observations of major basins globally, although the accuracy of timing for simulated hydrologic quantities varied among rivers and areas [Lawrence *et al.*, 2011; Oleson *et al.*, 2008; Qian *et al.*, 2006]. However, CLM4 hydrologic simulations have not been fully assessed at the level of a global grid. Thus, we define a set of metrics including absolute and normalized biases, temporal correlation, and seasonal dynamics to identify model strengths and deficiencies at the grid level. Using these metrics, we identify the contributions of uncertainty from both the atmosphere and the land components of the earth system model to soil moisture and runoff. Based on our evaluation, we propose improvements to the land model hydrology. Our results not only meet evaluation objectives that are coincident with CMIP5 goals [Taylor *et al.*, 2012], they also provide insights toward coupling ESM and IAM water cycles to examine human-earth feedbacks affecting water supply, demand, and management.

2. Datasets and methods

The study was designed as two parts to answer following questions:

1. How well do the fully coupled models, particularly CCSM/CLM, represent the surface soil moisture and runoff? What atmospheric forcings have the greatest influence on these two variables?

The hydrologic simulations of the CMIP5 models are largely dependent on the forcings of various atmosphere models, but the ensemble comparison may still help to reveal areas where hydrology is frequently underrepresented by the earth system models and areas where observations/satellite products have biases.

2. What are the contributions of these dominant forcings to hydrologic biases? How do these biases relate to biases generated by land component? What are the potential modifications for addressing land component – driven biases?

By applying alternate atmospheric forcings, offline CLM simulations help to determine contributions of biases in the coupled model from those driven by the land model component.

2.1 Fully coupled global model outputs

The CCSM version 4.0 (CCSM4) is a coupled climate model for simulating the earth system. The historical model outputs are available from the Climate Model Intercomparison Project Phase 5 (CMIP5) repository. We use outputs from the CCSM4 MOther of All Runs (MOAR) for several reasons. First, MOAR is the historical control run with fixed satellite phenology and hence more realistic interactions between vegetation and hydrological processes than the unconstrained model. This constraint helps us focus on the physical rather than vegetative hydrologic components of version 4 of the land model (CLM4) in CCSM4. The MOAR run is the only century-long ensemble member with sub-daily atmosphere variables, making it possible to perform subsequent offline runs driven by the same set of forcing. Also, the MOAR outputs cover the time period of 1850-2005 that is overlapped with observations.

In CLM4, soil moisture dynamics is controlled by infiltration, runoff (surface and subsurface), gradient diffusion, gravity, and root extraction in a ten-layer model (3.8 m) plus an underlying five-layer aquifer (5 m). The runoff is parameterized as exponential functions of groundwater level [Oleson *et al.*, 2010]. The model has been calibrated and validated against major river discharge and terrestrial water storage observations [Oleson *et al.*, 2008]. Using uncertainty quantification framework, Huang *et al.* [2013] found that subsurface runoff generation and soil texture-related parameters are the most significant to runoff simulations. Details of hydrologic parameterizations in CLM4 can be found in [Huang *et al.*, 2013; Niu *et al.*, 2005; Niu *et al.*, 2007; Oleson *et al.*, 2008]. The choice of CLM4 hydrologic parameters may have considerable impact on the results of runoff and soil moisture, but is not the scope of the study.

We included eight other models from the CMIP5 repository in our comparison with observations: HadCM3, MIROC5, GFDL-CM3, CSIRO-Mk3, BCC-csm1, MRI-ESM1, FGOALS-g2, and GISS-E2-R. The models were selected to meet two criteria: they must have both runoff and surface soil moisture monthly outputs and they must have historical runs. Brief descriptions of each model and institution can be found in CMIP5 website (<http://cmip-pcmdi.llnl.gov/cmip5/availability.html>). Outputs were extracted from a single historical run (1850-2005) by each model.

Two types of coupled model output were involved in this evaluation: the hydrologic outputs (i.e. runoff and surface soil moisture) for comparison against observations, and the atmosphere outputs from CCSM4 MOAR simulations for driving the CLM4 offline runs. We extracted monthly surface soil moisture in the top 10 cm and runoff from the CMIP5 archive via the Earth System Grid (<http://pcmdi9.llnl.gov>) for the CCSM4 and the eight other models. Coupled model monthly land outputs were extracted from ensemble member r6i1p1 for CCSM4 and from r1i1p1 for the eight other models. Atmosphere outputs from the coupled CCSM MOAR run were acquired from the National Center for Atmosphere Research (NCAR) via the Earth System Grid (<https://www.earthsystemgrid.org>) and used to force the offline CLM4 runs. The forcing data include 3-hourly solar radiation, specific humidity, temperature, surface pressure, and wind together with 6-hourly fields of precipitation.

2.2 Observational data

2.2.1 Surface soil moisture

Soil moisture products have been estimated from an individual remote sensing satellite in various studies (e.g., *Al-Yaari et al.* [2014]; *Kerr et al.* [2001]; *Loew et al.* [2013]; *Njoku and Entekhabi* [1996]; *Njoku et al.* [2003]; *Wigneron et al.* [1995]), but a multi-sensor approach has improved global soil moisture estimates. Attempts have been made to merge four passive microwave soil moisture retrievals from the Scanning Multichannel Microwave Radiometer, the Special Sensor Microwave Imager, the Tropical Rainfall Measuring Mission microwave imager, and the Advanced Microwave Scanning Radiometer – Earth Observing System with two active microwave soil moisture estimates from the European Remote Sensing satellite and the Advanced Scatterometer into the new European Space Agency Climate Change Initiative soil moisture (ESA CCI SM) [*Liu et al.*, 2012; *Wagner and Dorigo*, 2012]. The product's temporal domain ranges from 1978 to 2010 with daily values at 0.25° spatial resolution. The detection depth of the microwave signal ranges from 2 to 5 cm depending on the

type of sensor and soil condition [Liu et al., 2012]. We use Volumetric Water Content (VWC, vol vol⁻¹) as the basis for our comparisons.

The ESA CCI SM data product has no coverage in densely vegetated regions such as the Amazon and central Africa where dense canopy masks out both passive and active microwave signals. The soil moisture retrievals are also absent under frozen or snow conditions. Whenever data are available, the areas are included in the calculation as well as the model simulations. Intercomparison and validation of the microwave satellite data have been conducted at regional and continental scales against in-situ observations [Albergel et al., 2012; Brocca et al., 2011; Gruhier et al., 2010; Loew et al., 2013]. In general, the satellite product accurately reproduces the seasonal cycle as well as short-term variability.

2.2.2 Monthly runoff

The University of New Hampshire (UNH) Global Runoff Data Center (GRDC hereafter) composite runoff field V10 is a gridded runoff dataset at 0.5 degree [Fekete and Vorosmarty, 2002]. The dataset was constructed by first calculating basin-scale runoff based on a water balance model developed by UNH. The water balance model (WBM) simulation at each cell was corrected by runoff estimates for the corresponding interstation area. The interstation areas were defined by a river routing model, the Global Simulated Topological model, to which the GRDC stations were geo-registered. A total of 663 GRDC stations were included and represented 72% of actively discharging areas. The majority of discharge records were from the 1970s and the final product is a composite annual runoff. The WBM-modeled runoff from 1971 to 1980 was averaged to approximate the time period.

The runoff dataset has more complete global coverage than the soil moisture dataset, enabling evaluation of densely forested areas such as the Amazon and central Africa and permafrost areas such the Himalayas and Arctic Circle. We compared the runoff differences divided by Global Precipitation Climatology Centre (GPCC) precipitation reanalysis, which gives the normalized runoff difference (NRD):

$$NRD = \frac{Q_{model} - Q_{obs}}{P}$$

where Q_{model} and Q_{obs} denote the modeled and observed runoff and P the GPCC precipitation. NRD was used instead of percent change because the long-term runoff is zero or close to zero in arid areas, making any percent difference either very large or infinite. We applied GPCC precipitation instead of precipitation from each corresponding model because our aim was to reduce the range of runoff

difference induced by variations in modeled precipitation. Dividing runoff by precipitation within each model generates a runoff ratio that describes the portion of runoff relative to precipitation, which is not the intention of this comparison. Furthermore, applying precipitation from each individual model also introduces uncertainties from atmospheric simulation that we wanted to minimize in our comparison. The GPCC monthly precipitation 1-degree data [Schneider *et al.*, 2011] were provided by the NOAA/OAR/ESRL Physical Science Division from the website at <http://www.esrl.noaa.gov/psd>.

2.2.3 Qian's reanalysis data and GPCC

Qian *et al.* [2006] adjusted NCEP-NCAR (National Centers for Environmental Prediction-National Center for Atmospheric Research) reanalysis forcing dataset by combining it with station records and satellite observations of temperature, precipitation, and cloud cover. Qian's reanalysis dataset covers the global land areas with 3-hourly and T62 (~1.875°) resolution and serves as the offline CLM model forcing data from 1948 to 2004.

The GPCC full data reanalysis version 6.0 comprises globally gridded gauge-analysis precipitation products over land areas derived from quality controlled station data [Becker *et al.*, 2013]. The monthly precipitation data were used to normalize the runoff discrepancies between CMIP5 models and observations.

2.3 Offline experiments to assess sources of error

We extracted climate variables from the MOAR run to construct the forcings for offline CLM4 runs. The MOAR climate variables are available in 3-hourly, 6-hourly, and monthly time steps. All our processing was based on 3-hourly data. The standard climate forcings for a CLM4 historical run with satellite phenology include three NetCDF files: 3-hourly solar radiation, 6-hourly precipitation (converted by averaging from 3-hourly), and 3-hourly surface temperature, specific humidity, pressure, wind speed. The MOAR climate variables were combined with Qian's reanalysis data [Qian *et al.*, 2006] to construct offline runs with four sources of climate forcings (Table 1):

Table 1. List of offline experiments and forcings

	QIAN	MOAR	MOAR_PRECIP	MOAR_TEMP
Precipitation	reanalysis ¹	coupled run ²	reanalysis	coupled run
Temperature/humidity	reanalysis	coupled run	coupled run	reanalysis
Other forcings ³	reanalysis	coupled run	coupled run	coupled run

1. Qian's 2006 reanalysis dataset (see section 2.2.3)

2. atmosphere forcings from MOAR coupled run

3. other forcings include solar radiation, wind, and surface pressure
- a. Qian's 2006 reanalysis dataset (QIAN hereafter)
 - b. Atmosphere outputs from the MOAR coupled run (MOAR hereafter)
 - c. Qian's reanalysis, but with precipitation data from the MOAR run (MOAR_PRECIP hereafter)
 - d. Qian's reanalysis, but with surface temperature and specific humidity from MOAR run (MOAR_TEMP hereafter).

In the offline experiments, soil moisture is extracted from top 4.5 cm soils and excludes ice content. This soil moisture output matches the satellite product closely both in scale and phase, and therefore provides the most appropriate comparison with observation datasets. Monthly global mean values were compared between simulations and observations to reveal the dynamics of runoff and soil moisture. Differences between MOAR_TEMP and MOAR_PRECIP relative to QIAN determine what fractions of the total variance between MOAR and QIAN are due to temperature/humidity and precipitation, respectively.

2.4 Correlation analyses

Temporal correlation analysis between model simulations and observations used Pearson's correlation coefficient r . The Pearson correlation coefficient was calculated between simulations and observations, and between the hydrologic variables (runoff and surface soil moisture) and atmosphere forcings (precipitation and surface temperature).

3. Results and discussions

3.1 Surface soil moisture

The soil volumetric water content differences between CCSM4 and the ESA CCI SM dataset indicate that soil moisture discrepancies are within 5% in the majority of the area covered by the ESA CCI SM dataset. The inclusion of wetland areas in the surface soil moisture data in the CCSM4 CMIP5-archived outputs contributes to the apparent, but incorrect, signal of permanently saturated soils in high latitude areas between 50 to 70°N including the Hudson Bay in Canada and parts of Siberia (Figure 1). For this reason, the wetland areas have been omitted from the calculation of surface soil moisture in the remainder of our analyses. Outside of the wetland areas, CCSM4's soil moisture exceeded ESA CCI SM's observation by 0.05-0.20 VWC in predominantly mountainous regions covering the Rocky Mountains, central Europe and the Alps, central Africa, areas immediately south of Himalayas including India, Bangladesh, Burma etc.,

northern and central China, and western Australia. CCSM4 underestimated surface soil moisture by up to 0.20 in high latitude areas of North America and Eurasia, central Asia, and southern China.

Figure 1. Absolute surface soil moisture difference indicates CCSM4's soil moisture exceeds ESA CCI SM observation by up 0.05-0.20 (vol vol⁻¹) in the Rocky Mountains, central Europe, central Africa, south of Himalayas, most of China, and west Australia. CCSM4 underestimated surface soil moisture by up to 0.20 in high latitude areas. Most other CMIP5 models had positive biases in high latitude areas and United States except FGOALS and BCC.

In contrast, with the exception of FGOALS and BCC, most other CMIP5 models had positive biases in high latitude areas and in the United States. Both FGOALS and BCC models suffered from the inclusion of wetland in the soil moisture calculation and thus displayed oversaturation. This is not surprising because FGOALS used an earlier version of the CCSM land surface model (CLM3). FGOALS and BCC were the only models with an overall negative bias compared to ESA CCI SM dataset. An extremely dry bias followed the edge of continents and small islands in CSIRO.

Two types of mismatch between these simulation outputs and satellite observations cause models to overestimate soil moisture. The first possible cause is a depth mismatch between the archived top 10 cm layer and the 2-5 cm layer measured by the instruments in the ESA CCI SM data set. Although *Wagner et al.* [1999] has demonstrated that surface soil moisture can act as a predictor of deeper soil profile, the surface soil is inherently drier than the

underlying layers at long time scales (e.g. monthly) because of loss by surface evaporation. The archived outputs include more than double the depth of the satellite observation, which potentially introduces a positive bias in water content in many areas with respect to the ESA CCI SM product. The second possible cause is a phase mismatch between the modeled and observed VWC. The archived surface soil water content includes the mass of water in all phases, whereas the satellite data includes only the liquid phase of soil water. The satellite data as a rule excludes areas with snow cover or land surface temperature below zero, but it may not exclude all areas with ice content below the surface that would not be detected as water content. Therefore the satellite product is potentially 'drier' than the modeled soil, especially in high latitude areas.

Therefore both thicker depth and the inclusion of ice content in the CCSM4 simulation tend to give higher water content values than the ESA CCI SM observations. In general, the two types of mismatch would artificially shift the systematical bias in modeled surface soil moisture toward small positive values. However, the bias induced by ice content may be rather subtle compared to the depth mismatch, as the microwave signal only detects shallow depth of soil (2-5 cm at most) and the algorithms used to detect frozen conditions treat the contact layer and the rest of the soil column as a whole [Naeimi *et al.*, 2009]. The probability of containing ice content in unfrozen microwave soil is therefore very low. The monthly map of unfrozen soil moisture by microwave were used to clip out the usable areas from simulated soil moisture. We did not attempt to filter out frozen soils separately by model simulated surface temperature field as it may further create mismatch against the microwave product. Fortunately, we were able to relieve the depth and ice content mismatches from our offline analyses because we customized simulations that were not restricted to archived data to match the soil depth and to remove ice content in the soil moisture output.

The evaluation of soil moisture estimation may be limited by the quality of the observational dataset. ESA CCI SM soil moisture products were found to have poor correlations at high latitude of north hemisphere against the reanalysis of the European Centre for Medium-Range Weather Forecasts Interim [Albergel *et al.*, 2013], partly owing to the low average observation densities in northern latitudes due to snow and ice [Dorigo *et al.*, 2014]. Also, the absolute values and dynamic range of ESA CCI SM soil moisture dataset is affected by surface soil moisture simulation of GLDAS-1 Noah, a land surface model that was used to rescale the microwave products [Liu *et al.*, 2012], so the absolute value should not be deemed as "true" soil moisture when compared to climate model outputs. Finally, switching among observing systems induced long term discontinuities

into the dataset, and in turn may affect trend analysis [Loew *et al.*, 2013]. In this study, we focus more on the correlation analysis, although absolute values still have important implications when comparing modeling outputs forced by different climate variables.

Figure 2. Temporal correlation of CCSM4's surface soil moisture in four seasons indicates monthly soil moisture dynamics are better correlated with observations in low- to mid-latitude areas.

The temporal dynamics of soil moisture, however, are more consistent than the magnitudes between the models and observations (Figure 2). Monthly CCSM4 soil moisture dynamics are better correlated with observation in tropical areas, but have decreased coefficients in high latitude areas, especially in northern hemisphere winter (DJF) and spring (MAM). Similar to CCSM4, most CMIP5 models displayed similar annual spatial patterns with decreased correlation coefficient in permafrost areas such as Canada and Siberia and in arid zones such as the Sahara and central Australia (not shown). The high latitude areas with the least correlation generally have the largest absolute biases. Overall, soil moisture is better correlated in northern hemisphere summer and fall, but has more negative coefficients in spring (MAM), implying model deficiency in snowmelt simulation.

3.2 Runoff

Canada and Siberia and the major mountain ranges, including the Rocky Mountains, Andes, and Himalayas are the areas where most models overestimate runoff by more than the magnitude of the Global Precipitation

Climatology Centre (GPCC) precipitation reanalysis (Figure 3). FGOALS and BCC both produce unrealistically high amounts of runoff in the Saharan region. GISS is the exception in that it generally underestimates runoff. The Amazon is the only region where all models underestimate runoff, and these results are consistent with a negative precipitation bias reported for CMIP5 models [Mehran *et al.*, 2014]. Similar to soil moisture, the runoff comparison has a mismatch between the simulation and observations: the CMIP5 models define runoff as the total liquid water leaving the grid cell, which accounts for both surface and subsurface terms, while the GRDC runoff product assumes all water leaving a grid cell emerges as river discharge at a given stream gauge. Thus, the GRDC product may underestimate total runoff in headwater and upstream basins if subsurface water does not discharge within a grid cell and/or discharges to a stream outside a measurement basin.

Figure 3. Precipitation normalized runoff difference between CMIP5 models and GRDC dataset. Most CMIP5 models, except GISS, produced higher runoff than GRDC in mountain ranges. All models underestimated runoff in the Amazon.

Our evaluations of both surface soil moisture and runoff indicated that the largest discrepancies between model outputs and observations occur in mountainous and high latitude areas. Mehran *et al.* [2014] found that CMIP5 models generally overestimate precipitation in steep terrain. Their bias map for CESM1_BGC_es, a version close to CCSM4, shows a very similar pattern to the runoff bias in this study except in Canada and Siberia. We speculate that the runoff biases in mountainous regions are caused by precipitation biases in the atmosphere model, while biases in high latitude areas may be caused by other atmosphere forcings or by the land surface model algorithms.

Another potential reason for most CMIP5 models having large biases in mountainous areas may be tracked to deficiencies in the GRDC dataset. The gridded GRDC runoff was generated by linking discharge gauging station data with a digital river network and distributing runoff across interstation regions using a water balance model. The WBM itself could be biased due to meteorological forcings (e.g. precipitation) and physical (e.g. soil properties) or biophysical attributes (e.g. land cover). Inconsistencies also exist between the GRDC station data and the river network due to resolution discrepancies and data quality [Fekete and Vorosmarty, 2002], but the GRDC dataset is still the only gridded runoff field available for global scale evaluation. The GRDC composite runoff dataset provides only a monthly mean runoff field, which limits our analysis to bias evaluation.

3.3 Atmosphere-land hydrology correlations in the coupled CCSM4

Four potential sources of bias are 1) the error from observational data, 2) structural deficiencies of CLM4, 3) forcing errors from the atmosphere, and 4) model parameterization. Many researchers are currently working to improve CLM and its parameters, and here we attempt to identify the effects of atmospheric forcing on land hydrology to better understand CLM deficiencies.

Figure 4. Correlation between runoff and precipitation, and runoff and surface temperature in winter and summer, respectively. Precipitation is positively correlated to runoff in northern hemisphere summer (JJA) except for the areas above Arctic Circle. In

1
2
3
4 438 northern hemisphere winter (DJF), the correlation is weakened in the high elevation
5 439 areas where freeze and thaw dominate the hydrology. Surface temperature is negatively
6 440 correlated to runoff in JJA but more positively correlated in DJF. Correlations with soil
7 441 moisture follow similar patterns.

8
9
10 442 Atmospheric forcings are expected to be one of the major sources of bias in land
11 443 surface hydrology when hydrologic cycles are driven by climate model outputs.
12 444 Precipitation has been found to largely affect runoff trends while temperature has
13 445 relatively weaker influences [Gerten *et al.*, 2008; McCabe and Wolock, 2011].
14 446 CLM4 imports six atmospheric variables from the Community Atmosphere Model
15 447 4.0 (CAM4) including solar radiation, precipitation, surface temperature, pressure,
16 448 wind, and specific humidity. Monthly correlation analysis reveals that precipitation
17 449 and surface temperature are the major predictors for soil moisture and runoff.
18 450 The correlations for each hydrologic variable exhibit similar geographic and
19 451 temporal patterns. In northern hemisphere summer (JJA), precipitation is
20 452 positively correlated to both runoff (Figure 4) and soil moisture (not shown),
21 453 except for areas above Arctic Circle. In northern hemisphere winter (DJF),
22 454 precipitation is not as strongly correlated to runoff and soil moisture, especially in
23 455 the northern hemisphere and in high elevation areas when freeze and thaw are
24 456 the main drivers for hydrology. Surface temperature, on the other hand, is
25 457 negatively correlated to soil moisture and runoff in JJA as high temperature dries
26 458 up soil via evaporation and transpiration. Areas where temperature correlation
27 459 coefficients are positive are either within the Arctic Circle or affected by summer
28 460 monsoon. In DJF high temperatures induce snow thaws that consequently
29 461 moisten the soil, therefore surface temperature is more positively correlated to
30 462 the two hydrologic components. The rest of the atmospheric forcings indicate
31 463 much weaker correlations with the two hydrologic variables.

32
33
34 464 As the precipitation shows strong correlation to the runoff and surface soil
35 465 moisture in mid- to low-latitude areas and temperature shows stronger (positive
36 466 and negative) correlation in high latitude zones, understanding the geographic
37 467 differences in atmosphere-driven biases can help evaluation of hydrological
38 468 processes in the land surface model. For example, the CMIP5 archived models
39 469 often have larger biases in high latitude areas where snow and permafrost
40 470 freeze-and-thaw mechanism may be underrepresented due to deficiency from
41 471 temperature or land model. Similarly, runoff simulation of CMIP5 models in high
42 472 latitude areas may be more biased by temperature forcing, but more affected by
43 473 precipitation in mountainous areas. The correlations between climate forcings
44 474 and hydrologic variables open the possibility of isolating the biases from
45 475 atmospheric forcings therefore revealing respective sources of uncertainty from
46 476 the atmosphere and land models.

3.4 Atmospheric drivers of soil moisture and runoff errors in CLM4

The offline MOAR simulation demonstrates that our offline runs can be used to diagnose the coupled model simulations (i.e. CMIP5). The offline MOAR simulation generates almost identical 10-cm soil moisture (comparisons not shown here) and surface runoff as the coupled simulation, except where the wetland area has been removed from the soil moisture calculations in the offline outputs. See section 3.1 for discussion of improperly inclusion of wetland in soil moisture outputs in CMIP5 simulations. This confirms that offline runs can be used to determine the error sources of the land model hydrology in the coupled model.

To better evaluate the contributions of atmospheric forcing error to hydrologic uncertainty, the following analyses reduce the effects of soil depth and ice content mismatch present in the CMIP5 analysis of soil moisture. For the offline analyses, we used the modeled soil moisture in the top 4.5 cm layers, which matches closely with the satellite detecting depth, and included only liquid water in the modeled water content. These procedures were not possible for the CMIP5 evaluations as the CMIP5 repository provides limited output variables. The difference between the two outputs is mostly within 0.04 except the CMIP5 soil (10 cm with ice content) contains 0.1-0.2 more water content in high latitude areas. This explains the discrepancies in high latitude areas between two comparisons of coupled and offline runs (Figure 1, CCSM-ESA CCI SM vs Figure 5, MOAR-ESA CCI SM).

Figure 5. Absolute biases between offline runs and ESA CCI SM surface soil moisture observations. a). the offline MOAR run resembled the CCSM4 coupled run. b). Qian's reanalysis forced run served as the reference that alleviated the underestimation of soil moisture in high latitude areas and Central America. c). offline run forced by reanalysis and modeled precipitation increased soil moisture compared to MOAR and QIAN runs, especially in the band of north 40 to 70. d) offline run forced by modeled temperature and relatively humidity reduce surface soil moisture compared to other offline runs.

Qian's reanalysis dataset is the closest atmosphere forcings to the observations and was therefore intended to isolate the biases to the land surface model only. Using reanalysis forcings improved soil moisture and runoff outputs with respect to the offline MOAR simulation. Underestimation of soil moisture in the MOAR simulation was alleviated in the QIAN simulation in high latitude areas and Central America (Figure 5). Additionally, positive differences from ESA CCI SM data in Europe and Africa were reduced in the QIAN simulation. Runoff output was even more drastically improved in the QIAN simulation. The overestimation of runoff in mountains was mostly alleviated (Figure 6a and b), including the Rocky Mountains, Andes, Himalayas, and Northern Oceania. The QIAN simulation also improved runoff in the eastern Amazon, central Africa, and high latitude areas, although it increased overestimation in Eastern Europe. East of the Amazon and Central Africa changed from positive biases to neutral or negative. Overall, the biases in mountainous and tropical areas have been improved by using reanalysis data in place of the MOAR atmosphere model outputs.

Figure 6. Absolute biases between offline runs and GRDC runoff dataset. Similar as surface soil moisture, a) offline run driven by modeled forcings; b) offline run driven by reanalysis eliminated most of positive biased in mountainous areas; c) offline run driven

by MOAR precipitation produced more positive biases than the reference; d) offline run driven by modeled temperature and relative humidity changed the overall positive biases into negative.

Independent use of modeled precipitation and temperature forcings for offline simulations indicates that these atmospheric inputs have opposing effects on land surface hydrology with respect to their respective reanalysis forcings. The MOAR_PRECIP simulation increases soil moisture compared to the QIAN simulation, especially within the latitude band of north 40° to 70°, but otherwise has limited effects across the rest of the land surface (Figure 5b and c). The MOAR_PRECIP simulation has a greater impact on runoff through increases in area and magnitude of positive biases (Figure 6b and c). Furthermore, the soil moisture and runoff in the MOAR_PRECIP simulation are greater than in the MOAR simulation (Figures 5a and c, and 6a and c). The MOAR_TEMP simulation shows that modeled temperature and humidity reduced the surface moisture and runoff with respect to the QIAN simulation (Figures 5b and d, and 6b and d). The runoff bias maps in particular show the distinct contrast between runs driven by modeled precipitation and temperature (Figure 6c and d). In the original coupled CCSM4 and offline MOAR simulations, the positive bias introduced by precipitation input is canceled out to varying degrees around the globe by the negative bias from temperature input.

Monthly global 10-year mean runoff (1971-1980) shows a similar pattern of opposing hydrological effects of modeled precipitation and temperature inputs. The CMIP5 fully coupled CCSM4 simulation matches observations well in April to September when hydrologic cycles are active (Figure 7). The QIAN simulation matches observations even better at low flow months, but underestimates runoff in June and July. This indicates that either the Qian dataset has low precipitation or high temperature bias in these two months, or the CLM has deficiency in simulating the drying limb of the spring peakflow. The offline MOAR simulation follows the coupled run well with subtle discrepancies in spring and summer. These discrepancies are likely induced by lack of land-atmosphere feedbacks (e.g. evapotranspiration effects on temperature and humidity). The MOAR_PRECIP simulation has high positive bias in spring and early summer (February to June in northern hemisphere, September to December in the southern hemisphere) when snow melts and high flows occur. These are the months when MOAR precipitation is more positively biased than QIAN, implying precipitation is the main driver of runoff bias. In contrast, the MOAR_TEMP simulation has the greatest negative bias compared to the other three simulations throughout the year. Peakflow timings were advanced from June to May in the QIAN and MOAR_PRECIP simulations. These monthly global results

are consistent with the spatial results in that opposite hydrological effects of modeled precipitation and temperature inputs cancel each other out.

Figure 7. Global mean monthly runoff (10-year average) of model simulations and GRDC data indicates that CCSM simulation matched GRDC well April to September. QIAN simulation matched GRDC in all months but June and July. MOAR_PRECIP run has high positive biases in the months when MOAR precipitation is more positively biased than the Qian's reanalysis. MOAR_TEMP run simulation has greater negative biases throughout the year.

The annual cycle of global mean surface soil moisture also demonstrates hydrological compensation in simulations due to opposing effects of modeled precipitation and temperature inputs (Figure 8). The 1991 trough is related to a global precipitation deficiency associated with a warm El Niño Southern Oscillation (<http://www.isse.ucar.edu/sadc/chptr5.html>). The trough starting in 2001 are the results of the millennium drought in many areas (e.g., [van Dijk et al., 2013; Wandel et al., 2009]). The ESA CCI SM data generally have troughs in January and peaks in the middle of the year (i.e. June and July). The MOAR simulation tends to have two peaks in the first and second half of a year (e.g., year 1995) and has more intra-annual variability than the observations. The QIAN simulation follows the observations more closely in both phase and magnitude, except for the years after 2002, indicating that sources of uncertainty are more likely from the atmospheric forcings. Similar as surface runoff, the surface soil moisture simulations were shifted upwards by MOAR_PRECIP and downwards by MOAR_TEMP relative to the MOAR run.

Figure 8. Global mean monthly soil moisture (1985-2004) of model simulations and observations shows that seasonal moisture dynamics are out of phase in some years (i.e. opposite wet and dry extremes). Basically all runs except MOAR_TEMP overestimated runoff globally, implying the deficiency is more likely from land surface model rather than forcing data.

3.5 Potential sources of bias from CLM4

If we assume the CLM4 offline run driven by Qian's reanalysis data eliminates most of the uncertainty generated by atmospheric forcing, the rest of the QIAN simulation bias is most likely induced by CLM4 itself. The QIAN simulation has negative runoff bias in the Amazon, central Africa, southwest China, and south Asia. Comparing with soil texture maps generated by National Aeronautics and Space Administration Land Data Assimilation Systems (<http://ldas.gsfc.nasa.gov/gldas/GLDASsoils.php>) and by Global Soil Wetness Project-Phase 3 (<http://hydro.iis.u-tokyo.ac.jp/~sujan/research/gswp3/soil-texture-map.html>), the areas with runoff underestimation are mostly associated with high clay content soils including sandy clay loam, clay loam, and clay. The bias may be propagated from the mischaracterization of clayey soils through pedo-transfer functions or parameterizations. For example, clayey soils tend to exhibit aggregation structure, which is one of most important characteristics of macropore formation. Macropores enable water to flow through unsaturated soil more rapidly than it would in a soil matrix defined by Darcy's law [Beven and Germann, 1982]. The existence of macropores increases effective hydraulic conductivity, thus decreases water content in surface soils. Without this

mechanism, CLM4 may overestimate evapotranspiration and in turn underestimate runoff by retaining too much plant available water. Comparing to FLUXNET-MTE global land estimates, *Tang and Riley* [In review] found that CLM4.5 overestimated evapotranspiration in the same areas where runoff was underestimated in this study. We propose that macropore flow is an essential mechanism that is lacking in the CLM and may be responsible for the mis-partitioning of water among evapotranspiration, groundwater, and runoff in tropical and other high clay content areas.

Another important process often associated with clayey soils is the shallow subsurface lateral drainage (i.e. interflow) [*McDaniel et al.*, 2008]. The restricting layers formed by argillic and fragipan horizons intercept percolating water and contribute to river discharge directly thus contribute much more rapidly than groundwater [*Jackson et al.*, 2014]. Hillslope with restricting layers may therefore produce considerably more runoff than those without argillic/fragipan layers [*Needelman et al.*, 2004]. The CLM hydrology contains no lateral drainage except in frozen soils. We therefore argue that adding lateral drainage in the high clay content soils with high contrast hydraulic conductivity may potentially change the water balance in the areas currently with large runoff biases. The lateral drainage from restricting layer may be directly added to the surface runoff depending on the topography and river channel network.

The areas where runoff simulation is overestimated overlap with the global distribution of Andisols [*Takahashi and Shoji*, 2002]. Defined by United States Department of Agriculture soil taxonomy (http://www.nrcs.usda.gov/Internet/FSE_DOCUMENTS/nrcs142p2_051232.pdf), Andisols are soils formed in volcanic ash with very high porosity (often $>0.60 \text{ cm}^3 \text{ cm}^{-3}$) and therefore high water holding capacity. The mineral soil porosity θ is defined by sand content in CLM as $\theta = 0.489 - 0.00126(\%sand)$. Increasing porosity has been shown to be among the most sensitive parameters for decreasing runoff yield in a physically-based hydrologic model [*Du et al.*, 2013]. With low porosity, CLM4 may retain insufficient plant available water and underestimate evapotranspiration, therefore partitioning too much to runoff. Sensitivity of surface hydrology to saturated hydraulic conductivity and porosity needs to be evaluated before future modifications are taken, as the two parameters were identified as secondarily significant to runoff and sensible/latent heat flux after subsurface runoff parameters [*Hou et al.*, 2012; *Huang et al.*, 2013]. The proposed modifications are speculated by overlapping the biases with the CLM soil texture map and need further test and proof.

4. Summary

Comparisons of surface soil moisture between fully coupled model simulations and observations reveal large positive biases, mostly in mid- to high-latitude areas, except for CCSM4, FGOALS, and BCC. Runoff is overestimated in mountain ranges and in most of the arctic by all CMIP5 models except GISS. All models underestimated runoff in Amazon areas. Terrestrial water storage and dynamics at high northern latitudes are critical to the global water balance. Hydrological fluxes have been poorly monitored in these areas [Kane, 2005], and hydrologic models have difficulties obtaining high quality data for calibration and validation. Current model deficiencies, like those presented above, urge the land modeling community to better understand hydrologic cycles in high latitudes and to help improve overall performance of the models.

When assessing runoff and soil moisture, one should not seek an exact match between model simulations and observations due to the mismatch and uncertainty derived from both ends. The validation of soil moisture from land surface modeling should focus mainly on relative changes and dynamics, but we do need to pay attention to the areas consistently having large biases. For example, the CIMP5 archived CLM simulated 10-cm soil moisture was up to 10% different from the observed moisture in 2-5 cm in many areas such as southern China and central/ southern Africa over the long term. The discrepancies were expectedly reduced in the offline tests with 4.5-cm soil moisture and ice content excluded, however the overall spatial pattern was retained. The simulated runoff had the same sign of bias in the same area and implied precipitation might be responsible for the dry or wet in both variables. There were also areas where the biases are opposite sign from soil moisture and runoff such as east half of the United States. It indicates that the land model may not correctly partition the water into surface runoff and infiltration.

CCSM4 produces reasonable soil moisture estimates (except where wetlands are included) and positive runoff bias in mountain ranges and central Africa. Negative runoff biases are found mainly in the Amazon, Southeast Asia, and the Middle East. Positive bias of global mean runoff occurred mainly in February-April and October-December. CCSM4 globally averaged surface soil moisture follows observed seasonal cycles but is out of phase compared to ESA CCI SM data in some years. Overall, CCSM4 produces less bias in surface soil moisture prediction compared to eight other CMIP5 models, but has similar runoff over-predictions in high altitude and high latitude areas as most of the other models.

Modeled precipitation and temperature errors generate compensating biases in CCSM4 soil moisture and runoff. Offline CLM4 runs driven by simulated and

1
2
3
4 691 reanalysis atmospheric inputs reveal that simulated precipitation causes
5 692 overestimation of runoff in the mountainous areas, east Amazon, and central
6 693 Africa, and a general increase in overestimation of soil moisture. CLM4 tends to
7 694 compensate for these overestimations when provided with simulated temperature
8 695 and humidity, but at the cost of exacerbating surface soil moisture
9 696 underestimates in high latitudes.

10
11
12
13 697 Bias from atmosphere forcings is not sufficient to explain all the deviation of
14 698 simulated runoff and soil moisture from observation. Driven by Qian's reanalysis
15 699 data, the CLM4 underestimates runoff in Amazon, central Africa, and other areas
16 700 with high soil clay content. We hypothesize that the lack of fast path water
17 701 infiltration is partially responsible for erroneous partitioning between
18 702 evapotranspiration and runoff. CLM does not include preferential fast flow
19 703 through macropore structure, and implementing this structure into global scale
20 704 climate model is a challenging task involving extra parameterization and
21 705 computational demand. Adding lateral drainage within the shallow soil layers is
22 706 however relatively straightforward, but the model sensitivity needs to be tested
23 707 first. We also hypothesize that low soil porosity causes overestimation of runoff in
24 708 mountainous areas with volcanic soils. Improving these processes and data in
25 709 CLM might help correct the compensating sensitivities of soil moisture and runoff
26 710 to errors in precipitation and temperature inputs.

27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34 711

35
36 712 Acknowledgement: This material is based upon work supported by the U.S.
37 713 Department of Energy, Office of Science, Climate and Environmental Sciences
38 714 Division, BER Program, under Contract Number DE-AC02-05CH11231.

39
40
41 715

42
43 716

44
45 717

46
47 718

48
49 719

50
51 720

52
53 721

54
55 722

56
57 723

724

725 **References:**

- 726 Al-Yaari, A., et al. (2014), Global-scale evaluation of two satellite-based passive microwave soil
727 moisture datasets (SMOS and AMSR-E) with respect to Land Data Assimilation System estimates,
728 *Remote Sensing of Environment*, 149, 181-195.
- 729 Albergel, C., P. de Rosnay, C. Gruhier, J. Munoz-Sabater, S. Hasenauer, L. Isaksen, Y. Kerr, and W.
730 Wagner (2012), Evaluation of remotely sensed and modelled soil moisture products using global
731 ground-based in situ observations, *Remote Sensing of Environment*, 118, 215-256.
- 732 Albergel, C., W. A. Dorigo, G. Balsamo, J. Munoz-Sabater, P. de Rosnay, L. Isaksen, L. Brocca, R.
733 de Jeu, and W. Wagner (2013), Monitoring multi-decadal satellite earth observation of soil
734 moisture products through land surface reanalyses, *Remote Sensing of Environment*, 138, 77-89,
735 doi:10.1016/j.rse.2013.07.009.
- 736 Alkama, R., L. Marchand, A. Ribes, and B. Decharme (2013), Detection of global runoff changes:
737 results from observations and CMIP5 experiments, *Hydrology and Earth System Science*, 10,
738 2117-2140, doi:10.5194/hessd-10-2117-2013.
- 739 Becker, A., P. Finger, A. Meyer-Christoffer, B. Rudolf, K. Schamm, U. Schneider, and M. Ziese
740 (2013), A description of the global land-surface precipitation data products of the Global
741 Precipitation Climatology Centre with sample applications including centennial (trend) analysis
742 from 1901-present, *Earth System Science Data*, 5, 71-99, doi:10.5194/essd-5-71-2013.
- 743 Beven, K., and P. Germann (1982), Macropores and water flow in soils, *Water Resources*
744 *Research*, 18(5), 1311-1325.
- 745 Brocca, L., et al. (2011), Soil moisture estimation through ASCAT and AMSR-E sensors: an
746 intercomparison and validation study across Europe, *Remote Sensing of Environment*, 115, 3390-
747 3408.
- 748 Collins, W. D., et al. (2006), The Community Climate System Model Version 3 (CCSM3), *Journal of*
749 *Climate*, 19, 2122-2143.
- 750 Collins, W. D., et al. (2014), The integrated Earth System Model (iESM): Formulation and
751 functionality, *GeoSi. Model Dev. Discuss*, in review.
- 752 Dai, A., T. Qian, and K. E. Trenberth (2009), Changes in continental freshwater discharge from
753 1948 to 2004, *Journal of Climate*, 22, 2773-2791.
- 754 Decker, M., and X. Zeng (2009), Impact of modified Richards equation on global soil moisture
755 simulation in the Community Land Model (CLM3.5), *Journal of Advances in Modeling Earth*
756 *Systems*, 1, 22, doi:10.3894/JAMES.2009.1.5.
- 757 Di Vittorio, A. V., et al. (2014), From land use to land cover: restoring the afforestation signal in a
758 coupled integrated assessment–earth system model and the implications for CMIP5 RCP
759 simulations, *Biogeosciences*, 11, 6435-6450, doi:10.5194/bg-11-6435-2014.
- 760 Dorigo, W. A., et al. (2014), Evaluation of the ESA CCI soil moisture product using ground-based
761 observations, *Remote Sensing of Environment*, doi:http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.rse.2014.07.023.
- 762 Du, E., T. E. Link, J. A. Gravelle, and J. A. Hubbart (2013), Validation and sensitivity test of the
763 distributed hydrology soil-vegetation model (DHSVM) in a forested mountain watershed,
764 *Hydrological Processes*, doi:10.1002/hyp.10110.
- 765 Fekete, B. M., and C. J. Vorosmarty (2002), High-resolution fields of global runoff combining
766 observed river discharge and simulated water balances, *Global Biogeochemical Cycles*, 16(3),
767 doi:10.1029/1999GB001254.
- 768 Field, C. B., et al. (2014), IPCC, 2014: Climate Change 2014: Impacts, Adaptation, and
769 Vulnerability. Part A: Global and Sectoral Aspects. Contribution of Working Group II to the Fifth

770 Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change *Rep.*, 1132 pp pp,
 771 Cambridge, United Kingdom and New York, NY, USA.
 772 Gedney, N., P. M. Cox, R. A. Betts, O. Boucher, O. Huntingford, and P. A. Stott (2006), Detection
 773 of a direct carbon dioxide effect in continental river runoff records, *Nature*, *439*, 835-838.
 774 Gerten, D., S. Rost, W. von Bloh, and W. Lucht (2008), Causes of change in 20th century global
 775 river discharge, *Geophysical Research Letters*, *35*, doi:10.1029/2008GL035258.
 776 Gruhier, C., et al. (2010), Soil moisture active and passive microwave products: intercomparison
 777 and evaluation over a Sahelian site, *Hydrology and Earth System Science*, *14*, 141-156.
 778 Hou, Z., M. Huang, L. R. Leung, G. Lin, and D. M. Ricciuto (2012), Sensitivity of surface flux
 779 simulations to hydrologic parameters based on an uncertainty quantification framework applied
 780 to the Community Land Model, *Journal of Geophysical Research*, *117*, D15108,
 781 doi:10.1029/2012JD017521, 2012.
 782 Huang, M., Z. Hou, L. R. Leung, Y. Ke, Y. Liu, Z. Fang, and Y. Sun (2013), Uncertainty of runoff
 783 simulations and parameter identifiability in the Community Land Model: evidence from MOPEX
 784 basins, *Journal of Hydrometeorology*, *14*, 1754, doi:10.1175/JHM-D-12-0138.1.
 785 Jackson, C. R., M. Bitew, and E. Du (2014), When interflow also percolates: downslope travel
 786 distances and hillslope process zones, *Hydrological Processes*, *28*, 3195-3200,
 787 doi:10.1002/hyp.10158.
 788 Kane, D. L. (2005), High-latitude hydrology, what do we know?, *Hydrological Processes*, *19*,
 789 2453-2454, doi:10.1002/hyp.5929.
 790 Kerr, Y. H., P. Waldteufel, J.-P. Wagneron, J. Martinuzzi, J. Font, and M. Berger (2001), Soil
 791 moisture retrieval from space: the Soil Moisture and Ocean Salinity (SMOS) mission, *Geoscience
 792 and Remote Sensing, IEEE Transactions on* *39*(8), 1729 - 1735, doi:10.1109/36.942551.
 793 Labat, D., Y. G. Aeris, and J. L. Guyot (2004), Evidence for global runoff increase related to
 794 climate warming, *Advances in Water Resources*, *27*, 631-642.
 795 Lawrence, D. M., et al. (2011), Parameterization improvements and functional and structural
 796 advances in Version 4 of the Community Land Model, *Journal of Advances in Modeling Earth
 797 System*, *3*, 27, doi:10.1029/2011MS000045.
 798 Liu, Y. Y., W. A. Dorigo, R. M. Parinussa, R. A. M. de Jeu, W. Wagner, M. F. McCabe, J. P. Evans,
 799 and A. I. J. M. van Dijk (2012), Trend-preserving blending of passive and active microwave soil
 800 moisture retrievals, *Remote Sensing of Environment*, *123*, 280-297,
 801 doi:10.1016/j.rse.2012.03.014.
 802 Loew, A., T. Stacke, W. A. Dorigo, R. A. M. de Jeu, and S. Hagemann (2013), Potential and
 803 limitations of multidecadal satellite soil moisture observations for selected climate model
 804 evaluation studies, *Hydrology and Earth System Science*, *17*, 3523-3542, doi:10.5194/hess-17-
 805 3523-2013.
 806 Luo, Y. Q., et al. (2012), A framework for benchmarking land models, *Biogeosciences*, *9*, 3857-3874,
 807 doi:10.5194/bg-9-3857-2012.
 808 McCabe, G. J., and D. M. Wolock (2011), Century-scale variability in global annual runoff
 809 examined using a water balance model, *International Journal of Climatology*, *31*, 1739-1748,
 810 doi:10.1002/joc.2198.
 811 McDaniel, P. A., M. P. Regan, E. Brooks, J. Boll, S. Barndt, A. Falen, S. K. Young, and J. E. Hammel
 812 (2008), Linking fragipans, perched water tables, and catchment-scale hydrological processes,
 813 *Catena*, *73*, 166-173, doi:10.1016/j.catena.2007.05.011.
 814 Mehran, A., A. AghaKouchak, and T. J. Philips (2014), Evaluation of CMIP5 continental
 815 precipitation simulations relative to satellite-based gauge-adjusted observations, *Journal of
 816 Geophysical Research*, *35*, doi:doi: 10.1002/2013JD021152.

817 Naeimi, V., K. Scipal, Z. Bartalis, S. Hasenauer, and W. Wagner (2009), An Improved Soil Moisture
 818 Retrieval Algorithm for ERS and METOP Scatterometer Observations, *Geoscience and Remote*
 819 *Sensing, IEEE Transactions on*, 47(7), 1999 - 2013, doi:10.1109/TGRS.2008.2011617.
 820 Needelman, B. A., W. J. Gburek, G. W. Petersen, A. N. Sharpley, and P. J. Kleinman (2004),
 821 Surface runoff along two agricultural hillslopes with contrasting soils, *Soil Science Society of*
 822 *America*, 68, 914-923.
 823 Niu, G. Y., R. E. Dickinson, and L. E. Gulden (2005), A simple TOPMODEL-based runoff
 824 parameterization (SIMTOP) for use in global climate models, *Journal of Geophysical Research*,
 825 110(D21106), doi:10.1029/2005JD006111.
 826 Niu, G. Y., Z. L. Yang, R. E. Dickinson, L. E. Gulden, and H. Su (2007), Development of a simple
 827 groundwater model for use in climate models and evaluation with Gravity Recovery and Climate
 828 Experiment data, *Journal of Geophysical Research*, 112, doi:10.1029/2006JD007522.
 829 Njoku, E. G., and D. Entekhabi (1996), Passive microwave remote sensing of soil moisture,
 830 *Journal of Hydrology*, 184(1-2), 101–129, doi:10.1016/0022-1694(95)02970-2.
 831 Njoku, E. G., T. J. Jackson, V. Lakshmi, T. K. Chan, and S. V. Nghiem (2003), Soil moisture retrieval
 832 from AMSR-E, *Geoscience and Remote Sensing, IEEE Transactions on* 41(2), 215 - 229,
 833 doi:10.1109/TGRS.2002.808243.
 834 Oleson, K. W., et al. (2010), Technical description of version 4.0 of the Community Land Model
 835 (CLM).Rep., 257 pp, NCAR Tech. Note NCAR/TN-4781STR.
 836 Oleson, K. W., et al. (2008), Improvements to the Community Land Model and their impact on
 837 the hydrological cycle, *Journal of Geophysical Research*, 113, doi:10.1029/2007JG000563.
 838 Owe, M., R. de Jeu, and T. Holmes (2008), Multisensor historical climatology of satellite-derived
 839 global land surface moisture, *Journal of Geophysical Research*, 113, doi:10.1029/2007JF000769,
 840 2008.
 841 Piao, S., P. Friedlingstein, P. Ciais, N. de Noblet-Ducoudre, D. Labat, and S. Zaehle (2007),
 842 Changes in climate and land use have a larger direct impact than rising CO₂ on global river runoff
 843 trends, *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 104, 15242-15247.
 844 Qian, T., A. Dai, K. E. Trenberth, and K. W. Oleson (2006), Simulation of global land surface
 845 conditions from 1948 to 2004. Part I: forcing data and evaluations, *Journal of Hydrometeorology*,
 846 7, 23.
 847 Schneider, U., A. Becker, P. Finger, A. Meyer-Christoffer, B. Rudolf, and M. Ziese (2011), GPCC
 848 full data reanalysis version 6.0 at 1.0°: monthly land-surface precipitation from rain-gauges built
 849 on GTS-based and historic data, edited by G. P. C. Centre, Boulder, Colorado USA,
 850 doi:10.5676/DWD_GPCC/FD_M_V6_100.
 851 Seneviratne, S. I., et al. (2013), Impact of soil-climate feedbacks on CMIP5 projections: first
 852 results from the GLACE-CMIP5 experiment, *Geophysical Research Letters*, 40, 5212-5217,
 853 doi:10.1002/grl.50956, 2013.
 854 Shi, X., J. Mao, P. E. Thornton, F. M. Hoffman, and W. M. Post (2011), The impact of climate, CO₂,
 855 nitrogen deposition and land use change on simulated contemporary global river flow,
 856 *Geophysical Research Letters*, 38, doi:10.1029/2011GL046773.
 857 Takahashi, T., and S. Shoji (2002), Distribution and classification of volcanic ash soils, *Global*
 858 *Environmental Research*, 6(2), 83-97.
 859 Tang, J., and W. J. Riley (In review), Impacts of incorporating root hydraulic redistribution on
 860 global evapotranspiration, edited.
 861 Taylor, K. E., R. J. Stouffer, and G. A. Meehl (2012), An overview of CMIP5 and the experiment
 862 design, *American Meteorological Society*, 485-498, doi:10.1175/BAMS-D-11-00094.1.
 863 van Dijk, A. I. J. M., H. E. Beck, R. S. Crosbie, R. A. M. de Jeu, Y. Y. Liu, G. M. Podger, B. Timbal,
 864 and N. R. Viney (2013), The Millennium Drought in southeast Australia (2001–2009): Natural and

human causes and implications for water resources, ecosystems, economy, and society, *Water Resources Research*, 49, 1-18, doi:01/2013; DOI: 10.1002/wrcr.20123.

Wagner, W., and W. A. Dorigo (2012), Fusion of active and passive microwave observations to create an Essential Climate Variable data record on soil moisture, in *ISPRS Annals of the Photogrammetry, Remote Sensing and Spatial Information Sciences*, edited, XXII ISPRS Congress.

Wagner, W., G. Lemoine, and H. Rott (1999), A method for estimating soil moisture from ERS scatterometer and soil data, *Remote Sensing of Environment*, 70, 191-207.

Wandel, J., G. Young, and B. Smit (2009), The 2001-2001 drought: vulnerability and adaptation in Alberta's special areas, *Prairie Forum*, 34(1), 211-234.

Wigneron, J.-P., A. Chanzy, J.-C. Calvet, and N. Bruguier (1995), A simple algorithm to retrieve soil moisture and vegetation biomass using passive microwave measurements over crop fields, *Remote Sensing of Environment*, 51(3), 331-341, doi:10.1016/0034-4257(94)00081-W.

877

878