Response to Reviewer 3 comments. R3 Comments normal font, *Responses in italics* 

The paper represents a first attempt to use parflow to simulate continental scale hydrologic processes, demonstrating a methodology for using existing physical observations to generate a numerical simulation that results in a natural organization of stream networks and groundwater flow. Such an approach may also be of interest to the geomorphology and geochemistry communities. The manuscript should definitely be published in GMD.

We thank the reviewer both for their constructive comments and for recognizing the merits and novelty of this work.

The previous review comments reflect considerable differences of opinion regarding novelty and the conceptualization. Although the authors have done a commendable job in responding to these comments, one thing I suggest the authors consider is a more detailed statement, possibly at the end of the results/discussion regarding (a) how or could such simulations could be improved through better parameterization (for example better resolution in the depth of subsurface, fixing state boundaries, etc? There is a general statement at line 487 but thoughts on how to prioritize additional products would be useful. (b) Do the authors think the resolution (perhaps for surface water) and parameterization impacts any of the scaling results (for example around figure 10 and 11).

We agree with the reviewer that these are great points to add to the discussion. We have expanded the discussion regarding improved input datasets, increased resolution and the scaling results.

Line 17: "tools for" and "processes; however, "

Change made in the revised manuscript.

Line 19: need to be or can only be?

Changed to "only be" in revised manuscript.

Line 22: Why give the area twice? First time seems sufficient.

Second area removed.

Line 30: recommend removing the word novel – readers should decide for themselves.

"Novel" removed in revised manuscript.

Line 45: "bridge this gap" is rather informal. Suggest replacing this phrase.

Changed to 'address this need' in the revised manuscript.

Line 78: "groundwater-surface water"

Change made in the revised manuscript.

Line 97: "extent (i.e. continental scale)" (there is more than one continent).

Change made in the revised manuscript.

Line 98: missing space "(1 km)

Change made in the revised manuscript.

Line 134: define Sx, Sy?

Sx and Sy now defined as the local topographic slope.

Line 166: "Physically this" – define "this" or delete.

Phrase "Physically this means that" deleted in revised manuscript.

Line 205: "functional relationships that impose"

Change made in the revised manuscript.

Line 208: This somewhat repeats what is stated at Line 162.

We feel the two are different enough and that this is an important point to bear repeating.

Line 221-237: missing spaces between values and units throughout: 102 m, 1 km, 100 m, 1 x 1 km, etc. please correct. This occurs throughout manuscript and some figures and should be corrected.

Changes made in the revised manuscript.

Line 229: It seems to me that several things are missing from the discussion. First, how is porosity specified? Second, at some point in the manuscript a discussion or acknowledgment regarding the bottom layer of the model relative to realistic physical conditions should be included. I am not familiar with the exact details or issues associated with the Gleeson et al. (2001) map, but the current simulation includes a

highly simplified treatment of the actual bottom boundary of the subsurface – namely the presence of low-porosity impermeable bedrock. I realize there is no other option than the assumption made, but if for example depth of regolith would improve the model considerably vs. not at all, that is important information to provide to the community.

Finally, it would be helpful to provide more information about the various products used here. I realize the references are included but for example, how is the soil conductivity in the two layers determined? Also, the basics of the Gleeson map construction.

The reviewer makes a good point here. We have added discussion on the need for deeper hydrogeologic data and more information regarding the process of assigning variables.

Figure 1: I did not find the description very clear relative to figure 1. What is plotted in (E)? Conductivity where? Below 2 m?

Figure 1 caption clarified to specify that the soil types are applied over the top 2 m and the hydraulic conductivity over the bottom 100 m.

Line 230: SSURGO – please define acronym.

Defined.

Line 237: minor point but Sx,Sy ook lowercase in equation – are uppercase previously

This is just the formatting of Sx in the denominator of the equation, they are uppercase.

Line 239: tense "reduce"

Changes made in the revised manuscript.

Line 245:246: This is unclear – what kind of uncertainty? "As such" does not fit here.

Three types of uncertainty are described and "as such" removed.

Line 248: Interfaces "between" property values.

Changes made in the revised manuscript.

Line 257: possibly add "variability using best available data". Also "impact of uncertain"

Change made in the revised manuscript.

Line 260-262: This statement is rather confusing. Please clarify. Was a new product created from another product or are the authors referring to an actual product? I also found it unclear exactly how unsaturated flow is handled- prescribed recharge? Please clarify with respect to equation 1.

This term was clarified both in the definition of gr in (1) and here.

Line 277: "far from being trivial". What does this mean? Can authors be specific? Trivial is a relative word.

The phrase "far from being trivial" was replaced with "required significant computational resources" replacing one relative word with a somewhat less relative word. We feel that we are specific and quantitative regarding compute resources used for the simulation later in this paragraph.

Line 281: "still better than 60% efficiency"

Change made in the revised manuscript.

Line 293: "checked for plausibility against"? Do authors mean: "are compared to observations"?

Yes, change made.

Line 342: Change "while" to "although"

Change made in the revised manuscript.

Line 344: "in future work"?

Change made in the revised manuscript.

Line 347: What is a plausibility check? This is an evaluation against parameters that were not used to develop the simulations. Out of curiousity, are any of these datasets used to generate the P-ET or other "products"?

Yes, basically that, and "no." The sentence now reads: "Therefore, the purpose of these comparisons is to evaluate model behavior and physical processes against observations not used to generate input parameters."

Line 354: Please clarify this statement –

Statement reworded for clarity.

Line 497: what does within "the confines of the numerical experiment" mean?
Phrase has been deleted.

1 A high resolution simulation of groundwater and surface water over most of the continental US 2 with the integrated hydrologic model ParFlow v3 3 Reed M Maxwell<sup>1\*</sup>, Laura E Condon<sup>1</sup>, Stefan J Kollet<sup>2</sup> 4 5  $^{1}$  Hydrologic Science and Engineering Program, Integrated GroundWater Modeling Center, Department of Geology and Geological Engineering, Colorado School of Mines, Golden, Colorado, USA 6 7 Centre for High-Performance Scientific Computing in Terrestrial Systems, Institute for Bio- and 8 Geosciences, Agrosphere (IBG-3), Research Centre Jülich, Jülich, DE 9 10 \*correspondence to: Reed M Maxwell, rmaxwell@mines.edu 11 12 Abstract 13 Interactions between surface and groundwater systems are well-established theoretically and 14 observationally. While numerical models that solve both surface and subsurface flow equations 15 in a single framework (matrix) are increasingly being applied, computational limitations have 16 restricted their use to local and regional studies. Regional or watershed-scale simulations have 17 been effective tools for understanding hydrologic processes; however there are still many Deleted: in 18 questions, such as the adaptation of water resources to anthropogenic stressors and climate Reed Maxwell 3/4/2015 7 Deleted: , 19 variability, that can only be answered across large spatial extents at high resolution. In response Reed Maxwell 3/4/2015 7 Deleted: need to 20 to this 'grand challenge' in hydrology, we present the results of a parallel, integrated hydrologic 21 model simulating surface and subsurface flow at high spatial resolution (1km) over much of 22 continental North America (~6,300,000 km<sup>2</sup>). These simulations provide integrated predictions Reed Maxwell 3/4/2015 7: Deleted: or 6.3M 23 of hydrologic states and fluxes, namely water table depth and streamflow, at very large scale and 24 high resolution. The physics-based modeling approach used here requires limited 25 parameterizations and relies only on more fundamental inputs, such as topography, 26 hydrogeologic properties and climate forcing. Results are compared to observations and provide 27 mechanistic insight into hydrologic process interaction. This study demonstrates both the 28 feasibility of continental scale integrated models and their utility for improving our 29 understanding of large-scale hydrologic systems; the combination of high resolution and large Reed Maxwell 3/4/2015 7:55 AM 30 spatial extent facilitates analysis of scaling relationships using model outputs. Deleted: novel

Introduction	
--------------	--

Sulis et al. 2012; Mikkelson et al. 2013).

37	There is growing evidence of feedbacks between groundwater, surface water and soil
38	moisture that moderate land-atmospheric energy exchanges, and impact weather and climate
39	(Maxwell et al. 2007; Anyah et al. 2008; Kollet and Maxwell 2008; Maxwell and Kollet 2008;
40	Jiang et al. 2009; Rihani et al. 2010; Maxwell et al. 2011; Williams and Maxwell 2011; Condon
41	et al. 2013; Taylor et al. 2013). While local observations and remote sensing can now detect
42	changes in the hydrologic cycle from small to very large spatial scales (e.g. Rodell et al. 2009),
43	theoretical approaches to connect and scale hydrologic states and fluxes from point
44	measurements to the continental scales are incomplete. In this work, we present integrated
45	modeling as one means to address, this need, via numerical experiments.

Though introduced as a concept in the literature almost half a century ago (Freeze and Harlan 1969), integrated hydrologic models that solve the surface and subsurface systems simultaneously have only been a reality for about a decade (VanderKwaak and Loague 2001; Jones et al. 2006; Kollet and Maxwell 2006). Since their implementation, integrated hydrologic models have been successfully applied to a wide range of watershed-scale studies (see Table 1 in Maxwell et al. 2014) successfully capturing observed surface and subsurface behavior (Qu and Duffy 2007; Jones et al. 2008; Sudicky et al. 2008; Camporese et al. 2010; Shi et al. 2013), diagnosing stream-aquifer and land-energy interactions (Maxwell et al. 2007; Kollet and Maxwell 2008; Rihani et al. 2010; Condon et al. 2013; Camporese et al. 2014), and building our understanding of the propagation of perturbations such as land-cover and anthropogenic climate change throughout the hydrologic system (Maxwell and Kollet 2008; Goderniaux et al. 2009;

Reed Maxwell 3/4/2015 7:55 AM

Deleted: bridge

Reed Maxwell 3/4/2015 7:55 AM

Deleted: gap

60	Prior to this work, computational demands and data constraints have limited the
61	application of integrated models to regional domains. Advances in parallel solution techniques,
62	numerical solvers, supercomputer hardware, and additional data sources have only recently made
63	large-scale, high-resolution simulation of the terrestrial hydrologic cycle technically feasible
64	(Kollet et al. 2010; Maxwell 2013). As such, existing large scale studies of the subsurface have
65	focused on modeling groundwater independently (Fan et al. 2007; Miguez-Macho et al. 2007;
66	Fan et al. 2013) and classifying behavior with analytical functions (Gleeson et al. 2011).
67	Similarly, continental scale modeling of surface water has utilized tools with simplified
68	groundwater systems that do not capture lateral groundwater flow and model catchments as
69	isolated systems (Maurer et al. 2002; Döll et al. 2012; Xia et al. 2012), despite the fact that
70	lateral flow of groundwater has been shown to be important across scales (Krakauer et al. 2014).
71	While much has been learned from previous studies, the focus on isolated components within
72	what we know to be an interconnected hydrologic system is a limitation than can only be
73	addressed with an integrated approach.

74

75

76

77

78

79

80

81

82

The importance of groundwater\_surface water interactions in governing scaling behavior of surface and subsurface flow from headwaters to the continent has yet to be fully characterized. Indeed, one of the purposes for building an integrated model is to better understand and predict the nature of hydrologic connections across scales and throughout a wide array of physical and climate settings. Arguably, this is not possible utilizing observations, because of data scarcity and the challenges observing 3D groundwater flow across a wide range of scales. For example, the scaling behavior of river networks is well known (Rodriguez-Iturbe and Rinaldo 2001), yet open questions remain about the quantity, movement, travel time, and spatial and temporal scaling of groundwater and surface water at the continental scale. Exchange processes and flow

Deleted:

near the land surface are strongly non-linear, and heterogeneity in hydraulic properties exist at all spatial scales. As such, a formal framework for connecting scales in hydrology (Wood 2009) needs to account for changes in surface water and groundwater flow from the headwaters to the mouth of continental river basins. We propose that integrated, physics-based hydrologic models are a tool for providing this understanding, solving fundamental non-linear flow equations at high spatial resolution while *numerically* scaling these physical processes up to a large spatial extent (i.e. continental scale).

In this study, we simulate surface and subsurface flow at high spatial resolution (1 km) over much of continental North America (6.3M km²), which is itself considered a grand challenge in hydrology (e.g. Wood et al. 2011; Gleeson and Cardiff 2014). The domain is constructed entirely of available datasets including topography, soil texture and hydrogeology This simulation solves surface and subsurface flow simultaneously and takes full advantage of massively parallel, high-performance computing. The results presented here should be viewed as a sophisticated numerical experiment, designed to diagnose physical behavior and evaluate scaling relationships. While this is not a calibrated model that is intended to match observations perfectly, we do verify that behavior is realistic by comparing to both groundwater and surface water observations.

The paper is organized as follows: first a brief description of the model equations are provided including a description of the input variables and observational datasets used for model comparison; next model simulations are compared to observations in a number of ways, and then used to understand hydrodynamic characteristics and to describe scaling.

Reed Maxwell 3/4/2015 7:55 AM

**Deleted:** the continent.

Reed Maxwell 3/4/2015 7:55 AM

Deleted: 1km

### Methods

- The model was constructed using the integrated simulation platform ParFlow (Ashby and Falgout 1996; Jones and Woodward 2001; Kollet and Maxwell 2006) utilizing the terrain following grid capability (Maxwell 2013). ParFlow is a physically based model that solves both the surface and subsurface systems simultaneously. In the subsurface ParFlow solves the mixed form of Richards' equation for variably saturated flow (Richards 1931) in three spatial dimensions given as:
- 116  $S_s S_w(h) \frac{\partial h}{\partial t} + \phi S_w(h) \frac{\partial S_w(h)}{\partial t} = \nabla \cdot \mathbf{q} + q_r(x, z)$  (1)
- where the flux term **q** [LT<sup>-1</sup>] is based on Darcy's law:

118 
$$\mathbf{q} = -\mathbf{K}_s(\mathbf{x})k_r(h)[\nabla(h+z)\cos\theta_x + \sin\theta_x]$$
 (2)

- In these expressions, h is the pressure head [L]; z is the elevation with the z-axis specified as
- upward [L];  $\mathbf{K}_s(\mathbf{x})$  is the saturated hydraulic conductivity tensor [LT<sup>-1</sup>];  $k_r$  is the relative
- permeability [-];  $S_s$  is the specific storage [L<sup>-1</sup>];  $\phi$  is the porosity [-];  $S_w$  is the relative saturation [-
- 122 ];  $q_r$  is a general source/sink term that represents transpiration, wells, and other fluxes including
- 123 the potential recharge flux, which is enforced at the ground surface  $[T^{-1}]$ ; and  $\theta$  [-] is the local
- angle of topographic slope,  $S_x$  and  $S_{y_x}$  in the x and y directions and may be written as
- 125  $\theta_x = \tan^{-1} S_x$  and  $\theta_y = \tan^{-1} S_y$ . Note that we assume that density and viscosity are both
- 126 constant, although ParFlow can simulate density and viscosity-dependent flow (Kollet et al.
- 127 2009). The van Genuchten (1980) relationships are used to describe the relative saturation and
- 128 permeability functions  $(S_w(h))$  and  $k_r(h)$  respectively). These functions are highly nonlinear and
- characterize changes in saturation and permeability with pressure.

Overland flow is represented in ParFlow by the two-dimensional kinematic wave equation resulting from application of continuity conditions for pressure and flux (Kollet and Maxwell 2006):

133 
$$\mathbf{k} \cdot \left( -\mathbf{K}_{s}(\mathbf{x}) k_{r}(h) \cdot \nabla(h+z) \right) = \frac{\partial \|h,0\|}{\partial t} - \nabla \cdot \|h,0\| \mathbf{v}_{sw} + \lambda q_{r}(\mathbf{x})$$
 (3)

In this equation  $\mathbf{v}_{sw}$  is the two-dimensional, depth-averaged surface water velocity [LT<sup>-1</sup>] given by manning's equation; h is the surface ponding depth [L] the same h as is shown in Equation 1. Note that ||h,0|| indicates the greater value of the two quantities in Equation 3. This means that if h < 0 the left hand side of this equation represents vertical fluxes (e.g. in/exfiltration) across the land surface boundary and is equal to  $q_r(\mathbf{x})$  and a general source/sink (e.g. rainfall, ET) rate [LT<sup>-1</sup>] with  $\lambda$  being a constant equal to the inverse of the vertical grid spacing [L<sup>-1</sup>]. This term is then entirely equivalent to the source/sink term shown in Equation 1 at the ground surface where  $\mathbf{k}$  is the unit vector in the vertical, again defining positive upward coordinates. If h > 0 then the terms on the right hand side of Equation 3 are active water that is routed according to surface topography (Kollet and Maxwell 2006).

The nonlinear, coupled equations of surface and subsurface flow presented above are solved in a fully-implicit manner using a parallel Newton-Krylov approach (Jones and Woodward 2001; Kollet and Maxwell 2006; Maxwell 2013). Utilizing a globally-implicit solution allows for interactions between the surface and subsurface flow system to be explicitly resolved. While this yields a very challenging computational problem, ParFlow is able to solve large complex systems by utilizing a multigrid preconditioner (Osei-Kuffuor et al.; Ashby and Falgout 1996) and taking advantage of highly scaled parallel efficiency out to more than 1.6 x  $10^4$  processors (Kollet et al. 2010; Maxwell 2013).

ParFlow solves saturated subsurface flow (i.e. groundwater), unsaturated subsurface flow (i.e. the vadose zone) and surface flow (i.e. streamflow) in a continuum approach within a single matrix. Thus, complete non-linear interactions between all system components are simulated without *a priori* specification of what types of flow occur in any given portion of the grid. Streams form purely based on hydrodynamic principles governed by recharge, topography, hydraulic conductivity and flow parameters, when water is ponded due to either excess infiltration (surface fluxes exceed the infiltration capacity, e.g. Horton 1933) or excess saturation (subsurface exfiltration to the surface system, e.g. Dunne 1983) for further discussion see Kirkby (1988) and Beven (2004) for example. Groundwater converges in topographic depressions and unsaturated zones may be shallow or deep depending upon recharge and lateral flows.

152

153

154

155

156

157

158

159

160

161

162

163

164

165

166

167

168

169

170

171

172

173

174

The physically based approach used by ParFlow is similar to other integrated hydrologic models such as Hydrogeosphere (Therrien et al. 2012), PIHM (Kumar et al. 2009) and CATHY (Camporese et al. 2010). This is a distinct contrast to more conceptually-based models that may not simulate lateral groundwater flow or simplify the solution of surface and subsurface flow by defining regions of groundwater or the stream-network prior to the simulation. In such models, groundwater surface water interactions are often captured as one-way exchanges (i.e. surface water loss to groundwater) or parameterized with simple relationships (i.e. functional relationships that impose the relationship between stream head and baseflow). The integrated approach used by ParFlow eliminates the need for such assumptions and allows the interconnected groundwater surface water systems to evolve dynamically based only on the governing equations and the properties of the physical system. The approach used here requires robust numerical solvers (Maxwell 2013; Osei-Kuffuor et al. 2014) and exploits high-performance computing (Kollet et al. 2010) to achieve high resolution, large extent simulations.

Reed Maxwell 3/4/2015 7:55 AM

Deleted: Physically this means that

Reed Maxwell 3/4/2015 7:55 AM

Formatted: Font:Times New Roman

Reed Maxwell 3/4/2015 7:55 AM

Formatted: Font:Times New Roman

Reed Maxwell 3/4/2015 7:55 AM

Formatted: Font:Times New Roman

Reed Maxwell 3/4/2015 7:55 AM

Deleted: to

Reed Maxwell 3/4/2015 7:55 AM

Formatted: Font:Times New Roman

Reed Maxwell 3/4/2015 7:55 AM

Deleted: .

Reed Maxwell 3/4/2015 7:55 AM

... [1]

Formatted: Font:Times New Roman

## **Domain Setup**

179

180

181

182

183

184

185

186

187

188

189

190

191

192

193

194

195

196

197

198

199

200

201

In this study, the model and numerical experiment was directed at the Continental US (CONUS) using the terrain following grid framework (Maxwell 2013) for a total thickness of 102m over 5 model layers. The model was implemented with a lateral resolution of 1 km with nx=3342, ny=1888 and five vertical layers with 0.1, 0.3, 0.6, 1.0 and 100 m discretization for a total model dimensions of 3,342 by 1,888 by 0.102 km and 31,548,480 total compute cells. The model domain and input data sets are shown in Figure 1. All model inputs were re-projected to have an equal cell-size of  $1 \times 1$  km as shown in Figure 1. Topographic slopes  $(S_x \text{ and } S_y)$  were calculated from the Hydrosheds digital elevation model (Figure 1b) and were processed using the r.watershed package in the GRASS GIS platform. Surface roughness values were constant 10<sup>-5</sup> [h m<sub>2</sub><sup>-1/3</sup>] outside of the channels and varied within the channel as a function of average watershed slope. Over the top 2 m of the domain, hydraulic properties from soil texture information of the Soil Survey Geographic Database (SSURGO) were applied and soil properties were obtained from Schaap and Leij (1998), Note that two sets of soil categories were available. The upper horizon was applied over the top 1m (the top three model layers) and the bottom one over the next 1 m<sub>e</sub> (the fourth model layer). These soil types were mapped to their corresponding category in the property database and those values were used in the model simulation (e.g. saturated hydraulic conductivity, van Genuchten relationships). Figures 1a and c show the top and bottom soil layers of the model. The deeper subsurface (i.e. below 2 m) was constructed from a global permeability map developed by Gleeson et al. (2011). These values (Gleeson et al. 2011) were adjusted to reduce variance (Condon and Maxwell 2013; Condon and Maxwell 2014) and to reflect changes in topography using the e-folding relationship empirically-derived in (Fan et al. 2007):  $\alpha = e^{-\frac{50}{f}}$  where  $f = \frac{a}{\left(1 + b * \sqrt{{S_x}^2 + {S_y}^2}\right)}$ . For this analysis a = 20, b = 125 and the value of 50

Reed Maxwell 3/4/2015 7:55 AM

Deleted: 1km

Reed Maxwell 3/4/2015 7:55 AM

Deleted: 100m

Reed Maxwell 3/4/2015 7:55 AM

Deleted: 1x1km

Reed Maxwell 3/4/2015 7:55 AM

Formatted: Superscript

Reed Maxwell 3/4/2015 7:55 AM

Deleted: 2m

Reed Maxwell 3/4/2015 7:55 AM

Deleted:

Reed Maxwell 3/4/2015 7:55 AM

Deleted: 1m

Reed Maxwell 3/4/2015 7:55 AM

Deleted: 2m

209 [m] was chosen to reflect the midpoint of the deeper geologic layer in the model. Larger values 210 of  $\alpha$  reduce the hydraulic conductivity categorically, that is by decreasing the hydraulic 211 conductivity indicator values in regions of steeper slope. Figure 1e maps the final conductivity 212 values used for simulation. Below the deeper geologic layer, the presence of impermeable 213 bedrock was assumed. This assumption oversimplifies regions that have weathered or fractured 214 systems that contribute to regional flow and aquifer systems deeper than 100 m. These 215 assumptions are necessitated by lack of data at this scale, not limitations of the model simulation. 216 Note that this complex subsurface dataset is assembled from many sources and is subject to 217 uncertainty: heterogeneity within the defined geologic types, uncertainty about the breaks 218 between geologic types and parameter values assigned to these types. There are breaks across 219 dataset boundaries, commonly at State or Province and International political delineations. The 220 fidelity and resolution of the source information used to formulate this dataset also changes 221 between these boundaries yielding some interfaces in property values. 222 All input datasets are a work in progress and should be continually improved. However,

All input datasets are a work in progress and should be continually improved. However, we feel it is important to continue numerical experiments with the data that is currently available, while keeping in mind the limitations associated with every model input. Shortcomings in hydrogeological data sets reflect the lack of detailed unified hydrogeological information that can be applied in high resolution continental models. This constitutes a significant source of uncertainty, which needs to be assessed, quantified and ultimately reduced in order to arrive at precise predictions. Still, it should be noted that the purpose of this work is to demonstrate the feasibility of integrated modeling to explicitly represent processes across many scales of spatial variability using best available data, By focusing on large-scale behaviors and relationships we limit the impact of uncertain inputs.

223

224

225

226

227

228

229

230

231

Reed Maxwell 3/4/2015 7:55 AM

Deleted: reduced

Reed Maxwell 3/4/2015 7:55 AM

Deleted: . As such there

Reed Maxwell 3/4/2015 7:55 AM

Deleted: across

Reed Maxwell 3/4/2015 7:55 AM

Deleted:

No-flow boundary conditions were imposed on all sides of the model except the land surface, where the free-surface overland flow boundary condition was applied. For the surface flux, a Precipitation-Evapotranspiration (P-E, or potential recharge) field, shown in figure  $1d_{\star}$  was derived from products developed by Maurer et al. (2002). They developed a gridded precipitation field from observations and simulated evaporation and transpiration fluxes using the VIC model. We calculate the average difference between the two from 1950-2000 and apply all positive values as potential recharge (P-E) (negative values were set to zero). The model was initialized dry and the P-E forcing was applied continuously at the land surface upper boundary  $(q_c$  in equation 1) until the balance of water (difference between total outflow and P-E) was less than 3% of storage. For all simulations a nonlinear tolerance of  $10^{-5}$  and a linear tolerance of  $10^{-10}$  were used to ensure proper model convergence.

236

237

238

239

240

241

242

243

244

245

246

247

248

249

250

251

252

253

254

255

256

257

258

While this study employs state of the art modeling techniques, it is important to note that the numerical simulation of this problem required significant computational resources.

Simulations were split over 128 divisions in the x-direction and 128 in the y-direction and run on 16,384 compute-cores of an IBM BG/Q supercomputer (JUQUEEN) located at the Jülich Supercomputing Centre, Germany. These processor splits resulted in approximately 2,000 unknowns per compute core; a relatively small number, yet ParFlow's scaling was still better than 60% efficiency, due to the non-symmetric preconditioner used (Maxwell 2013). The reason for this is the special architecture of JUQUEEN with only 256MB of memory per core and relatively slow clock rate. Additionally, code performance was improved using efficient preconditioning of the linear system (Osei-Kuffuor et al.). The steady-state flow field was accomplished over several steps. Artificial dampening was applied to the overland flow equations early in the simulation during water table equilibration. Dampening was subsequently

Reed Maxwell 3/4/2015 7:55 AM

Deleted: product

Reed Maxwell 3/4/2015 7:55 AM

Deleted: combination of

Reed Maxwell 3/4/2015 7:55 AM

Deleted: model-

Reed Maxwell 3/4/2015 7:55 AM

**Deleted:** for a product very similar

Reed Maxwell 3/4/2015 7:55 AM

**Deleted:** Maurer et al. (2002), shown in

Figure 1d.

Reed Maxwell 3/4/2015 7:55 AM

**Deleted:** is far from being trivial.

Reed Maxwell 3/4/2015 7:55 AM

Deleted: good (

Reed Maxwell 3/4/2015 7:55 AM

Deleted: )

decreased and removed entirely as simulation time progressed. Large time steps (10,000h) were used initially and were decreased (to 1h) as the stream network formed and overland flow became more pronounced with reduced dampening. The entire simulation utilized approximately 2.5M core hours of compute time, which resulted in less than 1 week of wall-clock time (approximately 150 hours) given the large core counts and batch submission process.

268

269

270

271

272

273

274

275

276

277

278

279

280

281

282

283

284

285

286

287

288

289

Model results were compared to available observations of streamflow and hydraulic head (the sum of pressure head and gravitational potential). Observed streamflow values were extracted from a spatial dataset of current and historical U.S. Geological Survey (USGS) stream gages mapped to the National Hydrography Dataset (NHD) (Stewart et al., 2006). The entire dataset includes roughly 23,000 stations, of which just over half (13,567) fall within the CONUS domain. For each station, the dataset includes location, drainage area, sampling time period and flow characteristics including minimum, maximum, mean and a range of percentiles (1, 5, 10, 20, 25, 50, 75, 80, 90, 95, 99) compiled from the USGS gage records. For comparison, stations without a reported drainage area, stations not located on or adjacent to a river cell in ParFlow, and stations whose drainage area were not within twenty percent of the calculated ParFlow drainage area were filtered out. This resulted in 4,736 stations for comparison. The 50<sup>th</sup> percentile values for these stations are shown in Figure 2a. Note that these observations are not naturalized, i.e. no attempt is made to remove dams and diversions along these streams and rivers, however some of these effects will be minimized given the longer temporal averages. Hydraulic head observations of groundwater at more than 160,000 locations were assembled by Fan et al. (Fan et al. 2007; Fan et al. 2013). Figure 2b plots the corresponding water table depth at each location calculated as the difference between elevation and hydraulic head. Note that

Reed Maxwell 3/4/2015 7:55 AM

**Deleted:** checked for plausibility against

these observations include groundwater pumping (most wells are drilled for extraction rather than purely observation).

### **Results and Discussion**

Figures 3 and 4 plot simulated streamflow and water table depth, respectively, over much of continental North America, both on a log scale for flow (Figure 3) and water table depth (Figure 4). Figure 3 shows a complex stream network with flow rates spanning many orders of magnitude. Surface flows originate in the headwaters (or recharge zones) creating tributaries that join to form the major river systems in North America. Note, as discussed previously that the locations for flowing streams are not enforced in ParFlow but form due to ponded water at the surface (i.e. values of h>0 in the top layer of the model in Equations 1-3). Overland flow is promoted both by topographic convergence, and surface and subsurface flux; however, with this formulation there is no requirement that all potential streams support flow. Thus, the model captures the generation of the complete stream network without specifying the presence and location of rivers in advance, but rather by allowing channelized flow to evolve as a result of explicitly simulated non-linear physical processes.

The insets in Figure 3 demonstrate multiscale detail ranging from the continental river systems to the first-order headwaters. In Figure 4, water table depth also varies over five orders of magnitude. Whereas aridity drives large-scale differences in water table depth (Figure 1d), at smaller scales, lateral surface and subsurface flow processes clearly dominate recharge and subsurface heterogeneity (see insets to Figure 4). Water tables are deeper in the more arid western regions, and shallower in the more humid eastern regions of the model. However, areas of shallow water table exist along arid river channels and water table depths greater than 10m

exist in more humid regions. Note that this is a pre-development simulation, thus, results do not include any anthropogenic water management features such as groundwater pumping, surface water reservoirs, irrigation or urbanization—all of which are present in the observations. Many of these anthropogenic impacts have been implemented into the ParFlow modeling framework (Ferguson and Maxwell 2011; Condon and Maxwell 2013; Condon and Maxwell 2014).

Although anthropogenic impacts clearly influence, water resources, a baseline simulation allows for a comparison between the altered and unaltered systems in future work.

314

315

316

317

318

319

320

321

322

323

324

325

326

327

328

329

330

331

332

333

334

335

Next we compare the results of the numerical experiment to observations. As noted previously, this is not a calibrated model. Therefore, the purpose of these comparisons is to evaluate model behavior and physical processes against observations not to generate input parameters. Figure 5 plots observed and simulated hydraulic head and streamflow for the dataset shown in Figure 2. Hydraulic head (Figure 5a) is plotted (as opposed to water table depth) as it is the motivating force for lateral flow in the simulation; it includes both the topography and pressure influences on the final solution. We see a very close agreement between observations and model simulations, though given the large range in hydraulic heads the goodness of fit may be influenced by topography. Additional metrics and comparisons are explored below.

Simulated streamflow (Figure 5b) also agrees closely with observations. There is some bias, particularly for smaller flows (which we emphasize by plotting in log scale), which also exhibit more scatter than larger flows, and are likely due to the 1km grid resolution employed here.

Larger flows are more integrated measures of the system and might be less sensitive to resolution or local heterogeneity in model parameters. We see this when linear least squared statistics are computed where the R<sup>2</sup> value increases to 0.8.

Reed Maxwell 3/4/2015 7:55 AM

Deleted: While

Reed Maxwell 3/4/2015 7:55 AM

Deleted: are

Reed Maxwell 3/4/2015 7:55 AM

Deleted: influential on

Reed Maxwell 3/4/2015 7:55 AM

Deleted: provide a plausibility check of

Reed Maxwell 3/4/2015 7:55 AM

Deleted:

Reed Maxwell 3/4/2015 7:55 AM

Deleted: somewhat driven

Reed Maxwell 3/4/2015 7:55 AM

**Deleted:** the underlying

Figure 6 plots histograms of predicted and observed water table depth (a), hydraulic head (b), median (50th percentile) flow and 75th percentile flows (c-d). The hydraulic head shows good agreement between simulated and observed (Figure 6b). While hydraulic head is the motivation for lateral flow and has been used in prior comparisons (e.g. Fan et al 2007) both observed and simulated values are highly dependent on the local elevation. Figure 6a plots the water table depth below ground surface, or the difference between local elevation and groundwater. Here we see the simulated water table depths are shallower than the observed, something observed in prior simulations of large-scale water table depth (Fan et al 2013). The observed water tables may include anthropogenic impacts, namely groundwater pumping, while the model simulations do not and this is a likely cause for this difference. Also, because groundwater wells are usually installed for extraction purposes there is no guarantee that the groundwater observations are an unbiased sample of the system as a whole. Figure 6c plots the steady-state derived flow values compared to median observed flow values and Figure 6d plots these same steady-state simulated flows compared to the 75th percentile of the observed transient flow at each station. While the ParFlow model provides a robust representation of runoff generation processes, the steady-state simulations average event flows. We see the model predicts greater flow than the 50th percentile observed flows (Figure 6c) and good agreement between the model simulations and the 75th percentile observed flows (Figure 6d). This indicates a potentially wet bias in the forcing, which might also explain the shallower water table depths.

343

344

345

346

347

348

349

350

351

352

353

354

355

356

357

358

359

360

361

362

363

364

365

Figures 7 and 8 compare observed and simulated flows and water table depths for each of the major basin encompassed by the model. Water tables are generally predicted to be shallower in the model than observations with the exception of the Upper and Lower Colorado which

demonstrate better agreement between model simulations and observations than other basins. These histograms agree with a visual inspection of Figures 2b and 4 which also indicate deeper observed water tables. Figure 8 indicates that simulated histograms of streamflow also predict more flow than the observations. This might indicate that the P-E forcing is too wet. However, a comparison of streamflow for the Colorado Watershed, where water table depths agree (Figure 8 e and g) and flows are overpredicted (Figure 7 e and g), indicates a more complex set of interactions than basic water balance driven by forcing.

366

367

368

369

370

371

372

373

374

375

376

377

378

379

380

381

382

383

384

385

386

387

388

To better diagnose model processes, model inputs are compared with model simulation outputs over example regions chosen to isolate the impact of topographic slope, forcing and hydraulic conductivity on subsurface-surface water hydrodynamics. We do this as a check to see if and how this numerical experiment compares to real observations. It is important to use a range of measures of success that might be different from that used in a model calibration where inadequacies in model parameters and process might be muted while tuning the model to better match observations. Figure 9 juxtaposes slope, potential recharge, surface flow, water table depth, hydraulic conductivity and a satellite image composite also at 1km resolution (the NASA Blue Marble image, (Justice et al. 2002)) and facilitates a visual diagnosis of control by the three primary model inputs. While the model was run to steady-state and ultimately all the potential recharge has to exit the domain as discharge, the distribution and partitioning between groundwater and streams depends on the slope and hydraulic conductivity. Likewise, while topographic lows create the potential for flow convergence, it is not a model requirement that these will develop into stream loci. Figure 9 demonstrates some of these relationships quite clearly over a portion of the model that transitions from semi-arid to more humid conditions as the North and South Platte River systems join the Missouri. As expected changes in slope yield

flow convergence, however, this figure also shows that as recharge increases from west to east (X > 1700 km), panel c) the model generally predicts shallower water tables and greater stream density (panels d and e, respectively). Conversely, in localized areas of decreased P-E (e.g. 700 < Y < 900 km specifically south of the Platte River) water tables increase and stream densities decrease. The satellite image (panel f) shows increases in vegetation that correspond to shallower water tables and increased stream density.

389

390

391

392

393

394

395

396

397

398

399

400

401

402

403

404

405

406

407

408

409

410

411

Hydraulic conductivity also has a significant impact on water table depth and stream network density. In areas of greater recharge in the eastern portion of Figure 9c, regions with larger hydraulic conductivity (panel b) show decreased stream network density and increased water table depths. This is more clearly demonstrated in Figure 10 (a region in the upper Missouri) where, except for the northeast corner, recharge is uniformly low. Slopes are also generally low (panel a), yet hydraulic conductivities show a substantial increase due to a change in datasets between state and country boundaries (panel b, X > 1250km, Y > 1400 km). The relative increase in hydraulic conductivity decreases hydraulic gradients under steady state conditions and generally increases water table depth, which in turn decreases stream network density. This change in hydraulic conductivity yields a decrease in the formation of stream networks resulting in an increase in water table depth. Thus, hydraulic conductivity has an important role in partitioning moisture between surface and subsurface flow, also under steadystate conditions. While mass balance requires that overall flow must be conserved, larger conductivity values allow this flow to be maintained within the subsurface while lower conductivities force the surface stream network to maintain this flow. In turn, stream networks connect regions of varying hydrodynamic conditions and may result in locally infiltrating conditions creating a losing-stream to recharge groundwater. This underscores the connection

between input variables and model predictions, an equal importance of hydraulic conductivity to recharge in model states and the need to continually improve input datasets.

412

413

414

415

416

417

418

419

420

421

422

423

424

425

426

427

428

429

430

431

432

433

434

Finally, the connection between stream flow and drainage area is a classical scaling relationship (Rodriguez-Iturbe and Rinaldo 2001), which usually takes the power law form  $Q=kA^n$ , where Q is volumetric streamflow [L<sup>3</sup>T<sup>-1</sup>], A is the contributing upstream area [L<sup>2</sup>] and k  $[LT^{-1}]$  and n are empirical constants. While this relationship has been demonstrated for individual basins and certain flow conditions (Rodriguez-Iturbe and Rinaldo 2001), generality has not been established (Glaster 2009). Figure 11a plots simulated streamflow as a function of associated drainage area on log-log axes, and Figure 11b plots the same variables for median observed streamflow from more than 4,000 gaging stations. While no single functional relationship is evident from this plot, there is a striking maximum limit of flow as a function of drainage area with a continental scaling coefficient of n = 0.84. Both Figures 11a and b are colored by aridity index (AI), the degree of dryness of a given location. Color gradients that transition from blue (more humid) to red (more arid) show that humid basins fall along the maximum flow-discharge line, while arid basins have less discharge and fall below this line. For discharge observations (Figure 11b) the same behavior is observed, where more humid stations fall along the n=0.9 line and more arid stations fall below this line. Essentially this means that in humid locations, where water is not a limiting factor, streamflow scales most strongly with topography and area. Conversely arid locations fall below this line because flow to streams is limited by groundwater storage.

The model presented here represents a first, high-resolution integrated simulation over continental-scale river basins in North America using the best available data. However, primary input datasets are used (potential recharge, subsurface properties and topography), which clearly

require improvement. For example, higher resolution simulations are feasible, given that the ParFlow model exhibits better than 80% parallel efficiency for more than 8 billion compute cells. This could improve the surface and subsurface prediction; although, we do not expect the form of the scaling relationships as shown in Figure 11 to change with an increase in resolution. Higher resolution simulations would require higher resolution parameter fields that do not exist at this time. Similarly, model lower boundaries (i.e. the overall thickness of the subsurface) could be extended given information about deeper hydrogeologic formations and their properties. The model domain could be expanded to larger spatial extent, either over more of continental North America, coastlines, or even globally. Thus, the study strongly motivates improved, unified input and validation data sets for integrated hydrologic models at the continental scale, similar to data products available to the atmospheric sciences.

## Conclusions

Here we present the results of an integrated, multiphysics-based hydrologic simulation covering much of Continental North America at hyperresolution (1km). This numerical experiment provides a consistent theoretical framework for the analysis of groundwater and surface water interactions and scaling from the headwaters to continental scale (10<sup>0</sup>-10<sup>7</sup> km<sup>2</sup>). The framework exploits high performance computing to meet this grand challenge in hydrology (Wood et al. 2011; Gleeson and Cardiff 2014; Bierkens et al. 2015). We demonstrate that continental-scale, integrated hydrologic models are feasible and can reproduce observations and the essential features of streamflow and groundwater. Results show that scaling of surface flow is related to both drainage area and aridity. These results may be interrogated further to understand the role of topography, subsurface properties and climate on groundwater table and

streamflow, and used as a platform to diagnose scaling behavior, e.g. surface flow from the headwaters to the continent.

These presented results are a first-step in high resolution, integrated, continental-scale simulation. We simulate an unaltered, or pre-development scenario of groundwater and surface water flows under steady-state conditions. As such, the discussion focuses on the physical controls of groundwater surface water interactions and scaling behavior; however there are obvious limitations to this scenario and these simulations. Clearly reservoir management, groundwater pumping, irrigation, diversion and urban expansion all shape modern hydrology. Work has been undertaken to include these features within the ParFlow framework at smaller scales (Ferguson and Maxwell 2011; Ferguson and Maxwell 2012; Condon and Maxwell 2013; Condon and Maxwell 2014) and an important next step is to scale the impacts out to the continent.

Additionally, the steady-state simulation does not take into consideration temporal dynamics or complex land-surface processes, also important in determining the quantity and fluxes of water. These limitations can all be addressed within the current modeling framework but require transient simulations and additional computational resources. Model performance is also limited by the quality of available input datasets. As noted throughout the discussion, existing datasets are subject to uncertainty and are clearly imperfect. As improved subsurface characterization becomes available, this information can be used to better inform models and fully understand the propagation of uncertainty in these types of numerical experiments (e.g. Maxwell and Kollet 2008; Kollet 2009). However, while the magnitudes of states and fluxes may change with improved datasets, the overall trends and responses predicted here are not likely to change. While there are always improvements to be made, these simulations represent a critical

Reed Maxwell 3/4/2015 7:55 AM

Deleted:

Reed Maxwell 3/4/2015 7:55 AM

**Deleted:** within the confines of the numerical experiment.

first step in understanding coupled surface subsurface hydrologic processes and scaling at continental scales resolving variances over four for orders of spatial scales.

This study highlights the utility of high performance computing in addressing the grand challenges in hydrological sciences and represents an important advancement in our understanding of hydrologic scaling in continental river basins. By providing an integrated model we open up a useful avenue of research to bridge physical processes across spatial scales in a hydrodynamic, physics-based upscaling framework.

# **Code Availability**

ParFlow is an open-source, modular, parallel integrated hydrologic platform freely available via the GNU LPGL license agreement. ParFlow is developed by a community led by the Colorado School of Mines and F-Z Jülich with contributors from a number of other institutions. Specific versions of ParFlow are archived with complete documentation and may be downloaded or checked-out from a commercially hosted, free SVN repository; v3, r693 was the version used in this study. The input data and simulations presented here will be made available and may be obtained by contacting the lead author via email.

http://inside.mines.edu/~rmaxwell/maxwell software.shtml

500	
501 502	Figures
503	Figure 1. Maps of top soil type (applied over the top 2 m of the model) (a), elevation (masl) (b),
504	bottom soil type (c), potential recharge, P-E, (m/y) (d), saturated hydraulic conductivity (m/h,_
505	applied over the bottom 100 m of the model) (e) over the model domain (f).
506	

507 508 509	Figure 2. Plot of observed streamflow (a) and observed water table depth (b).
-------------------	---

Figure 3. Map of simulated surface flow (m <sup>3</sup> /s) over the CONUS domain with two insets zooming into the Ohio river basin. Colors represent surface flow in log scale and line widths
vary slightly with flow for the first two panels.

the North and South Platte River basin, headwaters to the Mississippi. Colors represent depth in log scale (from 0.01 to 100m).	518	, 11 1 1
---	-----	----------

521 Figure 5. Scatterplots of simulated v. observed hydraulic head (a) and surface flow (b).

523 524 525 526	Figure 6. Histograms of simulated and observed water table depth (a), hydraulic head (b), median observed flow (c) and 75 <sup>th</sup> percentile observed flow (d).
--------------------------	---

527 528 529	
530 531	Figure 7. Distributions of observed and simulated streamflow by basin as indicated.

Figure 8. Distributions of observed and simulated water table depth by basin as indicated. Figure 9. Plots of topographic slope (a), hydraulic conductivity (b) potential recharge (c), water table depth (d), streamflow (e) and satellite image (f) for a region of the model covering the Platte River basin. Figure 10. Plots of topographic slope (a), hydraulic conductivity (b) potential recharge (c), water table depth (d), streamflow (e) and satellite image (f) for a region of the model covering the Upper Missouri basin. Figure 11. Plots of scaling relationships for simulated and median observed surface flow. Log-scale plots of surface flow as a function of contributing drainage area derived from the model simulation (a) and observations (b). Individual symbols are colored by aridity index (AI) with blue colors being humid and red colors being arid in panels (a) and (b). 

552 References

Anyah, R. O., C. P. Weaver, G. Miguez-Macho, Y. Fan and A. Robock (2008). "Incorporating water table dynamics in climate modeling: 3. Simulated groundwater influence on coupled land-atmosphere variability." <u>Journal of Geophysical Research-Atmospheres</u> **113**(D7): 15,

- Ashby, S. F. and R. D. Falgout (1996). "A parallel multigrid preconditioned conjugate gradient algorithm for groundwater flow simulations." <u>Nuclear Science and Engineering</u> **124**(1): 145-159.
- Beven, K. (2004). "Robert e. Horton's perceptual model of infiltration processes." <u>Hydrological</u> Processes **18**(17): 3447-3460,
- Bierkens, M. F. P., V. A. Bell, P. Burek, N. Chaney, L. E. Condon, C. H. David, A. de Roo, P. Döll, N. Drost, J. S. Famiglietti, M. Flörke, D. J. Gochis, P. Houser, R. Hut, J. Keune, S. Kollet, R. M. Maxwell, J. T. Reager, L. Samaniego, E. Sudicky, E. H. Sutanudjaja, N. van de Giesen, H. Winsemius and E. F. Wood (2015). "Hyper-resolution global hydrological modelling: What is next?" <a href="https://example.com/Hydrological/Processes/"><u>Hydrological Processes/</a> 29(2): 310-320, 10.1002/hyp.10391</u>
- Camporese, M., C. Paniconi, M. Putti and S. Orlandini (2010). "Surface-subsurface flow modeling with path-based runoff routing, boundary condition-based coupling, and assimilation of multisource observation data." <u>Water Resources Research</u> 46(2): W02512, 10.1029/2008wr007536
- Camporese, M., C. Paniconi, M. Putti and S. Orlandini (2010). "Surface-subsurface flow modeling with path-based runoff routing, boundary condition-based coupling, and assimilation of multisource observation data." <u>Water Resour. Res.</u> **46**(2): W02512, doi: 10.1029/2008wr007536
- Camporese, M., D. Penna, M. Borga and C. Paniconi (2014). "A field and modeling study of nonlinear storage-discharge dynamics for an alpine headwater catchment." <u>Water</u>
  Resources Research **50**(2): 806-822, 10.1002/2013wr013604
- Condon, L. E. and R. M. Maxwell (2013). "Implementation of a linear optimization water allocation algorithm into a fully integrated physical hydrology model." <u>Advances in Water Resources</u> **60**(0): 135-147, http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.advwatres.2013.07.012
- Condon, L. E. and R. M. Maxwell (2014). "Feedbacks between managed irrigation and water availability: Diagnosing temporal and spatial patterns using an integrated hydrologic model." Water Resources Research **50**(3): 2600-2616, 10.1002/2013wr014868
- Condon, L. E., R. M. Maxwell and S. Gangopadhyay (2013). "The impact of subsurface conceptualization on land energy fluxes." <u>Advances in Water Resources</u> **60**(0): 188-203, http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.advwatres.2013.08.001
- Döll, P., H. Hoffmann-Dobrev, F. T. Portmann, S. Siebert, A. Eicker, M. Rodell, G. Strassberg and B. R. Scanlon (2012). "Impact of water withdrawals from groundwater and surface water on continental water storage variations." 59,Äi60(-0): 156,
- Dunne, T. (1983). "Relation of field studies and modeling in the prediction of storm runoff."

  <u>Journal of Hydrology</u> **65**(1,Äi3): 25-48, <a href="http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/0022-1694(83)90209-3">http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/0022-1694(83)90209-3</a>
- Fan, Y., H. Li and G. Miguez-Macho (2013). "Global patterns of groundwater table depth."
   Science 339(6122): 940-943, 10.1126/science.1229881

- Fan, Y., G. Miguez-Macho, C. P. Weaver, R. Walko and A. Robock (2007). "Incorporating water table dynamics in climate modeling: 1. Water table observations and equilibrium water table simulations." <u>Journal of Geophysical Research-Atmospheres</u> **112**(D10): -,
- Ferguson, I. M. and R. M. Maxwell (2011). "Hydrologic and land–energy feedbacks of agricultural water management practices." Environmental Research Letters 6(-1), doi:10.1088/1748-9326/6/1/014006

- Ferguson, I. M. and R. M. Maxwell (2012). "Human impacts on terrestrial hydrology: Climate change versus pumping and irrigation." <u>Environmental Research Letters</u> 7(4): 044022,
   Freeze, R. A. and R. L. Harlan (1969). "Blueprint for a physically-based, digitally-simulated
  - Freeze, R. A. and R. L. Harlan (1969). "Blueprint for a phyiscally-based, digitally-simulated hydrologic response model." <u>Journal of Hyrology</u> 9: 237-258,
  - Glaster, J. C. (2009). "Testing the linear relationship between peak annual river discharge and drainage area using long-term usgs river gauging records." <u>Geological Society of America Special Papers</u> **451**: 159-171, 10.1130/2009.2451(11)
  - Gleeson, T. and M. Cardiff (2014). "The return of groundwater quantity: A mega-scale and interdisciplinary "future of hydrogeology"?" <a href="https://example.com/Hydrogeology/Hydrogeolog
  - Gleeson, T., L. Marklund, L. Smith and A. H. Manning (2011). "Classifying the water table at regional to continental scales." <u>Geophysical Research Letters</u> **38**(L05401): 6, 10.1029/2010GL046427
  - Gleeson, T., L. Smith, N. Moosdorf, J. Hartmann, H. H. Dürr, A. H. Manning, L. P. H. van Beek and A. M. Jellinek (2011). "Mapping permeability over the surface of the earth."

    <u>Geophysical Research Letters</u> **38**(2): L02401, 10.1029/2010gl045565
  - Goderniaux, P., S. Brouyère, H. J. Fowler, S. Blenkinsop, R. Therrien, P. Orban and A. Dassargues (2009). "Large scale surface,äisubsurface hydrological model to assess climate change impacts on groundwater reserves." <u>Journal of Hydrology</u> **373**(1,Äi2): 122-138, http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jhydrol.2009.04.017
  - Horton, R. E. (1933). "The role of infiltration in the hydrologic cycle." <u>Transactions-American</u> <u>Geophysical Union</u> **14**: 446-460,
  - Jiang, X., G. Y. Niu and Z. L. Yang (2009). "Impacts of vegetation and groundwater dynamics on warm season precipitation over the central united states." <u>Journal of Geophysical</u> Research **114**: 15,
  - Jones, J. E. and C. S. Woodward (2001). "Newton-krylov-multigrid solvers for large-scale, highly heterogeneous, variably saturated flow problems." <u>Advances in Water Resources</u> **24**(7): 763-774,
  - Jones, J. P., E. A. Sudicky, A. E. Brookfield and Y. J. Park (2006). "An assessment of the tracer-based approach to quantifying groundwater contributions to streamflow." <u>Water Resour.</u> Res. 42, 10.1029/2005wr004130
  - Jones, J. P., E. A. Sudicky and R. G. McLaren (2008). "Application of a fully-integrated surface-subsurface flow model at the watershed-scale: A case study." <u>Water Resources Research</u> **44**(3): W03407, 10.1029/2006wr005603
- Justice, C. O., J. R. G. Townshend, E. F. Vermote, E. Masuoka, R. E. Wolfe, N. Saleous, D. P.
   Roy and J. T. Morisette (2002). "An overview of modis land data processing and product status." <a href="Remote Sensing of Environment">Remote Sensing of Environment</a> 83(1,Äi2): 3-15, <a href="http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0034-4257(02)00084-6">http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0034-4257(02)00084-6</a>
- 640 Kirkby, M. (1988). "Hillslope runoff processes and models." <u>Journal of Hydrology</u> **100**(1,Äi3): 315-339, http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/0022-1694(88)90190-4

- Kollet, S. J. (2009). "Influence of soil heterogeneity on evapotranspiration under shallow water table conditions: Transient, stochastic simulations." <u>Environmental Research Letters</u> **4**(3):
- Kollet, S. J., I. Cvijanovic, D. Schüttemeyer, R. M. Maxwell, A. F. Moene and B. P. (2009).
   "The influence of rain sensible heat, subsurface heat convection and the lower temperature boundary condition on the energy balance at the land surface." <u>Vadose Zone</u>
   Journal 8(4): 12,

- Kollet, S. J. and R. M. Maxwell (2006). "Integrated surface-groundwater flow modeling: A free-surface overland flow boundary condition in a parallel groundwater flow model." Advances in Water Resources 29(7): 945-958,
- Kollet, S. J. and R. M. Maxwell (2008). "Capturing the influence of groundwater dynamics on land surface processes using an integrated, distributed watershed model." <u>Water</u>
  Resources Research **44**(W02402): 18, doi:10.1029/2007WR006004
- Kollet, S. J., R. M. Maxwell, C. S. Woodward, S. Smith, J. Vanderborght, H. Vereecken and C. Simmer (2010). "Proof of concept of regional scale hydrologic simulations at hydrologic resolution utilizing massively parallel computer resources." <u>Water Resources Research</u> **46**(W04201): -, Doi 10.1029/2009wr008730
- Krakauer, N. Y., H. Li and Y. Fan (2014). "Groundwater flow across spatial scales: Importance for climate modeling." <u>Environmental Research Letters</u> **9**(3): 034003,
- Kumar, M., C. J. Duffy and K. M. Salvage (2009). "A second order accurate, finite volume based, integrated hydrologic modeling (fihm) framework for simulation of surface and subsurface flow." <u>Vadose Zone Journal</u>,
- Maurer, E. P., A. W. Wood, J. C. Adam, D. P. Lettenmaier and B. Nijssen (2002). "A long-term hydrologically based dataset of land surface fluxes and states for the conterminous united states\*." Journal of Climate 15(22): 3237-3251, 10.1175/1520-0442(2002)015<3237:althbd>2.0.co;2
- Maxwell, R. M. (2013). "A terrain-following grid transform and preconditioner for parallel, large-scale, integrated hydrologic modeling." <u>Advances in Water Resources</u> **53**: 109-117, http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.advwatres.2012.10.001
- Maxwell, R. M., F. K. Chow and S. J. Kollet (2007). "The groundwater-land-surface-atmosphere connection: Soil moisture effects on the atmospheric boundary layer in fully-coupled simulations." <u>Advances in Water Resources</u> **30**(12): 2447-2466, Doi 10.1016/J.Advwatres.2007.05.018
- Maxwell, R. M. and S. J. Kollet (2008). "Interdependence of groundwater dynamics and landenergy feedbacks under climate change." Nature Geosci 1(10): 665-669,
  - Maxwell, R. M. and S. J. Kollet (2008). "Quantifying the effects of three-dimensional subsurface heterogeneity on hortonian runoff processes using a coupled numerical, stochastic approach." Advances in Water Resources **31**(5): 807-817,
  - Maxwell, R. M., J. D. Lundquist, J. D. Mirocha, S. G. Smith, C. S. Woodward and A. F. B. Tompson (2011). "Development of a coupled groundwater-atmospheric model." <u>Monthly Weather Review</u> doi: 10.1175/2010MWR3392(139): 96-116,
- Maxwell, R. M., M. Putti, S. Meyerhoff, J.-O. Delfs, I. M. Ferguson, V. Ivanov, J. Kim, O.
   Kolditz, S. J. Kollet, M. Kumar, S. Lopez, J. Niu, C. Paniconi, Y.-J. Park, M. S.
   Phanikumar, C. Shen, E. A. Sudicky and M. Sulis (2014). "Surface-subsurface model intercomparison: A first set of benchmark results to diagnose integrated hydrology and feedbacks." Water Resources Research 50(2): 1531-1549, 10.1002/2013wr013725

- Miguez-Macho, G., Y. Fan, C. P. Weaver, R. Walko and A. Robock (2007). "Incorporating water table dynamics in climate modeling: 2. Formulation, validation, and soil moisture simulation." Journal of Geophysical Research-Atmospheres 112(D13): -,
- 691 Mikkelson, K. M., R. M. Maxwell, I. Ferguson, J. D. Stednick, J. E. McCray and J. O. Sharp 692 (2013). "Mountain pine beetle infestation impacts: Modeling water and energy budgets at 693 the hill-slope scale." <u>Ecohydrology</u> **6**(1): 64-72, 10.1002/eco.278

- Osei-Kuffuor, D., R. M. Maxwell and C. S. Woodward "Improved numerical solvers for implicit coupling of subsurface and overland flow." <u>Advances in Water Resources(0)</u>, http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.advwatres.2014.09.006
- Osei-Kuffuor, D., R. M. Maxwell and C. S. Woodward (2014). "Improved numerical solvers for implicit coupling of subsurface and overland flow." <u>Advances in Water Resources</u> **74**(0): 185-195, http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.advwatres.2014.09.006
- Qu, Y. and C. J. Duffy (2007). "A semidescrete finite volume formulation for multiprocess watershed simulation." Water Resources Research 43(W08419): 18, doi:10.1029/2006WR005752
- Richards, L. A. (1931). "Capillary conduction of liquids in porous mediums." Physics 1: 318-333,
- Rihani, J. F., R. M. Maxwell and F. K. Chow (2010). "Coupling groundwater and land surface processes: Idealized simulations to identify effects of terrain and subsurface heterogeneity on land surface energy fluxes." <u>Water Resour. Res.</u> **46**: 1-14, doi:10.1029/2010WR009111
- Rodell, M., I. Velicogna and J. S. Famiglietti (2009). "Satellite-based estimates of groundwater depletion in india." Nature 460(7258): 999-1002,
- Rodriguez-Iturbe, I. and A. Rinaldo (2001). <u>Fractal river basins: Chance and self-organization</u>, Cambridge University Press.
- Schaap, M. G. and F. J. Leij (1998). "Database-related accuracy and uncertainty of pedotransfer functions." <u>Soil Science</u> **163**(10): 765-779,
- Shi, Y., K. J. Davis, C. J. Duffy and X. Yu (2013). "Development of a coupled land surface hydrologic model and evaluation at a critical zone observatory." <u>Journal of Hydrometeorology</u> **14**(5): 1401-1420, 10.1175/jhm-d-12-0145.1
- Sudicky, E., J. Jones, Y.-J. Park, A. Brookfield and D. Colautti (2008). "Simulating complex flow and transport dynamics in an integrated surface-subsurface modeling framework." Geosciences Journal 12(2): 107-122, 10.1007/s12303-008-0013-x
- Sulis, M., C. Paniconi, M. Marrocu, D. Huard and D. Chaumont (2012). "Hydrologic response to multimodel climate output using a physically based model of groundwater/surface water interactions." Water Resources Research 48(12): W12510, 10.1029/2012wr012304
- Taylor, R. G., B. Scanlon, P. Doll, M. Rodell, R. van Beek, Y. Wada, L. Longuevergne, M. Leblanc, J. S. Famiglietti, M. Edmunds, L. Konikow, T. R. Green, J. Chen, M. Taniguchi, M. F. P. Bierkens, A. MacDonald, Y. Fan, R. M. Maxwell, Y. Yechieli, J. J. Gurdak, D. M. Allen, M. Shamsudduha, K. Hiscock, P. J. F. Yeh, I. Holman and H. Treidel (2013).
  "Ground water and climate change." Nature Clim. Change 3(4): 322-329,
- Therrien, R., E. Sudicky, Y. Park and R. McLaren (2012). Hydrogeosphere: A three-dimensional numerical modelling describing fully-
- 731 integrated subsurface and surface flow and transport. User guide. Waterloo, Ontario, Canada, 732 Aquanty Inc.

- van Genuchten, M. T. (1980). "A closed-form equation for predicting the hydraulic conductivity of unsaturated soils." Soil Science Society of America Journal **44**(5): 892-898,
- VanderKwaak, J. E. and K. Loague (2001). "Hydrologic-response simulations for the r-5
   catchment with a comprehensive physics-based model." <u>Water Resources Research</u>
   37(4): 999-1013,

- Williams, J. L. and R. M. Maxwell (2011). "Propagating subsurface uncertainty to the atmosphere using fully-coupled, stochastic simulations." <u>Journal of Hydrometeorology</u>, doi:10.1175/2011JHM1363.1
- Wood, B. D. (2009). "The role of scaling laws in upscaling." <u>Advances in Water Resources</u> **32**(5): 723-736, http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.advwatres.2008.08.015
- Wood, E. F., J. K. Roundy, T. J. Troy, L. P. H. van Beek, M. F. P. Bierkens, E. Blyth, A. de Roo, P. Döll, M. Ek, J. Famiglietti, D. Gochis, N. van de Giesen, P. Houser, P. R. Jaffé, S. Kollet, B. Lehner, D. P. Lettenmaier, C. Peters-Lidard, M. Sivapalan, J. Sheffield, A. Wade and P. Whitehead (2011). "Hyperresolution global land surface modeling: Meeting a grand challenge for monitoring earth's terrestrial water." Water Resources Research 47(5): W05301, 10.1029/2010wr010090
- Xia, Y., K. Mitchell, M. Ek, B. Cosgrove, J. Sheffield, L. Luo, C. Alonge, H. Wei, J. Meng, B. Livneh, Q. Duan and D. Lohmann (2012). "Continental-scale water and energy flux analysis and validation for north american land data assimilation system project phase 2 (nldas-2): 2. Validation of model-simulated streamflow." <u>Journal of Geophysical Research: Atmospheres</u> 117(D3): D03110, 10.1029/2011jd016051